

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Florida International University Board of Trustees (S336S220041)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	102
9/28/23 11:33 AM		
		Page 1 of 8

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Florida International University Board of Trustees (S336S220041)

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's rationale is centered around strengthening the educator pipeline and improving recruitment and retention. More specifically, the applicant will reform their curriculum to ensure it incorporates high-quality elements as indicated by research (pg. e15). Several sources are provided that demonstrate a rationale for the curriculum redesign, clinical placements, and recruitment efforts (pgs. e15-18). The proposed logic models (pgs. e36-42) are thorough in detailing how project activities will lead to outputs and outcomes. For example, related to Goal 3b, activities such as a Summer Institute will become institutionalized and aid stakeholders in understanding how to support EPP teacher candidates (pg. e42).

(ii) Project goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable. The applicant identifies three goals: revising the undergraduate EPP curriculum; revising recruitment efforts to enroll and retain 100 students; and revise professional development and learning opportunities for teacher candidates. Seven objectives are described related to the goals. These proposed goals, objectives, and anticipated outcomes are well-designed. (pgs. e36-42). Performance measures are articulated via the project objectives and performance measures document (pgs. e209-211)

(iii) The project serves as an expansion of efforts to improve teaching and learning by elevating current practices. These research-based practices will support rigorous standards by continuing a standard of excellence as demonstrated by the applicant's rank among other Elementary programs. It is evident that the program produces teacher candidates who are prepared to incorporate rigorous standards in their classroom as demonstrated by at least 75% of their subgroups meeting or exceeding state standards for performance. (pgs. e43-44)

(iv) The project's activities are informed by up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. For example, elements indicated by research as making an EPP program successful (pg. e32) are included in the plan of implementation in addition to engagement with a high-need LEA partner. Of particular note, there will be ongoing efforts to ensure professional development experiences include training related to current best practices. This is accomplished via the Professional Development workgroup (pg. e33)

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 2 of 8

(v) Performance feedback about the project is well-demonstrated via established systems for evaluation and feedback. For example, the applicant indicates previous success in collecting feedback from student participants and improving language based on results (pg. e46). Other feedback will be solicited from workgroups related to elements of the project such as the CKTM workgroup, CPFPP workgroup, and PPM workgroup.

(vi) The applicant convincingly demonstrates that the project will build capacity in the teacher candidate population, within the partner LEA, and will yield results far beyond the conclusion of federal funding. Specifically, capacity building is demonstrated via the project's anticipated improvements to recruitment, retention, and professional development. Project activities will continue to produce results after the conclusion of funding due to the strengthening of clinical experiences, improved collaborations with the LEA partner, and other continued activities (pg. e48)

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:

(i) The evaluation plan is comprehensive, seeking to answer guiding research questions. The methods of evaluation include both qualitative and quantitative performance data that should allow for a robust assessment of the extent to which outcomes are being achieved. A detailed timeline (pgs. e54-55) for data collection efforts is articulated, indicating that each cohort will receive identical evaluative efforts.

(ii) The methods of evaluation are appropriate to assess the success of the project via an examination of the goals, objectives, and outcomes. The applicant's efforts will include formative and summative assessments. To monitor progress, the applicant will collect multiple forms of data to provide summary data and visualizations that are appropriate for the cohort size (pg. e56)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)**

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 3 of 8

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 institution indicates support for project activities via the provision of facilities, furnishing, materials, and equipment (pg. e57). Other evidence of support is demonstrated via the provision of office space, furniture, and the necessary materials for implementation (pg. e58).

(ii) The succinct narrative indicates that most expenses are related to supporting personnel expenses, stipends, and materials costs.

(iii) The budget justification details evidence of some costs being reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance. For example, proposed costs are in alignment with the accomplishment of project activities and support implementation. (pgs. 206-208).

(iv) Letters of commitment are on file to demonstrate that the partner school district is ready to support the project (pg. e198). Support is indicated related to collaborative efforts for curriculum revision and opportunities for clinical experiences.

(v) The budget and overall narrative demonstrate the relevance and commitment of the partnering LEA. The Miami-Dade County Public School district is a significant contributor to the project, providing infrastructure resources such as professional development and support for existing programs.

