Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Kansas State University (S336S220016)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

A. Quality of the Project Design (30 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 proposed project demonstrates a rationale.

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

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

(iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.

(vi) 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.

The applicant has provided research to support the increased need for educators, due to shortages resulting from COVID and other factors. This shortage has presented challenges for filling vacancies in specific content areas and specific communities. To address this national need, the proposed project will address these needs through creation of a grow your own program that provides pathways to teacher licensure from community colleges to Kansas State University and providing quality mentor supports (e21).

The applicant has demonstrated a clear rationale for selecting its community college partners. Community colleges within a close radius to the partner districts were selected in order to develop a supply of teacher candidates from within the local communities, making it more likely that candidates are better prepared for the demographic to be taught, due to potential shared experiences, and to increase the likelihood that teachers will commit to and remain at the partner districts (e25).

The applicant has provided a clear logic model to demonstrate its rationale. The logic model details the inputs, activities and expected short-, medium- and long-term outcomes for the project (e47). Having a detailed logic model helps support the direction of the project and keeps project staff focused on the path to obtaining intended results.

The applicant has provided measurable goals, objectives and outcomes that are directly relevant to the proposed program (e35-36).

The program demonstrates a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning by infusing the use of evidence- based practices in improving teaching and learning throughout its curriculum. Required coursework instructs teacher candidates how to use data and research to modify classroom instruction for all learners (i.e., IEP, ELL, low literacy) (e39- 40) that they might provide the best learning environment possible.

Research has been provided to support various aspects of the project's design. For example, Research supports the need

Strengths:

to provide mentor teachers with comprehensive training to better prepare them for working with preservice teachers. The project's mentor academy will replicate elements of Parker, Zenkov, & Glaser's (2021) framework for training cooperating teachers. The proposed program will provide supervision, graduate-level seminars, professional learning opportunities, and professional learning communities to selected mentor teachers (e29). Using methods that are research based increases the likelihood they will help achieve the project's intended results.

Two frameworks centering racial equity will be used to guide teacher training: cultural responsiveness and equity mindedness. Both frameworks are grounded in research and train candidates to examine biases and educational inequities to create an ongoing awareness and accountability for change (e22). This is critical for training candidates to work with diverse students and is likely to produce success, based on their grounding in research.

The applicant has provided a table (e43) clearly linking elements of the project and intended outcomes to studies that

meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards. Grounding the project in research supports the likelihood of achieving intended outcomes.

The applicant has provided a table delineating its plan for obtaining feedback, suggesting it is in integral and intentional (e46) part of the project.

The applicant will further build capacity by providing virtual professional development for candidates (e46-48).

Weaknesses:

The applicant has not clearly articulated all goals and outcomes, in that no specific values have been provided for measurement. Although the applicant has indicated that there will be an "increased number" or "percentage change" for many objectives and outcomes (e.g., e35), it is not clear what those intended numbers and increases are.

The applicant has demonstrated how the proposed program demonstrates a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning (e39), but it is not clear from the information provide how the project will fit into larger efforts at reform within the district, or even the state. To maximize success and buy-in, it important to infuse programming within larger efforts at reform in the school district, or at minimum the state.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. B. 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 provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
(ii)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a robust evaluation plan, to include research questions aligned with project elements and intended outcome (e47). Designing research questions with these in mind helps to ensure data and identified themes from data analysis are valid in relation to what the evaluation is seeking to answer.

The applicant has selected an external evaluator with an M.S. in Educational Foundations with a focus on program evaluation (e49) and nearly 20 years' experience in project evaluation, to include programs for children and youth of all ages (birth through college), educator professional learning programs, parent and community engagement, and educational innovation (e48). Selecting an evaluator with such relevant education and experiences increases the likelihood of the evaluation resulting in valid and reliable performance data.

The project evaluation will implement a Quasi-Experimental Design (QED) with statistical adjustment to compare a treatment group and a control group for estimating the effectiveness of the interventions (e37). Comparing outcomes with treatment and control groups helps increase the validity of findings and the correlation between interventions and outcomes.

