

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Pacific University (S336S220058)

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	26
--------------------------	----	----

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	0
-----------------------	---	---

Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Diverse Workforce	3	0
----------------------	---	---

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 111 100

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 1 of 8

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Pacific University (S336S220058)

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 project design demonstrates a rationale that is centered around the premise that digital curriculum (DC) has been implemented in many schools with limited knowledge about how teachers make decisions when using DC (pg. e16). The applicant cites numerous research studies and indicates their intention to further contribute to this body of knowledge by observing how teachers enact mathematics DC (pg. e17). This is evident throughout the project design and is visible within the logic model (pg. e29 or e80) that outlines the program elements. Specifically, the logic model shows the connections between the observation of instruction and how it leads to the transformation of elementary teacher education courses.

(ii) The narrative details project goals, objectives, and outcomes (pg. e13). One goal (transform the preparation of elementary mathematics teachers to ensure that instruction with DC maximizes students' social, emotional, and academic learning) is supported by four objectives with an anticipated four outcomes. Outcomes are measurable, with a goal of over 800 PSTs across three states being trained utilizing the TEDC toolkit.

(iii) The project design incorporates a focus on rigorous academic standards. The applicant will work to increase rigorous academic standards based on the recommendation of NCTM. Recommendations will be included in the Toolkit. (pg. e13) The use of the TEDC Toolkit is a key factor in improving the quality of new teachers by improving teacher preparation (pg. e29)

(iv) The project design is reflective of current knowledge and effective practice. In addition to the extensive research conducted related to the project, the applicant completed a pilot study. Results from that study informed the design of this project due to discoveries about how teachers interacted with DC and how teachers overemphasized procedural fluency versus true engagement with mathematical concepts. (pgs. e21-22)

(v) Feedback mechanisms are sufficiently detailed with most centering around utilizing video observations and audio reflections (pg. e34). These methods will allow for project staff and teacher candidates to observe how well the project is being implemented and provide opportunities to modify services. In addition, the Partner Advisory Panel will meet to

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 2 of 8

share findings and identify potential areas of intervention (pg. e38)

(vi) It is evident that the project will build capacity related to teaching efforts with DC. Sustainable results are demonstrated via continued dissemination of findings and sharing of results with school districts and policymakers across three states (pg. e38)

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 methods of evaluation will provide performance data on outcomes. Specific assessment instruments include observational data and surveys. The applicant identifies multiple data analysis efforts that should provide performance data, such as a multi-level regression model (g. e41).

(ii) The methods of evaluation are appropriate to assess project impacts. Qualitative and quantitative measures will be evaluated. For example, the applicant will mainly rely on survey analysis to measure if the Toolkit is having the desired impact on teacher enactment with DC and the development of students' social-emotional skills (pgs. e40-46)

Weaknesses:

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**

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 3 of 8

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 narrative presented a limited discussion to indicate support from the applicant institution. For example, the narrative indicated that the university will provide 20% of contract time for each professor involved in the grant. (pg. e49) Additionally, the applicant indicates that each institution will provide faculty, staff, technology, and library assets (pg. e80).

(ii) The proposed budget is adequate to implement the project as described (e229-248). All costs are necessary and in alignment with the accomplishment of project objectives. Costs are justified for year one.

(iii) The budget is reasonable in relation to the proposed outcomes and significance of the project in developing a Toolkit that can be utilized far beyond the conclusion of the project. The applicant diversifies funding sources by leveraging partner funds in excess of the 100% match requirement.

(iv) Sustainability efforts are described and rely heavily on dissemination efforts. For example, the applicant hopes to share the Toolkit with others at the AMTE conference each year via conference presentations, publications, and webinars (pg. e46). Partner commitments are appropriate and contributions are noted for financial support and professional support as members of the Partner Advisory Committee.