Weaknesses:

(iii) The presented budget includes some costs that appear to be unreasonable. For example, the applicant institution indicates support in the form of facilities, but the budget justification indicates \$110,211.52 in facilities and

administration costs (pg. 208). In addition, the partnering school district subaward is significantly high at over \$2 million. (4 points not awarded)

(iv) Sustainability efforts are not defined beyond a statement indicating that the cost-match budget demonstrated commitment (pg. e59). More information about cost-matching efforts and a plan for sustaining activities is desirable. (3 points not awarded)

Reader's Score: 23

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 4 of 8

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 provides sufficient details related to the management plan. A comprehensively detailed schedule for administrative operations is provided that outlines milestones for accomplishment (pgs. e60-61) Information about staff responsibilities is described (pg. e58-59) and indicates highly qualified staff as demonstrated by staff resumes (pgs. e102-197)
- (ii) Feedback mechanisms are defined within the management plan. The project includes several workgroups that meet on a monthly basis, with some meetings biweekly, to discuss project activities (pg. e60). The evaluation plan supports continuous improvement via the provision of data to determine progress.

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.**

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 5 of 8

Strengths:

(b)The project narrative includes elements that indicate the applicant is revising its educator preparation program to improve the diversity of teacher candidates. Specifically, the applicant will work to recruit teachers of color, particularly men, to provide them with clinical experiences in high need schools that prepare them to persist as educators. (pg. e15)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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 has a strong focus on increasing the number of diverse teacher candidates with a focus on the recruitment and retention of men of color (pg. e31). In collaboration with the partner school district, the applicant will provide opportunities for professional development through Project Recruiting, Empowering and Developing Inclusive Male Teachers and Leaders (Project REDI). The revisions to the EPP will allow for 100 well-prepared teachers with certifications in alignment with the state's Department of Education standards.

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:

No strengths noted.

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 6 of 8

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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 targeted schools that will be used for clinical experiences demonstrate high population of underserved students. For example, all schools have a free and reduced lunch rate of at least 85.7%, with most above 90% (pg. e31). Project activities will promote equity via a prepared teacher workforce.

(b) Teacher candidates will be able to promote equity in elementary, middle, and high schools related to access to resources. The clinical experience will also allow for a supervised experience where participants have the opportunity to examine sources of inequity and implement responsive practices that promote inclusivity (pg. e30)

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.

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 7 of 8

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score:

Status:

Last Updated:

0

Submitted 06/06/2022 03:22 PM

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 8 of 8

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 11:30 AM

	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	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	23
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Florida International University Board of Trustees (S336S220041)

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 narrative is substantial to support a rationale for the project (pages e14-e22). For example, the applicant cites results from research that support the need for the project because of teacher shortages due to declining enrollments and other factors (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016). The applicant cites data from its target district that underscore the need to revamp its current offerings for educator development. Specifically, the greatest number of vacancies within district exist in ESE (52%), English Language Arts (12%), Guidance Counselors (12%; considered instructional staff), Science (12%) and Math (6%). Additionally, 6.6% of teachers are on Temporary Certifications, well above the 4% national average. By implementing specific goals, the applicant will increase the numbers of students using the current pipeline from the school system (page e15-e23).

(ii) The narrative clearly describes the goals, objectives and activities that support three goals of the project. Specifically, the applicant's goals are to revise the current curriculum; revise recruitment and retention strategies; and revise professional development in its existing program (pages e23-e45). The applicant will establish workgroups to work on each goal. For example, the applicant will establish collaborative workgroups to ensure curricular reform and ensure the curriculum allows students to enter the workforce significantly more prepared, to work in high need areas, and support the social emotional and academic needs of diverse students in high need schools. This will assist with revising recruitment. Another workgroup will work with faculty and EPP stakeholders to incorporate additional activities into coursework. This will facilitate the goal for revising curriculum. The applicant will leverage resources, activities and partnerships to deliver effective and ongoing professional development to teacher candidates (page e32). This will support the goal for recruitment. Activities clearly support the goals for the project. A detailed logic model is provided to support the narrative (pages e38-e42).

(iii) The applicant provides a convincing narrative that supports the existing teacher education program which has resulted in the applicant being successful in areas such as retention, ESOL teacher placement rate and state ranking (pages e43-e44). The applicant's program will build upon the existing state program that will expand offerings to teacher candidates but with emphasis on earning certification in working with students with disabilities and teachers of English learners.

