Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Southern Mississippi (S336S220065)

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	27
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	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total 111	97	

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.336S

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

Applicant: University of Southern Mississippi (S336S220065)

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:

Overview:

The applicant clearly provided a strong rationale that is supported by the logic model. The rationale also clearly outlines the proposed program objectives designed to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The project design is thoroughly described and reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. Appropriate evidence of performance feedback and continuous improvement strategies are also provided in the narrative. Further, the applicant provides clear evidence of appropriate strategies for building capacity and yielding results that will extend beyond the period of the grant.

i. A well-developed rationale that is grounded in evidenced-based research is provided in the narrative. Research on revitalizing teacher preparation, teacher residency, mentorship and clinical practices is provided in the narrative (e20; e37). The rationale is supported by a logic model that connects the inputs and activities to the outcomes (e70).

ii. The applicant indicates a clear goal, to REFORM the residency model to target local PTCs with minority status into a clinically intensive teacher preparation and induction program embedded in a high need LEA (e22). They also provide clear evidence of measurable objectives (e25-e27). For example, the applicant proposes to: implement research-based teaching practices in the classroom that will be demonstrated through lesson observations by mentor faculty, video lesson self-reflections, quizzes and lesson demonstrations (e22). A clearly outlined table, that matches each goal and objective to the performance measures and desired outcomes (e25-e27).

iii. Appropriate evidence is provided indicating the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. For example, the applicant will spend the first year of the project revising and strengthening our reading and writing literacy course and clinical experiences, developing mentor training and PD workshops for residency students and mentor teachers, creating an induction program, and piloting an 8-week course schedule format for PTC seniors (e27). The applicant will revise the current program of study (e28), provide literacy courses in the content area (e29-30), provide clinical experiences (e32) and provide quality mentors to program participants (e33). Professional development will also be provided for the mentor teachers. A detailed outline of the

modified course is also provided in the narrative (e30-e31).

iv. Strong evidence of a project design that reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice is noted in the narrative. For example, the applicant builds on research related to teacher preparation and revitalizing teacher prep programs (e37-e38). Specifically, the applicant indicates that the proposed project was designed to provide an embedded highly supportive teacher residency and induction program with decreasing levels of support as new teachers grow in their teaching competencies (e38). A figure provided in the narrative depicts how the number of hours of support provided by the mentor be a lot during the clinical hours, increase during student teaching and eventually decrease over time (e39).

v. Proficient performance feedback and continuous improvement are clearly an integral part of the proposed program design. A four-pronged evaluation system has been developed; including the collection of observational data, surveys, and PD action plans (e40). In addition to formative feedback residents will complete self-assessments and self-reflections that will be reviewed along with their mentor teacher (e41). Evaluation data from all four prongs will inform summer PD session participation and adjustments to the residency and induction program (e41).

vi. The proposed project is appropriately designed to build capacity and yield results that will clearly extend beyond the period of the grant. For example, the applicant will recruit existing student cohorts who may be interested in teaching in rural teacher shortage areas (e42). Additionally, all PTCs will be required to commit to teaching in the LEA for two years while they complete the induction period (e43). Further, the applicant specifies that they will produce 15 new teachers a year (e41). A figure in the application, further breaks down how the applicant proposes to build and extend beyond the funding period (e44).

Weaknesses:

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

v. None noted
vi. None 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:

Overview:
A strong evaluation plan that includes the collection of valid and reliable data that are clearly aligned to goals and objectives of the proposed project is evident in the application. The methods of evaluation are clearly specified and appropriate. The methods of evaluation described in the narrative are also thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives and outcomes described in the narrative.

i. Various data collection processes are clearly described in the narrative. Each will yield valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. For example, to determine the impact on k-6 student outcomes, aggregated test scores will be provided (e45). Additionally, the applicant will use a mixed-methods design to determine resident's and mentor participants' perceptions, expectations and needs (e45). Additional collect qualitative and quantitative data will be collected from semi-structured focus groups and surveys (e45).

ii. Appropriate evaluation methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project are described in the narrative. Formative and summative data will be collected and used to evaluate progress throughout the program. The applicant will collect survey data from residents and mentors. Pre and post content assessments will be collected from courses. Mentor teachers' performance-based evaluations will also be analyzed (e47-e48). Further, all qualitative and quantitative data will be triangulated and compared to assess resident growth, beginning teacher growth, mentor growth, impact on teacher retention for both USM program participants and mentors, strengths of the program, weaknesses of the program, and areas of need that may not have been addressed (e49).