The proposed evaluation is through in that it includes both qualitative and quantitative data to be collected (e35). Including multiple data sources allows for triangulation of findings, which helps improve the validity of performance data as the evaluator is able to clearly see if findings are similar across data sources and analysis.

Program surveys will be administered at two different periods throughout each cohort's program cycle: pre- and post (e37). Administering surveys at various points provides baseline data that can be used for comparison in order to identify changes over time that may be related to the program's interventions.

Given the project's small population size (60 preservice teachers/students) the evaluation will include data on all participants, rather than a sample and students in the university's traditional educator preparation program will serve as a

comparison group to determine what differences in outcomes may exist between students in the traditional program versus those in the project (e50). Not having to utilize a sample group provides more direct information on candidates and overall outcomes to likely provide more reliable data regarding the project's impact.

Analysis results will be reported for the entire program and disaggregated by variables that might include demographic elements, location/community, membership in a priority group, pre-enrollment circumstances, or other elements (e50). Disaggregating data allows for identifying differences in impact among various subgroups and/or the identification of mitigating factors impacting performance data.

Weaknesses:

The proposed evaluation plan does not include measures for student achievement. With the intention of the project to ultimately improve academic achievement of the underserved students, the proposed evaluation is not through, as it does not assess for impacts of student outcomes.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i)   The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.
(ii)   The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.
(iii)   The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.
(iv)   The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the

project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.
(v)   The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

The university will provide use of its state-of-the-art technology center, which includes the latest in technological resources, a resource library with books, games, videos, and makerspace materials listed in an online bibliography for students to check out and have mailed to them (e51); and support with important tasks, such as cataloging technology equipment for externally funded projects (e50).

In addition to use of its technology center, the university will provide access to its Zoom services for meetings; its online learning management system; and IT support (e51). The resources will be critical to the successful functioning of the program.

Budget costs are adequate and reasonable to support the project and include line items relevant to each aspect of the project (e183). Money budgeted for salaries is also low in comparison to most projects, leaving more money to go toward project implementation.

With approximately 16,272 (e54) students to be served and total project cost of $1,304,409 (e184), the project has a per student costs of roughly $800 per student. A cost that is reasonable given the intended outcomes and future cost savings due to better teacher retention.

A multiyear operating model for development of sustainability plan has been provided (e620). The applicant will convene a sustainability committee responsible for ensuring project sustainability beyond the period of grant funding.

The applicant has provided letters of support (and MOUs) from each of its key project partners (e169). Through these letters of support, the commitment of each partner has been detailed. Having this information codified demonstrates what

each partner will contribute to the project and solidifies their commitment to successful implementation of the project.

Weaknesses:

Limited information on what facilities, equipment and supplies will be provided has been included in the narrative. The applicant has indicated that each partner will contribute to available resources for the program, but it is not clear from the information provided, what resources partners other than the university will provide.

It is not clear from the information provided that the applicant currently has resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. The applicant has made no specific mention of future funding sources or contributions to ensure sustainability of the program after grant funding has ended. The applicant has provided letters of support from its key project partners (e160), but support from a more broad range of stakeholders has not been clearly demonstrated or documented.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **D. 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 management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

   (i)   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.
   (ii)   The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

   Strengths:

   The applicant has provided a detailed, multi-year management plan with tasks, responsible parties, timelines and milestones (e57). Creating and using a detailed management plan helps ensure accountability for program implementation and to ensure that the project is completed on-time and within budget.

   The applicant has provided a table delineating its plan for obtaining feedback. This plan includes the frequency, evaluation method and element to be evaluated for ensuring continuous feedback and process improvements (e46). This plan will help ensure obtaining feedback and fostering continuous improvement are a regular and intentional part of the program design.

   To ensure feedback and continuous improvement, the external evaluator and project team will develop a progress checklist, based upon project goals, objectives, and project timelines. The project team will be required to complete the checklist as an agreed-upon, acceptable threshold for implementation. The external evaluator will review project documents and data collected by the project manager each semester, along with the implementation checklist to assess progress, implementation, and project improvements (e45).