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 2 of 9

(iv) The convincing narrative provides a discussion of using up-to-date research and effective practice to support the project design (pages e44-e45). Such topics will include Classroom Management, Differentiated Instruction, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Students are also offered opportunities to complete webinars regarding Social Emotional Learning utilizing resources from the Child Mind Institute, and Learner's Edge.

(v) The narrative is robust to describe how the applicant will provide feedback and continuous improvement using the Continuous Improvement Model (pages e45-e47). Specifically, the applicant provides opportunities for work teams to collaborate and review their efforts. Specifically, the applicant will offer evaluative instruments via electronic format for better organization of data that can be monitored, compared, and shared with program faculty and other stakeholders. All assessments undergo item analysis to ascertain reliability and validity of surveys and assure that any newly revised surveys will yield data that are more relevant and actionable for program decision-making, reflects faculty commitment to continuous improvement, program effectiveness, and teacher candidate success.

(vi) The narrative is clearly described for proving methods for sustainability (page e47-e49). Specifically, the applicant will rely on its partnering school district to incorporate the activities derived from project activities. These include resources developed from the collaborations of teachers and IHE staff.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

- (iii) No weaknesses noted.
- (iv) No weaknesses noted.
- (v) No weaknesses noted.
- (vi) 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:

(i) The methods of evaluation are extensive to provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes (page e48-e55). The mixed methods approach provides a process based and outcomes-based evaluation methodology. For example, measures include guiding questions so that program officials can evaluate the processes of implementation.

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 3 of 9

(ii) The methods of evaluation are extensively thorough and feasible for the goals, objectives, and activities (pages e40-e46). For example, the applicant will collect baseline data to gauge performance targets for quantitative goals. This may include GPA, SAT/ACT and course performance.

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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) Narrative is provided to describe facilities, equipment and supplies to support the project (page e57-e58). Specifically, the applicant states that the College will provide the facilities, furnishings, materials and equipment necessary for

instruction, support, program management, and selected services and activities. The partnership school district will support the program with partnership for teacher candidates.

(ii) The budget narrative is convincing to describe to cover the cost of project activities (page e59). For example, the budget includes (1) the salary and benefits of a program assistant who will support the project's implementation and student needs as they participate in field and their clinical experiences and (2) a web and social media specialist who can spend 50% of their time working on growing and supporting our social media and web presence. These positions provide support to the project. For example, the PI is .84 calendar months (7% effort), which includes a 3% annual adjustment, to work in collaboration with M-DCPS, providing oversight to ensure changes to the undergraduate curriculum, recruitment of a diverse population of students and offering professional development and ongoing learning opportunities for students, totaling direct cost of \$28,134.97 over the 5-year funding period. An additional 4% of the effort is covered in cost match.

(iii) The applicant provides costs within the budget for activities. This information supports the project design.

(iv) The plan is provided for extending beyond the grant funded period (page e59). The applicant will continue

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 4 of 9

partnerships with the school district. The applicant provides a 100% match to the program.

(v) The demonstrated commitments of each of the school districts is provided by letter (page e59, Appendix).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) The narrative is insufficient to describe this criterion. Costs are not described and aligned to specific objectives and activities. This information is needed to make the narrative substantial.

(iv) The narrative is limited and unclear as to future funding sources.

(v) No weaknesses noted.

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:

(i) The well-defined management plan includes a list of activities, persons designated to conduct them and an sufficient timeline (pages e60-e61). For example, workgroups will meet bi-weekly. Yearly activities are detailed and aligned with the positions who will coordinate them.

(ii) Mechanisms for feedback and continuous improvement are clearly described (pages e60-e61). For example, the work groups will meet regularly. At each meeting, a committee member will take notes to be documented and shared with the members of the committee and the Project Investigator.

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:

a) The applicant is thoroughly conducive to having a comprehensive program at a Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) (page e22). Specifically, the applicant serves a majority of Hispanic students from the sending school district.

b) Additionally, the applicant provide supportive narrative to describe how it will reform teacher preparation programs to address diversity (page e11). The narrative is clear to support the competitive priority in particular, is provided to explain how the applicant will include changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses noted.