Weaknesses:
i.   None noted
ii.   None 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:

Overview:
The applicant provides appropriate evidence of support including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization. In addition, the applicant provides strong evidence of a budget that is reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance to support the proposed project. Additionally, the costs described in the budget are reasonable. The applicant also clearly demonstrates that they have some of the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. They have appropriately provided a multi-year financial and operating model with some commitments from partners involved with the proposed project.

i. Solid evidence of support from partnering agencies to ensure successful implementation of the proposed program is clearly described in the narrative. For example, the University is committed to $1,307,814.55 over the five-year program period (e50). They will provide the $481,384.95 in time commitment (course instruction, research and evaluation, mentor teacher development, and field coordination) and effort (including fringe benefits) for the faculty involved in the management team (e50). Two courses will be provided as an in-kind offering for mentor teachers with an estimated value of $92,340 (e51). Mentor teachers will receive living stipends from the partnering school district. In addition, the district will provide meeting spaces, classrooms and web platforms to deliver program courses (e52). Additional supports are clearly described including facilities, computer labs, campus offices and community partners (e53-e55).

ii. The applicant is proposing to adjust the delivery of their undergraduate residency program which will require significant personnel resources. Therefore, the proposed budget is appropriate for implementing this project. Non-federal funds will be used to support some of the initial development processes (e55). Federal funds will be used to hire a Project Director, a part-time residency coordinator, and a part-time District Evaluation Liaison (e56). All costs, as defined in the budget narrative (e125-e152), are sufficient in relation to the requirements of the goals and objectives of the proposed project. The costs described appropriately reflect specific front-end investments in building capacities to design and deliver the proposed project activities.

iii. Appropriate evidence that the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project are provided in the narrative. Specifically, federal funds will be used to support the work of the PIs in the summer and throughout the school year. The evaluation team will continuously evaluate project activities to ensure progress towards meeting the objectives and will make changes as necessary. They will also ensure the quality of the program design implementation process (e56). Approximately 25% of the federal funds will be used to support residents, beginning teachers, and mentor teachers. Only 4% of federal funds will be spent on travel and supplies (e57).

iv. The applicant provides a detailed plan that demonstrates that it has some of the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant and that will apply for additional support. Specifically, the applicant notes, the partnering school district will continue provide matching funding for activities such as gradate coursework for new mentors and stipends for undergraduate residents (e52). Additionally, a detailed sustainability plan is described in the narrative including a transition of support for residents from grant funds and induction support to full funding from local funds (e57-e58).

v. Appropriate support is evidenced by the commitment of faculty and staff to manage the proposed project, the financial commitments of the university and the financial commitments described from the partnering school district (e50-e59). The letter of support also provides evidence of this support (e72)

Weaknesses:

i.   None noted
ii.   None noted
iii.   None noted
iv.   The multi-year plan provided is not as well-developed (e56-e57). The applicant also failed to provide evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) (3 points not awarded).
v.   None noted

Reader's Score: 27

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:

Overview:

The applicant provides an adequate 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 could include job descriptions for key personnel in the event the applicant needs to hire new personnel. In addition, the applicant provides clear procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

i. The management plan described in the narrative is appropriate for achieving the goals and objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. For example, the applicant has developed a management team that will meet weekly to oversee the initial recruitment, hiring and PD planning and preparation for the residency program (e59). Resumes for the management team demonstrating appropriate skills for their roles in the proposed program are provided (e76-e109). Additionally, they will have a Coordination Team that will meet monthly to identify best practices to improve recruitment, preparation, support and retainment of teacher candidates and beginning teachers across the organizations (e60). Appropriate time commitments are also clearly provided. The PD/ID will oversee the daily operations and provide fiscal management of the project (e61). Other key personnel are identified and have appropriate time commitments and responsibilities including a part-time Field Director who will support relationships between the mentor teachers and USM, Coordinate communication with the University Supervisor and serve on the UNMT and UNCT (e61). A detailed timeline including the activity, year and the person responsible is also included in the narrative (e62-e65).

ii. A sufficient plan for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project is noted in the narrative. For example, the applicant will use an Advisory Board (superintendents and partner school principals) who will meet monthly with the coordination team and the management team to discuss the changes in schools and school needs as they arise (e65). In addition, the evaluation team will provide formative data that will inform changes and modifications to the proposed project (e49).

Weaknesses:
i.   None noted
ii.   None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 points).

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator

workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding one or both of the following:

a)   High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A

Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences)prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.

b)   Reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.

Strengths:

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority

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:

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority

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:

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority

Reader's Score: 0

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 clearly will establish a grow your own program designed to address the shortage of teachers in the specified high needs schools. They will also clearly increase the diversity of highly qualified teachers for the targeted area.