   The applicant will collect feedback on participant perceptions of progress, fidelity, and overall project management by conducting focus groups annually (e45). These focus groups will provide information the applicant can use to make adjustments to the project as needed to ensure strong implementation and increase the likelihood of obtaining intended outcomes.

   The applicant will provide summaries of evaluation activities that will be used to monitor project progress and inform strategic decision making for continued project improvement (e46).
   An annual summative report of program findings and recommendations will also be created.

   The applicant will collect participant and implementer feedback through an annual survey of all project participants—students, educator mentors, implementers, higher education faculty, partners, and school administrators, as applicable—as well as individual interviews with a random sample of five students annually (e49).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 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 one or both of the following:

    a)   High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences)prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.
    b)   Reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.

    Strengths:

    Not applicable

    Weaknesses:

    Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. **Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning (Up to 3 points).**

    Projects that are designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educator serving students, with a focus on underserved students, through increasing the number of teachers with certification or dual certification in a shortage area, or advanced certifications from nationally recognized professional organizations.

    Strengths:

    The applicant has elected to develop a grow-your-own program designed around a model that includes two years in a local community college, then a transition to Kansas State University to complete teacher education requirements. Recruiting candidates from within local communities, rather than from other districts or states, means teacher demographics are more likely to mirror those of the students they will serve (e32). This will be of particular importance to partner district, USD 51, which is approximately 32 percent Hispanic, 17 percent African American, and 13 percent other (e24).

    The proposed program expects to increase the number of teachers in hard-to-staff shortage areas, by graduating 60 certified teachers (e16) in these certification areas (e32). To support this effort, the university will evolve its current messaging to market itself to attract a more diverse audience; Implement a more streamlined admission process for first generation college students; and providing a diverse, first-generation academic advisor dedicated to the proposed project so underrepresented teacher candidates are able to establish a relationship with their support (e52).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. **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 creating a positive, inclusive, and identity-safe climate at institutions of higher education, through one or more of the following activities:

   a)   **Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.**
   b)   **Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.**

   Strengths:

   The university has developed its first-ever university wide strategic plan for diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging. The plan is a five-year inclusive plan providing a clear and holistic view of equity gaps and outlining targeted aims and research-based actions for addressing those disparities (e34). This plan demonstrates intentionality to address the needs of diverse students to ensure their success.

   The university includes over 40 Multicultural Student Organizations (MSOs) representing historically underrepresented students. These organizations provide opportunities for students to gain leadership skills, learn about academic resources and increase cultural awareness. Virtual opportunities are provided for participation (e34).

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant has noted their various affinity groups as a mechanism for fostering inclusion among the diverse candidates, but it is not clear how they will encourage or direct students towards the affinity groups to support the inclusion and connection that may result from them.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. **Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 2 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.

   a)   **In one or more of the following educational settings:**
   (1)   **Early learning programs**
   (2)   **Elementary school.**
   (3)   **Middle school**
   (4)   **High school**

   (5)   **Career and technical education programs.**
   (6)   **Out-of-school-time settings.**
   (7)   **Alternative schools and programs.**

   b)   **That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational 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:

Equity mindedness serves as theoretical framework to guide the project's design. This framework calls attention to patterns of inequity in outcomes. Equity-minded practitioners are race-conscious and aware of the social and historical context of exclusionary practices across systems and structures (Lazar, 2018). The equity-minded framework also requires practitioners to take personal and institutional responsibility for systemic inequities (e.g., racism) and critically reassess their own practice (e22).

Each Monday, the university hosts research-based, interactive "Hot Topics" gatherings for teacher candidates. These professional development sessions dive into topics important to inclusivity and instruct participants away from identifying problems with learners and towards identifying barriers to learning (e34). This will help educators foster greater accountability toward student success in the K-12 classrooms they will serve and to actively examine barriers to students' learning.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. **Partnership Grants for the Establishment of Grow Your Own Programs**

   Projects that establish Grow Your Own programs that are designed to address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and/or geographic areas, or shortages of school leaders in high-need schools, and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal, or other school leader workforce.