(b) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

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 clearly addresses this competitive preference priority (pages e14-e61) by increasing the proportion of well-prepared, diverse and effective educators serving students. Specifically, the applicant will focus on target on the 60% of paraprofessionals and their ability to access course and clinical experiences that will build the capacity of local education agencies.

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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 0

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**

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 7 of 9

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 applicant clearly addresses this competitive preference priority (pages e14-e61) by implementing social, emotional, and academic needs activities in the activities for teachers and students in each of the supporting goals. The program will provide culturally responsive training opportunities.

(b) The applicant clearly provides SEL activities within the courses to paraprofessionals and teachers. Specifically, new teachers will have the opportunity to provide such techniques in their field experiences (page e15). For example, partnership with Paradigm Shift will provide a multisector and regional collaboration for teacher diversity also ensures new teachers of color are supported and working in welcoming environments.

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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not promote a "Grow Your Own" culture to meet the requirements of the Invitational Priority. Absent from the narrative is a description of how the program will address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and geographic areas. Furthermore, the applicant does not describe, in detail, how it will address the shortage of school leaders in high-need schools and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal of other school leader workforce. Thus, the applicant does not address this Invitational Priority.

Reader's Score:

Status:

Last Updated:

0

Submitted 06/07/2022 11:30 AM

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 8 of 9

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 9 of 9

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 03:27 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Florida International University Board of Trustees (S336S220041)

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 20

Adequacy of Resources

1. Adequacy of Resources 30 22

Quality of the Management Plan

1. Management Plan 20 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority

Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Educator Diversity 4 4

Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Diverse Workforce 3 3

Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Meeting Student Needs 2 0

Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Promoting Equity 2 2

Invitational Priority

Invitational Priority

1. Grow Your Own 0 0

Total 111 101

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 1 of 10

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The Florida International University Board of Trustees (S336S220041)

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 provides a comprehensive description on how the proposed project demonstrates a rationale. The proposed project, Project REVISE (Project Rethinking the Effective, Visionary, and Innovative Study of Education), will focus on curricular reform that aligns with research highlighting the elements critical to high-quality programs. The Project REVISE curricular revisions will enhance the delivery of content knowledge and teaching methods, clinical placement and candidate performance, and quality of program performance management. The proposed project will recruit and retain 100 teacher candidates, focused particularly on men of color, and preparing them to teach in high need shortage areas. The applicant provides a detailed, thorough logic model, including goals, input and activities, and short-term and long-term goals (pgs. e15-e22; e36-e42).

(ii) The applicant demonstrates that the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. Goal 1: Revise the undergraduate EPP curriculum, in partnership with the partners at Miami Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS, and in line with recommendations offered by Teacher Preparation Inspection – US (TPI-US) and the requirements outlined by Absolute Priority 1; Goal 2: Revise our recruitment efforts, in partnership with our partners at M-DCPS, to enroll and retain 100 students in years 2-4, with a particular focus on recruiting men of color, into areas of high need as determined by our M-DCPS partners; and Goal 3: Revise professional development and ongoing learning opportunities for teacher candidates, in partnership with M-DCPS, to ensure they are prepared to meet the social, emotional, and academic needs of all children as soon as they enter the classroom (pgs. e22-e44).

(iii) The applicant demonstrates how the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The Project Revise activities that lead to improvements in teaching and learning support rigorous academic standards for students. The applicant indicates that their Elementary Education program, in 2020, was ranked 4th in the state among all other Elementary Education programs. Their reading program was ranked 3rd in the state and the applicant institution was recognized with a 4.0 (perfect score) across all areas of measurement, including English/ESOL placement rate, Reading and Elementary Education retention rates, and performance by student subgroups on statewide assessments scoring rubric. The applicant institution will elevate the

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 2 of 10

quality of content knowledge and teaching methods and ensure continuous improvement through project performance measurement (pgs. e43-e44).

(iv) The applicant clearly describes the design of the proposed project that reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. The applicant indicates that Project REVISE's curricular reform utilizes research-based approaches to ensuring high quality EPPs. Research indicates that EPPs establish the following: a clear vision of good teaching standards of performance; a curriculum that is taught with experiences built throughout the program; well-supervised clinical experiences; the appropriate use of performance assessments and portfolio evaluation; and shared beliefs and practices among school- and university-based faculty. The project's professional development workgroup will provide modules, experiences, and training sessions that will utilize up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice, such as those from Iris Center Modules, Child Mind Institute, and Learner's Edge (pgs. e44-e45).