The applicant clearly specifies that they will address Absolute Priority 1: Pre-Bac Model by (a) reforming USM's current elementary undergraduate residency program (e.g., where courses are delivered, how they are delivered, and increasing clinical experience hours), (b) changing course format (e.g., four 8-week courses and one summer course), (c) recruiting local PTCs with minority status and other needs of the partner high need LEA, (d) providing a year-long clinical experience, (e) developing and implementing a two-year induction program that includes additional professional development (PD) and ongoing coaching, and (g) training mentor teachers to provide quality coaching and support to PTCs (e21).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

Status:
Last Updated:

0

Submitted 06/07/2022 12:03 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/06/2022 11:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Southern Mississippi (S336S220065)
Reader #2:   **********

	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	27
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	0
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	0
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.336S

Reader #2:   **********
Applicant: University of Southern Mississippi (S336S220065)

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 number of Black prospective teacher candidates is down 57% since 2011 (page e18). 33% of school districts in Mississippi are in critical shortage areas where elementary education teachers are the most in-demand in the state (page e18). The University of Southern Mississippi's (USM) is fully accredited since 1954, during 2019-2020 over 90% of students passed the Praxis (page e19).

(ii)   As evident through Table 1, goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable (page e22-e27).

(iii)   USM faculty will revise and strengthen the reading and writing literacy course and clinical experiences, develop mentor training and PD workshops for residency students and mentor teachers, create an induction program, and pilot an 8 week course schedule format for seniors. This demonstrates the projects comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students (page e27, e30-e31). Table 2 displays an increase in 472 hours and 59 days in the proposed clinical hours for the proposed project (page e32).

(iv)   The project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice with high admission standards, improve teacher candidates knowledge of the science of reading, diversify the workforce, and a high-quality clinical experience (page e37-e38).

(v)   Development of a four pronged evaluation system with evaluation data collected through measures such as evaluations, self-evaluations, student assessment, and university professor research will ensure performance feedback and continuous improvements as integral to the design of the proposed project (page e40-41).

(vi)   Stipends of $7500 will be paid to the prospective teacher candidates (PTC's) to be embedded in schools and take courses without working to pay living costs, a required commitment to teach in the LEA for two years, and requirement to be from an underrepresented population demonstrates the projects design to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance (page e42-e43)

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)   Mixed methods research will be employed and a Research, Educational Statistics, and Assessment faculty

member will lead survey analysis. A random sample of residents, beginning teachers, and mentors will participate in the Community of Practice groups,. All mentors will complete pre and post assessment and random selection of mentors will be selected for observation to examine the extent to which the PD is translating into practice. Each of these factors demonstrate the extent that the project will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes (page e45-e46).

(ii)   Table 4 provides information on the formative and summative assessment tools that will be used each semester of the grant period to evaluate the graduate teachers' performance at different stages which are through, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives and outcomes of the proposed project (pages e46-e49).

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 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)   University non-federal commitment to the project totals $1,307,814,55 over the five-year program and a $285,679.20 commitment from partnership organizations as well as a partnership with the Forrest County School District (FCSD) and Table 5 demonstrates adequacy of support from the applicant and lead applicant organization (page e50- e55).
(ii)   Federal funds are supplementing the work already being done at USM and will allow for programmatic adaptations being proposed to be carried out demonstrating that it is adequate to support the proposed project (page e56).
(iii)   The Budget Summary support and 25% of federal funds will be used to support residents, beginning teachers, and mentor teachers with embedded, individualized PD and classroom equipment to apply to their developing skills in the classroom, with 4% being spent on travel and suppose demonstrating costs which are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (page e57, e125-e151).
    (V) The partner district's commitment is evidenced by their personnel investments, such as   the identification of 15 mentor teachers, and financial investments, including an annual stipend of $7500 per resident and mentor teacher training and release time as well as a letter of commitment from the local LEA. (page e58, e72-e73).

Weaknesses:

(iv)An annual review process will allow stakeholders to continually assess the program's effectiveness and develop a long-term framework for sustainability that ensures the USM: NEST's continuation after the federal grant funding ends. Sustainability will be structured through a gradual transfer of fiscal support from grant fund to permanent systems (page e57-e58). However the multi-year plan provided is not well-developed and there is not evidence of a partnership with an LEA.

Reader's Score: 27

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 Overall Project Management Timeline describes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones with a goal to achieve the objectives (page e62-e65).
   (ii)   An Advisory Board composed of superintendents and principals of partner school districts in our region will serve as a voice so USM is aware of evolving local school changes in needs as they arise ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project (page e65).

   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:

   Applicant did not apply for this priority.

   Weaknesses:

   Applicant did not apply for this priority.

   Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

   Strengths:

Applicant did not apply for this priority.

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not apply for this priority.

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:

   Applicant did not apply for this priority.

   Weaknesses:

   Applicant did not apply for this priority.