(v) Partner commitments are significant, with partners providing contributions via their expertise. Partners are crucial to sustainability and maintenance efforts as they will rotate responsibility for updating materials each year after the conclusion of the grant (pg. e46)

Weaknesses:

(ii) The justification of costs does not extend beyond year one of implementation. More information is needed for each year of the project. (2 point not awarded)

(iv) It is not clear what funds will be procured to update materials. The sustainability narrative lacks details in terms of how any financial expenditures will be handled. (2 points not awarded)

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

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 4 of 8

operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(i) The management plan is clearly outlined (pgs. e53-58) and outlines each phase of the project. A thoroughly detailed timeline is provided for each year of implementation as defined by phases. It is clear the project will be implemented on time and within budget. Specific responsibilities are outlined for each activity. Most activities are assigned to Rhine (PI) or the team.

(ii) Feedback opportunities are presented annually. The applicant indicates that the Partner Advisory Panel will provide feedback about project activities, such as the DC Observation Protocol professional development plan (pg. e57).

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

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 5 of 8

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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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:

(a) The applicant has a strong plan to address student social-emotional needs via the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning model. The model aids in fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion by providing students with socio-emotional support during the learning process.

(b) Their aim is to implement best practices to utilize student interactions when learning math as a way to improve cognitive skills. Another method for doing this is the enhancement of DC in alignment with Common Core State Standards to promote the use of emotions in learning (pgs. e21-23). The use of DC can be used to identify where students may experience issues in learning and allow educators to be more responsive in designing interventions to advance their success (pg. e28).

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).

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 6 of 8

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 applicant will address a critical inequity in the use of digital curricula. Specifically, when educators require the use of DC outside of the classroom, issues may arise as students may not have access to the necessary resources (pg. e26).

(b) The applicant will deeply examine how to navigate equity issues by interviewing teachers to determine alternative methods for instruction. Best practices will be noted and included within the TEDC Toolkit for others to use.

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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The narrative does not include a discussion related to Grow Your Own Programs.

Reader's Score:

Status:

Last Updated:

0

Submitted 06/06/2022 03:22 PM

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 7 of 8

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 8 of 8

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Pacific University (S336S220058)

Reader #2: *****

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	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	0
----------------------	---	---

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	100
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Panel - 1: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Pacific University (S336S220058)

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 rationale for the project is well-provided to describe the need for a digital curriculum (pages e16-e28). Specifically, the applicant connects various pieces of research to describe how teachers need supportive resources for utilizing digital curricula. The applicant cite research as well as results of its own observational studies. For example, the applicant states that it observed teachers using digital curricula (page e21) and is using that information to support the rationale.

(ii) The narrative provides information on the goals, objectives and activities that relate to developing a TEDC Toolkit (pages e28-e39). The project is described in phases over a five-year period. Specifically, the applicant will use personnel with various partners to design, test, implement and report development on an inclusive toolkit that will assist elementary teachers in providing math instruction using digital platforms. For this project, the outcomes provided by the toolkit will impact student's emotional learning and increase teacher capacity.

(iii) The applicant provides a clear information within its goals and objectives narrative to encompass activities to build teaching and learning and student success (pages e16-e39). The applicant's final project is intended to expand teacher ability to use digital curriculum.

(iv) The narrative is detailed for reflecting up-to-date research and effective practice to support the project design (pages e16-e39). The applicant provides recent supporting research to support the phases of the project. For example, in the pilot phase, the applicant will select teachers who will use the math activities and be observed while doing so. The observation tool is supported through research (Pianta et al, 2008).

(v) The narrative is well-defined to describe how the applicant will provide feedback and continuous improvement throughout the phases of the project (pages e16-e39). Specifically, person interacting with the project will provide feedback at various times. For example, in the pilot phase, teachers will provide feedback on the administration of the digital curriculum (page e34) through observations and evaluations.

(vi) The narrative is clear for explaining how the project will be sustained (page e46). Specifically, each of the university

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 2 of 8

partners will provide support for personnel to attend conferences. In this way, the applicant will be able to disseminate information and continue activities beyond the period of federal funding.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(i) 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 for the project (pages 39-e46). Specifically, the applicant will use embedded tools such as the Math observation tool to gather information on the administration of the math digital curriculum. Guiding questions are also used to provide information on a process-based evaluation. This information will be provided to make changes where necessary.