(v) The applicant provides clear performance feedback and continuous improvement that are integral to the design of the proposed project. The project's activities, within the scope of Quality of Program Performance Management, will enhance the ongoing need to improve measures of evaluation to ensure that they loop into ongoing efforts to improve EPPs. The workgroups, established under REVISE, will provide clear roles to support continuous improvement. The workgroup will provide connections between and across all groups, while the professional development group establishes a means that will be used to share the information across all EPP entities (pgs. e45-e47).

(vi) The applicant demonstrates how the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The project aims to implement a combination of theoretically- and empirically-based strategies to meet the need of high-need schools. The project will utilize its partnership to reform the educator preparation programs (EPP), in line with research-based approaches to high-quality EPPs. The proposed project will provide teacher candidates with quality content knowledge and teaching methods, high-quality clinical placements and enhanced candidate performance, and improved quality of program performance management. The effects of these reforms will be long lasting, and will extend beyond the period of funding, and will be beneficial to students within and outside Project REVISE. The long-term value to the EPPs is the strengthening of the clinical experiences, developing collaborations with the LEA partner, utilizing interdisciplinary team to engage in decision-making processes, the establishing of a Summer Institute, and ongoing professional development opportunities that create a pipeline of students, particularly men of color. The applicant indicates that all of these grant activities will continue long after the end of the federal funding period (pgs. e47-e48).

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.

(vi) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 3 of 10

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 demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The proposed project will utilize a mixed-method research design to gather the evidence and the analysis of data. This approach will provide a comprehensive understanding of the program by providing a global picture of its efficiency but providing an in-depth knowledge of the individual-level experience from program participants (teacher candidates, program faculty, stakeholders) (pgs. e48-e55).

(ii) The applicant clearly describes how the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant clearly aligns goals, specific goals, guiding questions of evaluation (from TPI-US), sources of evidence, and evaluation method (qualitative; quantitative). For each year of the proposed project, the results from the quantitative and qualitative analyses will be triangulated and evaluated to inform future improvement of the project and to monitor the progress of teacher candidates (formative). The applicant demonstrates, by the end of the project, findings from the project phases will be synthesized as an evaluation of the effectiveness of project REVISE (summative) (pgs. e56-e57).

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score: 20

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 clearly describes the adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization. The proposed project will be located on the applicant institution's campus and will provide the facilities, furnishings, materials, and equipment necessary for instruction, support, program management, and selected services and activities. The facilities will include classrooms, laboratories, lecture halls, meeting space, residences, recreational facilities, and library facilities. The applicant will provide office furniture, as well as the materials and equipment needed for instruction and programmatic support (pgs. e57-e58).

(ii) The applicant describes a budget that is adequate to support the proposed project. The application describes a comprehensive and detailed line item budget and budget justification for the following line items: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, participant support, subaward, facilities and administration cost. The applicant describes the resources needed to support the personnel who will participate in grant activities, including participating in work groups during the academic year, and structuring and implementing a summer institute. It also includes the time and resources for two faculty members in the Department of Counseling Recreation and School Psychology to serve as project evaluators for the grant's activities. (pgs. e58-e59).

(iii) The applicant indicates that the budget supports the personnel who will participate in grant activities, including participating in work groups during the academic year, and structuring and implementing a summer institute (pgs. e58).

(iv) The applicant generally states that the project has a cost-match and support from the partner, M-DCPS, and with the applicant institution. The applicant provides a line item indicating the total direct and indirect costs of \$4,106,043.56 and the cost match of \$4,106,043.56 (pgs. e59; e206-e208).

(v) The applicant describes the relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. The project partner, M-DCPS, provides a letter of collaboration in Appendix E. It is the country's fourth largest school district in the nation and it is equipped to provide ongoing professional development to its entire instructional staff. Both M-DCPS and the applicant institution have outlined cost-match budgets that describe the resources and commitment available to this initiative (pgs. e57-e59).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iii) The applicant does not provide costs that are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. For example, the partner, M-DCPS, provides a letter of collaboration but there is a line item for a sub-award to M-DCPS for \$2,433,188 to support the mentorship and professional development opportunities to students. The applicant indicates that it will commit to providing facilities, but there is a line item for \$110,211.52 for facilities and administration costs for the lead applicant institution (pgs. e57-e59; e206-e208).