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

Reader's Score:

Status:
Last Updated:

   0

Submitted 06/05/2022 10:55 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/03/2022 04:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kansas State University (S336S220016)
Reader #2:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	27

Quality of the Project Evaluation
    1. Project Evaluation   20   18

Adequacy of Resources
    1. Adequacy of Resources   30   25

Quality of the Management Plan
    1. Management Plan   20   20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority

Competitive Preference Priority 1
    1. Educator Diversity   4   0

Competitive Preference Priority 2
    1. Diverse Workforce   3   3

Competitive Preference Priority 3
    1. Meeting Student Needs   2   2

Competitive Preference Priority 4
    1. Promoting Equity   2   2

Invitational Priority

Invitational Priority
    1. Grow Your Own   0   0

                                              Total   111   97

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.336S

Reader #2:   **********
Applicant: Kansas State University (S336S220016)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **A. Quality of the Project Design (30 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 proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
   (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
   (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
   (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
   (v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.
   (vi) 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.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant indicated that the rationale for proposed project is to address the fact that 44% of public schools reported having at least one teaching vacancy, and 61% of them specifically identified the COVID-19 pandemic as a cause of those vacancies. Resignations accounted for 51% of the vacancies and retirements accounted for 21% of the vacancies. Thus, school districts across the nation are facing a basic issue of supply and demand. The applicant is proposing to implement Project REFORM to build capacity for recruiting and retaining teacher candidates by broadening the paths by which non-traditional candidates may access teacher preparation programs. The project will serve 60 mentor teachers in the three partner districts. Project REFORM is designed to seeks to provide three communities and community colleges with a Grow Your Own teacher pathway to serve underrepresented students and their communities by providing equitable opportunities leading to teaching careers. (pgs. e 20-27)

(ii) The proposed project will address three goals that are clearly stated and aligned with reasonable outcomes. The three primary goals of the project include: (1) the delivery of an effective teacher preparation program while recruiting a diverse pool of candidates to meet state certification requirements in critical shortage areas; (2) a year-long intensive clinical experience providing new teachers with daily mentoring and monthly networking support to facilitate their transition into the field of education; and (3) improve teacher retention in high-need schools by redesigning the induction support provided to novice teachers, piloting a 2-year induction program while developing additional resources tailored to the needs of novice teachers. (pgs. e28-32)

(iii) The applicant provided reasonable that the proposed project will prepare new or prospective teachers to understand and use research and data to modify and improve classroom instruction. The applicant indicated that in the courses students will address critical thinking and reflective decision making about educational issues and how they influence instruction. Courses will also teach students how to examines instructional planning, differentiating instruction, direct and indirect instructional strategies, strategies to promote student understanding, managing lesson delivery, classroom management, assessing student performance. After the program of study coursework is completed, a capstone project and a student teaching portfolio, is required in which students will develop a comprehensive unit assignment requiring a research-based unit plan, formative and summative assessments, and analysis of data to inform and modify instruction.

Students are required to follow Limited English-speaking focus students throughout their clinical experience, and to differentiate instruction for their students in their preparation and planning. (pgs. e 34-38)

(iv) The applicant provided some cited evidence-based research and best practices that were relevant to project rationale. For example, the applicant indicated that the project's research is grounded in key theoretical frameworks that supports the need to provide mentor teachers with comprehensive training to better prepare them for working with preservice teachers. Project REFORM's mentor academy will replicate elements of Parker, Zenkov, & Glaser's (2021) framework for training cooperating teachers through a holistic framework moves beyond the narrow scope of transmitting pedagogical skills to a broader view of a mentor as facilitative guide. Thus, a key focus on the preparation of cooperating teachers is building meaningful relationships with their teacher candidates based on open and reflective communicative practices. Given the significance of mentor teachers during both the student teaching semester, as well as the induction year, Project REFORM's inclusion of a mentorship academy for mentor teachers supports its main objective or recruiting and preparing diverse, non-traditional candidates for a career in teaching. (pgs. e 39-42)