(ii) The methods of evaluation are extensively thorough and feasible for the goals, objectives and activities (pages e46-e47). The plan includes gathering data in both qualitative and quantitative form. For example, in collecting qualitative data, the applicant's partners will meet via Zoom regularly to exchange information.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 3 of 8

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 plan is clear to provide facilities, equipment and supplies to support the project (page e53). The program will be housed at each of the partnering institutions. Equipment and support is provided from each institution. Teaching personnel will be selected from schools to test and refine the toolkit and make presentations at conferences.

(ii) A budget is provided (page e229). Costs are included for salaries and other objects that support the activities of the project. The applicant provides a 100% match.

(iii) Costs are included for the first year of the project.

(iv) The plan is provided for extending beyond the grant funded period (pages e59-e60). As the activities are conducted, it is expected that program activities will be institutionalized. For example, the toolkit will be developed and utilized. Activities will continue beyond the period of funding.

(v) The demonstrated commitments of reach of the partners are well-defined for the project (pages e60-e61). The list of partners along with their financial contributions are provided (Appendix).

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) All budget items are not clearly described. This information is needed for a fully developed narrative.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) A thorough explanation of costs is not included. Specifically, it is unclear how costs may be aligned with institutional guidelines.

(v) No weaknesses noted.

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 4 of 8

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:

(i) The management plan clearly includes a list of personnel and their qualifications (pages e54-e58). A thorough timeline is provided to describe activities for personnel designated.

(ii) Mechanisms for feedback and continuous improvement are substantially described within the project design (pages e26-e44). For example, quarterly meetings are planned for system level and school level leadership who will provide feedback to project leadership. Annual reports are planned as well.

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**

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

No strengths noted.

Reader's Score: 0

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:

(a) The applicant clearly addresses this competitive preference priority. Specifically, the applicant creates a safe, inclusive environment and implementing evidence-based practices, the applicant will improve training supports rooted in the district's equity framework, cultural competency, and antiracism (pg. e25) This leads to a great sense of inclusion.

(b) The applicant provides clear information on evidence-based practices. Such information supports the development of technology that can be replicated to advance student success.

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 project adequately demonstrates that strategies are in place that successfully promote equity in student access to educational resources and opportunities. The main mechanism is by increasing the number of student educators of color, which should lead to culturally relevant and representative staffing (pg. e25). This promotes equity and aligns with the competitive preference priority.

(b) Moreover, the narrative substantially supports the second part of this competitive preference priority describing how it will examine sources of inequity in educator preparational programs and professional development. The applicant describes how the applicant will address inclusiveness without regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language and disability status.

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,

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 7 of 8

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:

Submitted 06/07/2022 11:30 AM

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 8 of 8

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet**Applicant:** Pacific University (S336S220058)**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	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	0
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	100

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 1 of 10

Technical Review Form

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Pacific University (S336S220058)

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 application provides a description on how the proposed project demonstrates a rationale. The applicant provides the needs and the research for the creation of a toolkit for teacher educators, preservice teachers, teachers, principals, and preservice teacher field mentors that enhances the enactment of digital curricula, and addresses the issues of equitable access and the use of digital curricula (DC) resources. The overall rationale is the dramatic transformation toward using digital curricula (DC) in elementary classrooms that has left many teacher education programs behind. The applicant provides a logic model describing the purpose of the proposed program: improve the preparation of preservice teachers to effectively use digital curricula in elementary mathematics classrooms. The logic model includes resources, activities, outputs, and the effects of this project. The context for the project will be elementary mathematics classrooms, grades 3-5 (pgs. e16-e28; e80-e82).