(iv) The applicant does not demonstrate that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. The applicant lists a cross-match budget of \$4,107,043.56 in the budget, but it does not identify how this cross match budget was determined (pg. 208).

(v) No weaknesses were noted

Reader's Score: 22

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 describes a clear management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant provides a management plan aligning each major activity, personnel responsible, and the dates of activities. The applicant describes the roles and responsibilities of the senior personnel and other personnel (to be determined) in the budget justification (pgs. e60-e61; e207).

(ii) The applicant describes detailed procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. The applicant describes the process of ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the Quality of Design section of the grant proposal. The proposed evaluation will support the ongoing feedback and the continuous improvement of the project operations. The applicant describes the frequency and the purpose of the various team committee meetings (pgs. e60-e61).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) No weaknesses were 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

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 6 of 10

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:

Overview:

The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity.

(a) N/A

(b) The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity. The proposed project will recruit and retain 100 teacher candidates, focused particularly on men of color, and preparing them to teach in high need shortage areas (p. e11). The applicant describes 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 proposed project will revisit, revise, and re- envision the undergraduate educator preparation programs (EPPs) while increasing educator diversity, supporting a diverse educator workforce, and promoting equity in education. Project Rethinking the Effective, Visionary, and Innovative Study of Education (REVISE) will revise the undergraduate EPP curriculum, in partnership with the partners at M-DCPS, to disrupt the cycle of teacher shortage and ensure students graduate significantly more prepared to work in high need schools, and improving student success (pgs. e11).

Weaknesses:

(a) N/A

(b) No weaknesses were noted

Reader's Score: 4

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:

Overview:

The applicant describes a project to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educators, with a focus on underserved students.

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 7 of 10

The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 2: Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Grow to Strengthen Student Learning. For example, the applicant demonstrates that since 1965, the applicant institution has prepared a diverse population of teachers, through the implementation of high-quality, state approved, and nationally recognized teacher preparation programs. The applicant describes the proposed program Rethinking the Effective, Visionary, and Innovative Study of Education (REVISE), a 5-year Teacher Quality Partnership project that is designed to revisit, revise, and re-envision the undergraduate educator preparation programs (EPPs) while recruiting the next generation of diverse teacher educators. The proposed project will focus on curricular reform that aligns with research highlighting elements that are critical to high-quality programs that will have a significant impact on student performance. The proposed project proposes to recruit and retain 100 teacher candidates focused particularly on men of color, and to prepare them to teach in high-need shortage areas (pgs. e11; e14-e15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

Overview:

The applicant did not address Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs.

(a) N/A

(b) N/A

Weaknesses:

(a) N/A

(b) N/A

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 8 of 10

Reader's Score: 0

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:

Overview:

The applicant addresses Competitive Preference Priority 4: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities. The proposed program demonstrates that the proposed project is focusing on revising and re-envisioning the undergraduate educator preparation programs (EPPs) while increasing educator diversity, supporting a diverse educator workforce, and promoting equity in education.

(a) The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 4: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities. The applicant demonstrates a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students by focusing on revising and re-envisioning the undergraduate educator preparation programs (EPPs) while increasing educator diversity, supporting a diverse educator workforce, and promoting equity in education (pg. e11).

(b) The applicant 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. To meet the intended CPP 4, the applicant designed the evaluation with a primary focus on addressing the following overarching research question: By modernizing the design of EPP (content, teaching method, clinical placement, feedback, candidate performance, program performance management) with research-based instructional strategies and culturally responsive teaching and learning pedagogy, what is the impact of Project REVISE on bridging the gap in diversity and equity of perspective teachers at high-need schools? The applicant proposes a mixed-method research design to gather the evidence and the analysis of data (pgs. e48-e49).

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 9 of 10

(a) No weaknesses were noted.

(b) No weaknesses were noted.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 2

**Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority
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.

1.

Overview:

The applicant did not address the Invitational Priority: Grow Your Own.

N/A

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

Score:

Status:

Last Updated:

Submitted