(v) The applicant provided reasonable evidence that there will be process and procedures in place to review and discuss performance feedback and continuous improvement For example, the applicant indicated that the project team will develop a progress checklist, based upon the project goals, objectives, and timeline that the REFORM team must complete as an agreed-upon threshold for implementation. Project documents and data collected each semester and will be incorporated as part of the progress checklist to assess progress, implementation, and project improvement. Teams will participate in regular evaluation meetings with REFORM to provide advice and consultation on evaluation and formative feedback for project improvement. A focus group will be conducted annually with the REFORM team to assess perceptions of progress, fidelity, and overall project management. (pgs. e 42-44)

(vi) The applicant provided some evidence that some of the proposed project components have the potential to build capacity beyond the grant period. The applicant indicated that Project REFORM is designed to build capacity for recruiting and retaining teacher candidates by broadening the paths by which non-traditional candidates may access teacher preparation programs. Based on the fact that the program is online the applicant will utilize GoReact, a robotic video and audio recording device, to better serve student teachers in online programs. In the induction program, mentees will continue using GoReact software to upload video for commentary from mentors, bi-weekly for the first two years of their teaching career. GoReact cloud accounts allow for sharing uploaded video for commentary from both mentors and mentees. Project REFORM mentees will attend a virtual professional development and receive ongoing professional learning through a mentorship academy. Also, Project REFORM's induction program will include a virtual space for early

career teachers to share ideas, find support, and stay connected to faculty. (pgs. e46-48)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) While the applicant provided goals, the goals were stated more as outcomes than goals. The goals were not specific, and some did not provide clearly stated measurable outcomes.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) No weaknesses noted.

(v) No weaknesses noted.

(vi) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 27

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. B. 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 provide valid and reliable
performance data on relevant outcomes.**
**(ii)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate
to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

(i) The applicant provided a reasonable evaluation plan that had some methods of evaluation that could potentially determine the validity and reliable performance on relevant outcomes. For example, the applicant indicated that the evaluation will be both formative and summative, to examine program implementation and outcomes throughout implementation. The evaluation will also employ a comparison group to determine the extent to which results may differ between this project and the traditional student pathway. The study will implement a Quasi-Experimental Design (QED) with to compare a treatment group and a control group for estimating the effectiveness of the interventions. The evaluation has been designed in consideration of the five required performance measures, which include certification and licensure, shortage area certification, one-year persistence, one-year employment retention, and three-year employment retention. (pgs. e 28-39)

(ii) The applicant provided some evidence that there are methods of evaluation appropriate for accessing the effectiveness for the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. For example, all participants will complete a capstone and a student teaching portfolio. The applicant will perform, a qualitative and quantitative analysis to include data sources such as, participant demographics, academic outcome data (completion and completion time, postsecondary persistence, course enrollment and grades, certification, and licensure in all areas. (pgs. e 28-39)

Weaknesses:

(i) The applicant indicated the evaluation will measure teacher efficacy, retention and student survey data using corresponding assessment instruments. However, the applicant did not identify the instruments to be used. Additionally, the applicant indicated the evaluation will measure the effectiveness of interventions among the treatment and control group but did not explain what interventions will be used.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i)   The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.
(ii)   The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.

(iii)   The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.
(iv)   The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.
(v)   The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant successfully demonstrated support from the lead organization which is Kansas state University. For example, the applicant indicated that the program will be embedded in the university infrastructure. Administratively housed in the College of Education and the Center for Science Education to integrate the science STEM resources. The university ZOOM technology will be provided and serves as a platform for virtual meetings for all partnership meetings and student support. CANVAS is K-State's learning management system. Also, these platforms will provide easy to use, mobile access to online coursework. The university has committed office space, technology, supplies and university personnel from other divisions. KSUCOE also houses the Center for Student Success and Professional Services. All students will have access to supports from academic advisors and/or licensure specialists who will guide them through their professional program, graduation, initial teacher licensure and beyond. (pgs. e 56-58)