(ii) The application clearly describes goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project that are clearly specified and measurable. The proposed project, Toolkit for Enacting Digital Curricula (TEDC) will include the following goal: To transform the preparation of elementary mathematics teachers to ensure that instruction with digital curricula (DC) maximizes students' social, emotional, and academic learning. The project includes four (4) objectives and four (4) outcomes. The applicant provides a draft organizational chart for TEDC Toolkit Lessons and a draft organizational chart for TEDC Toolkit Interviews (pgs. e29-e39).

(iii) The applicant describes how the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The Mathematics Classroom Observation Protocol (MCOP) is designed to measure the degree to which K-16 math classrooms are aligned with the various math practice standards set out by multiple national organizations, including the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and Mathematical Association of America (pgs. e32-e34).

(iv) The applicant describes the design of the proposed project that reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. The applicant provides research on the need for district to seek solutions for differentiated learning and data-driven instructional decisions. The applicant indicates that schools are addressing these priorities through digital

curriculum (DC). For example, iReady is used by over 10 million K-8 students in 14,000 schools (CA Staff, 2021) and Dreambox claims it is used by nearly 6 million students in all 50 states (Garrard, 2021). The applicant provides information indicating that companies are delivering these products to America's public schools with relatively few checks and balances (Singer, 2017). With this rapid transformation of instruction in elementary mathematics, there is a gap in teacher preparation programs' understanding of how teachers make decisions when using DC and what influences teachers' DC enactment practices. The applicant indicates that mathematics education research has not yet fully examined how the intended DC becomes operationalized through the enactment practice. The proposed project will extend the research through case studies with filmed observations of how teachers enact the intended mathematics digital curriculum (pgs. e6-

(v) The applicant clearly describes the performance feedback and continuous improvement that are integral to the design of the proposed project. The project will use the analysis of video observations to develop an understanding and resources for the Toolkit for Enacting Digital Curriculum (TEDC Toolkit), a web-based resource of video clips of instruction, lesson plans, and teacher interviews, modeled after NCTM's Principles to Actions Professional Learning Toolkit. In the pilot phase, the teachers will provide feedback on the administration of the digital curriculum through their observations and evaluations (pgs. e16; e34).

(vi) The applicant describes how the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The applicant demonstrates that as a result of the work with schools and institutional support, the project will have significant financial and systemic resources to support continued dissemination of the results of the TEDC project at the conclusion of grant funding (pgs. e46-e47).

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

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 applicant describes the tools for evaluation and data analysis. The data analysis will help to answer each of the evaluation questions and will include descriptive and inferential statistics. The evaluation will include the frequency of actions to address equitable access to and use of DC with their students through coding of videos and interviews of teachers (pgs. e39-e46).

(ii) The applicant describes, how the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant describes the role of the external evaluator that will include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection strategies to provide formative feedback to the project team for continuous improvement during the grant period. The team will collect, analyze, and synthesize evidence to respond to formative evaluation questions (pgs. e39-e46).

Weaknesses:

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

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 or the lead applicant organization. The applicant demonstrates that the university partnership is prepared to implement this project with combined facilities offering state of the art libraries, technologies,

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 4 of 10

and technical support for data analysis and video capture in classrooms. Each university has already established long-term, strong partnerships with school districts that will be a key asset for working with and in schools to collect primary data (pgs. e47-e54).

(ii) The applicant describes a detailed budget for Year 1 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, supplies, contractual, other, indirect costs (pgs. e229-e247).

(iii) The applicant provides a narrative demonstrating that costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The budget is reasonable because the proposed project will help the public in knowing that the billions of dollars spent on technology and digital curricula in schools is having a beneficial impact on society through enhanced student education and student achievement. The proposed project will provide resources that demonstrate teacher's instructional decision-making with digital curriculum in elementary math classrooms, including how teachers address mathematical practices, socio-emotional learning, equitable access and use of digital curricula and DC-generated assessment data. The research will guide the development of new practices and innovative strategies in teacher education program courses and field work to ensure future teachers effectively use DC in schools to increase student learning (pgs. e46-e53).