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:

   Applicant did not apply for this priority.

   Weaknesses:

   Applicant did not apply for this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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:

   Applicant did not apply for this priority.

   Weaknesses:

   Applicant did not apply for this priority.

Reader's Score:

Status:
Last Updated:

   0

Submitted 06/06/2022 11:38 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/07/2022 09:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Southern Mississippi (S336S220065)
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	28
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	0

Competitive Preference Priority 4

   1. Promoting Equity   2   0

Invitational Priority
   Invitational Priority

   1. Grow Your Own   0   0

                                            Total   111   98

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.336S

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

Applicant: University of Southern Mississippi (S336S220065)

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 proposed partnership between USM and FCSD will lead to an expanded pool of well-prepared and diverse applicants in Mississippi by designing and implementing the NEST residency program. (pgs e18-e19) 5

   (ii) The objectives, measures, and desired outcomes for NEST graduates will demonstrate the impact of the NEST program by generating a robust/exhaustive set of effectiveness data. (pgs. e22-e27) 5

   (iii) The proposed NEST comprehensive and Exceptional Approach will improve teaching and learning by reforming the teacher preparation program through literacy reform strategies, increased clinical experiences, embedded teacher mentorship and coaching, mentor teacher development, and a two-year induction program. (pgs. e30-e36) 5

   (iv) The design of the proposed project is supported by evidence-based practices such as increasing teaching and fading mentor support and induction programs. (pgs. e37-e40). 5

   (v) The program performance feedback and continuous improvement will demonstrate levels of effectiveness by providing cycles of outcome data from the various evaluations embedded in the program design. (pgs. e40-e42)5

   (vi) The proposed project will sustain beyond the period of Federal financial assistance by utilizing district funds to pay PTC stipends, recruiting from the pool of district teaching assistants, and accessing the currently existing unfunded residency model resources. 5

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

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 strategy will provide adequately valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes by collecting and monitoring data that is clearly aligned to the program desired outcomes on formative and summative cycles. (pgs. e45-e46) 10

   (ii) The evaluation strategy will prove to be quite feasible and appropriate by directly aligning the timeline and data collection process with the identified objectives, measures and desired outcomes of the proposed project. (pgs. e46-e49) 10

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses

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 various supports stem from each of the partner organizations, which suggests exemplary capacity for the proposed program to be implemented with fidelity. (pg. e50) 6

   (ii) The timing of expenditures outlined in the proposed project's budget suggests fiscal capacity to adequately implement the proposed project given that Year 1 ($173,240.15) is the planning year and Years 2-5 ($1,212,926.40) are the implementation years. (pgs. e125-e127) 6

   (iii) The proposed project costs for the identified personnel are reasonable given that the federal funds will primarily support the PIs and a PD Coordinator. (pg. e56). The two PIs are budgeted $40,050 and Professional Development

Coordinator @ $10,000 for year 1. Additionally, $94,888.15 in matching nonfederal funds to support the core of the program – residents, beginning teachers, and mentor teachers. (pg. e57) 6

(iv) The applicant demonstrates minimal capacity to operate the project beyond the life of the grant. The applicant will implement Year 6 by Cohort 4 being employed in teaching positions and receiving induction support. (pg. e58) 4

(v) The proposed finances and resources offered from the partners demonstrate an exemplar level of relevance and commitment. The applicant cites relevant examples of each partner's financial and resource commitment. (pgs. e58-e59). For example, USM's commitment of faculty and staff to manage the project and FCSD's personnel investments that include 15 mentor teachers (p. e58). 6

Weaknesses:

(iv)While there is anticipation of having a system in place for life beyond the grant, the application does not provide a multiyear financial and operating model beyond Year 5.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **D. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)**

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

(i)   The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
(ii)   The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The use of the NEST management team to manage project activity related to the launch of the residency program and other implementation processes will provide an adequate approach to project oversight and management. Weekly meetings of this team provide a forum for monitoring progress and assessing the effectiveness of major project tasks (p. e59). • Qualifications are included for key project managers and personnel to provide evidence of leadership and expertise needed to oversee the implementation of proposed project tasks (p. e61-e64). • An overall project management timeline provides a broad scope in carrying out the objectives of the proposed project on time (p. e63). 10

Weaknesses:

No Weakenesses

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:

Did not apply

Weaknesses:

Did not apply

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:

   Did not apply

   Weaknesses:

   Did not apply

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:

   Did not apply

   Weaknesses:

   Did not apply

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.**

Did not apply
Strengths:

Did not apply
Weaknesses:
Reader's Score: 0

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.

Did not apply
Strengths:

Did not apply
Weaknesses:
 Score:
Status:

Last Updated:
Submitted
06/07/2022 09:09 PM