(ii) The applicant provided some evidence that the budget is reasonable to support the project. The applicant is requesting 1,304,409.00 federal funds and showed evidence of the same amount as a match. The program is providing $188,600.00 as a cash donation and other partners will contribute $1,116,558.00 in total cash donations. (Budget Narrative pgs. e187-193)

(iii) The applicant provided some evidence that the costs are in line with the ideas and purposes of the grant. The applicant is requesting The applicant indicated that the budget acknowledges the 2% limit on administrative costs as well as the 100% match obligation. The budget includes salaries, fringe benefits, travel, and stipends of $7,500 for pre-service teachers for a total of $166,500.00 over the life of the grant. Mentor Teachers will receive a $1500 stipend each semester they are providing on-going coaching and leadership to pre-service teachers. Cohort one will support 5, cohort two 10 mentors, cohort three 20 mentors and cohort four 25 for a total of 60 throughout the 5 year project. (pgs. e58-63 and Budget Narrative)

(iv) The applicant indicated the community colleges are willing to continue support to the project.

(v) The applicant provided an MOU. The applicant will put together a Sustainability Committee to look at future plans.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) The applicant did not provide a fully detailed budget and budget narrative that fully explained the costs for all expenditures. For example, there are cost each year in the other category for a total of $175,100.00, However, this costs was also listed as advertising and marketing in another section. There is another unexplained cost for 13,500.00.
(iv) The applicant does not provide evidence that there are resources to continue to implement the program after the grant period.

(v) The applicant does not provide a multi-year financial plan that evidenced there will be resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. While there is an unsigned MOU, the MOU does not demonstrate future commitments of

any partners.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. D. 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 management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i)   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.
(ii)   The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(i) The applicant reasonably demonstrated that there is a management plan in place to guide the organization in achieving the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities and a yearly timelines. The applicant provided evidence that the project tasks and activities are aligned with timelines for completion and milestones. The management plan included strategic planning for program development and effective tracking, and processes and procedures as to how the program will manage the progression of implementation. Based on a review of the timeline, the project has the potential to complete all project activities successfully. For example, by the end of fall 2022, the project will revisited the MOU with the partners. (pgs. e59-62)

(ii) The applicant provided some communication for providing feedback relevant to continuous improvement. For example, the applicant indicated that with the support of the outside evaluator, the project will engage in feedback from all participants, including from teacher candidates. The LEAs both the district and community college levels will provide feedback from the mentor teachers. (pgs. e 62-65) Teams will participate in regular evaluation meetings with REFORM to provide advice and consultation on evaluation and formative feedback for project improvement. A focus group will be conducted annually with the REFORM team to assess perceptions of progress, fidelity, and overall project management. The teams will complete a project checklist to share progress and engage in feedback. (pgs. e 42-44)

Weaknesses:
(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 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 one or both of the following:

a)   High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences)prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.
b)   Reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully

represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. **Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning (Up to 3 points).**

   Projects that are designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educator serving students, with a focus on underserved students, through increasing the number of teachers with certification or dual certification in a shortage area, or advanced certifications from nationally recognized professional organizations.

   ### Strengths:

   The applicant indicated that Project REFORM will leverage a collaborative effort with Kansas State University, Allen Community College, Independence Community College, and Coffeyville Community College and three LEA's serve 16,272 partner LEA students ranging from 58 to 74 percent poverty. Project REFORM is designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through expanding reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators. The project will market the program to attract a more diverse audience and streamline the admissions process. The applicant will utilize targeted geographic areas and student demographics to seek first generation college students

   No weaknesses noted.

   ### Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. **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 creating a positive, inclusive, and identity-safe climate at institutions of higher education, through one or more of the following activities:

   a)   Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.
   b)   Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.