(iv) The applicant provides information indicating that the university partnership is prepared to sustain this grant proposal to transform the preparation of preservice elementary mathematics teachers. For example, the combined facilities offer libraries, technologies, and technical support for data and analysis to sustain this program (pg. e53).

(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 applicant indicates that the partnership members are well qualified for this project based on their background in mathematics, math education, the preparation of teachers, and technology and the social science researchers have extensive background in program evaluation and assessment. The applicant describes the commitment of each partner consisting of mathematics education faculty from Pacific University (Oregon), University of Dayton (Ohio), Texas Woman's University, and Western Oregon University. The partnership also includes high needs schools and districts in these states as well as the Department of Education and NCTM representatives for an advisory panel. The outside evaluator partner is Education Northwest, with over 50 years of experience in research and evaluation and supports a diverse set of partners with whom to share vision and values (pgs. e12; e47-e54).

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses were noted.
- (ii) The applicant did not provide a budget narrative for Year 2, Year 3, Year 4, and Year 5 of the proposed project.
- (iii) No weaknesses were noted.
- (iv) The applicant does not adequately describe how it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. The applicant does not provide a sustainability plan for the proposed project.
- (v) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 26

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 5 of 10

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 detailed management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant provides a management plan including a description of the tasks, aligned with the personnel responsible, and the timeline. The applicant describes the qualifications and the roles and responsibilities of the key personnel for the proposed project. (pgs. e 49-e50; e54-e58).
- (ii) The applicant indicates that the advisory panel will provide feedback and insight on the project tools and the created resources (pg. e80). The applicant provides a letter of agreement and commitment for the President, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and Professor of Mathematics Education, Baylor University who will provide advice and feedback on he work to build the Toolkit for Enacting Digital Curricula (pg. e225). There is a letter from the Assistant Commissioner of Digital Learning, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board who will provide advice and feedback on the work of this proposed project (pg. e226). The school districts will provide teachers for the case studies, mentor teachers for the preservice teachers, and principals for the evaluation of preservice teachers. The advisory panel will provide feedback and insight on the project tools and created resources. The evaluator will provide feedback throughout the project to ensure the goals are being met and to provide a detailed analysis of the results of the research on the use of the Toolkit with preservice teachers and the Supervisor observation Protocol (pgs. e80-e81).

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 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

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 6 of 10

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 did not address Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity.

(a) N/A

(b) N/A

Weaknesses:

(a) N/A

(b) N/A

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:

Overview:

The applicant did not address Competitive Preference Priority 2: Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning.

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 7 of 10

Reader's Score: 0

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 clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs.

(a) The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic needs. The proposed project will create a safe, inclusive environment. The applicant describes how the project will focus on cultivating a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students. This will result in student teachers being an inspiration for students who desire to become teachers (pg. e25).

(b) The applicant provides a clear plan to implement evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students. It will implement evidence-based practices to support the training supports rooted in the district's equity framework, cultural competency, and antiracism (pg. e25).

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses were noted.

(b) No weaknesses were 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**

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 8 of 10

- (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.

(a) The applicant clearly addresses Competitive Preference Priority 4: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities. The proposed project will develop a particular sensitivity to high-needs students' access and ability to use these resources and to be creative in how to make alternative access to resources (pgs. 26-27). The toolkit will incorporate the video of instruction with DC, audio reflections/interviews, and lesson plans regarding elementary

mathematics teachers' action and thinking in regard to planning for, implementing, and assessing the impact of their DC (pg. e13).

(b) The proposed Toolkit will include video interviews with teachers explaining how they address their students' equitable access and use of DC. The main mechanism is by increasing the number of student educators of color, which leads to culturally relevant and representative staffing (pgs. e26-e27).

Weaknesses:

(a) No weaknesses were noted.

(b) No weaknesses were 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:

Overview:

The applicant did not address the Invitational Priority: Grow Your

Own. N/A

9/28/23 11:33 AM

Page 9 of 10

N/A

Weaknesses:

Score:

Status:

Last Updated:

Submitted

06/06/2022 03:27 PM