   ### Strengths:

   (b) The applicant effectively demonstrated that evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students will be interjected into the program components. The applicant provided evidence that there is a need in the LEAs for students to improve their academic achievement and to integrate SEL into rigorous academic inquiry, evidence-based SEL practices have been embedded into the teacher preparation curriculum, and teacher and principal development, given important research advancements that support whole child learning and its relative impact on the development of creating psychologically and physically safe school communities where students feel nurtured, secure, and supported. SEL skills and competencies will be back mapped into every teacher preparation course. (pgs. e13-15)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. **Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 2 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.

   a)   **In one or more of the following educational settings:**
   (1) **Early learning programs**
   (2) **Elementary school.**
   (3) **Middle school**
   (4) **High school**
   (5) **Career and technical education programs.**
   (6) **Out-of-school-time settings.**
   (7) **Alternative schools and programs.**

   b)   **That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational 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:

   (a) The program will serve three LEA's with students ranging from 58 to 74 percent poverty. Project REFORM The program will focus on recruiting teachers for high need subject areas in K-12. (pgs. 6-7)

   (b) The applicant indicated that the proposed program will develop an effective teacher preparation program while recruiting a diverse pool of candidates to meet state certification requirements in critical shortage areas. The program is a year-long intensive clinical experience providing new teachers with daily mentoring and monthly networking support to facilitate their transition into the field of education. The project will focus on high-need areas in critical need subject areas. The applicant will provide teachers with equity-mindedness training. (pgs. 8-10)

   Weaknesses:

   (a) No weaknesses noted.
   (b) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. **Partnership Grants for the Establishment of Grow Your Own Programs**

   Projects that establish Grow Your Own programs that are designed to address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and/or geographic areas, or shortages of school leaders in high-need schools, and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal, or other school leader workforce.

   Strengths:

   The applicant indicated that the program will include a component to Grow Your Own teacher pathway to serve underrepresented students and their communities by providing equitable opportunities leading to teaching careers. Each partner will play a key role in supporting a reformed Community College pathway, a reformed university teacher education program that streamline the path for highly diverse, economically challenged place-bound students to become high quality teachers serving urban or rural communities. KSUCOE has been a part of the CALL ME MISTER program to recruit Black Males into the field of teaching. (Abstract)

   Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Status:
Last Updated:

0

Submitted 06/03/2022 04:19 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/08/2022 03:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kansas State University (S336S220016)
Reader #3:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	26
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	1
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	1
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.336S

Reader #3: **********
Applicant: Kansas State University (S336S220016)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **A. Quality of the Project Design (30 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 proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
   (ii)   The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
   (iii)   The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
   (iv)   The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
   (v)   The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.
   (vi)   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.

   Strengths:

   Resignations (51%) and retirements (21%) accounted for much of the vacancies in the school districts in Kansas (pg. e20). The proposed program has foundations in culturally responsiveness and equity mindedness. Cultural responsiveness is focused on awareness of one's own cultural identity and views about difference and ways to learn from the diverse groups and community strengths of marginalized individuals and groups (pg. e21). Equity-minded practitioners are racially conscious and aware of systematic inequities and reflect on their own practices to impact student engagement and learning (pg. e22). The goals and objectives are clear and measurable (pp. e22). The applicant expresses rationale for the project by presenting WWC-evidence that supports each of the activities to reach the goals of the project (pp. e26- 31; e43). The applicant's logic model on pg. e47 focuses on inputs, outputs, and impact that demonstrates the project's rationale. The four components of the project are the creation of a community college pathways for educators, increasing classroom experiences, developing teacher-leaders for a Mentor Teacher Academy, and the establishment of an Induction Lab to support professional development requirements (pp. e35-36). Continuous improvement and feedback will be integrated into all of the project's activities with a quasi-experimental evaluation design used to measure the effectiveness by the external evaluator North of the Present. The applicant addresses the institutional leadership and LEA pledging support for the activities beyond the federal support (pg. e50). Additionally, there are clearly identified external evaluation partnership.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **B. 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 provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The evaluation plan in this application presents a quasi-experimental evaluation analysis to measure the effects of program for preservice and mentor teachers, empowerment of teachers and provide experiences that support diverse, nontraditional, historically underrepresented, and first-generation college students, and program improvements (pg. e48). Ms. McConnell will oversee the aspects of the project to make sure that the outcomes and procedures as she has experience working with teacher preparation. The project activities are measurable and include teacher outcomes at the short, intermediate, and long-term outcomes (pg. e47). The plan for collecting the data is detailed.

Weaknesses:

There are no student outcomes presented in the project as outcomes to be measured. The applicant does not present a timeline for evaluation activities with regular milestones.

Reader's Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

(ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.

(iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

(v) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

The applicant expresses support for the REFORM program through activities offered through the Rural Education Center (pg. e51). The KSU REC will coordinate activities for educational projects and have supported the project's initiative among the partners through recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention (pg. e52). The proposed plan estimates it will reach 16,272 students (pg. e53). The applicant states this proposal will pull together resources from the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences (pg. e54). Partnership between the LEAs and applicant seems to be strong. The applicant demonstrates the contributions that will support the continuation of the

program, such as program admission reform, recruitment from outside education, diverse, first-generation academic advisor, program completion supports, program placement into high-need elementary schools, mentoring experiences, and improved retention efforts (pp. e52-53).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant identifies partners in other parts of the application beyond the College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences, this section does not detail the collaboration or contribution of those additional external partners. Additional partnerships should be listed with clear contributions and how each contribution and resources will sustain the initiative.

Reader's Score: 26

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. D. 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 management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) 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.
(ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The project includes a detailed and clear implementation chart that also outlines evaluation activities as they relate and support formative feedback and project summative evaluation for each objective (pp. e56-62). There is a strong plan to provide teacher feedback through seeking feedback from teacher participants, LEAs, and the mentor-teachers (pg. e63). Feedback data will be reviewed and recommendations will be made to ensure the program is responsive to the needs of the college and partner LEA (pgs. e46, e63).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 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 one or both of the following:

a) High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V

of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences)prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.
b) Reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.

Strengths:

The applicant does not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning (Up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educator serving students, with a focus on underserved students, through increasing the number of teachers with certification or dual certification in a shortage area, or advanced certifications from nationally recognized professional organizations.

Strengths:

The project demonstrates the in the Topeka school district, 6% of teachers are working out of field, and 24% are inexperienced, while in Coffeyville, 2% are out of field and 11% are inexperienced, and in Independence, 5% are out of field and 20% are inexperienced (pp. e32-33).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. **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 creating a positive, inclusive, and identity-safe climate at institutions of higher education, through one or more of the following activities:

   a) **Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.**
   b) **Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.**

Strengths:

The applicant addresses this priority by stating that students will have access to resources such as depression, anxiety disorders, and medication management. The applicant states that involvement in underrepresented student affinity groups, such as the African Student Union, Asian American Student Union, Black Student Union, and numerous others are evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear from the application narrative how access to services will result in fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion. For example, for students who are identified with depression, how does visiting campus resources improve their belonging and inclusion. The applicant does not present evidence that involvement in their student groups on campus who represent historically underrepresented students will result in fostering belonging and inclusion in this teacher preparation program. Additionally, no evidence is presented in advancing student success for underserved students.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. **Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 2 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.

   a) **In one or more of the following educational settings:**
   (1) **Early learning programs**
   (2) **Elementary school.**
   (3) **Middle school**
   (4) **High school**
   (5) **Career and technical education programs.**
   (6) **Out-of-school-time settings.**
   (7) **Alternative schools and programs.**

b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational 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 addresses this priority by implication within the application responses.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not directly address this priority.

Reader's Score: 1

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. Partnership Grants for the Establishment of Grow Your Own Programs

Projects that establish **Grow Your Own** programs that are designed to address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and/or geographic areas, or shortages of school leaders in high-need schools, and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal, or other school leader workforce.

Strengths:

Supporting a "grow your own" program by recruitment of current students to have an interest in teaching to the high-need students in their home districts, the LEA and TQP applicant will be able to self-sustain addressing students who reflect the student body and meet the equity needs. The program will be not only self-sustaining but self-growing as it will continue to attract and retain teachers that can be supported to serve their native communities.

No weaknesses noted.
Weaknesses:
 Score:
Status:

Last Updated:
Submitted
06/08/2022 03:32 PM