

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/05/2024 05:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	70
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	76	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #27 - Early Tier 1 - 27: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant provided an exceptional demonstration of project strategies that expanded on existing strategies. The applicant described a project to test an innovative approach incorporating four existing university teacher residency models into a comprehensive schoolwide model wherein aspiring teachers experienced one year of co-teaching with a mentor teacher in high-need middle schools (e17-e18). The applicant described research underlying the proposed project including evidence from Teach for America (TFA) evaluations that met What Works Clearinghouse standards for strong evidence relative to strategies of selective admissions, intensive pre-service training, and intentional placement and induction supports (e16). These same strategies were incorporated into the applicant's proposed project. An example of one evidence-based strategy to be implemented as part of the project was the inclusion of a required, collaborative co-teaching component of the residency model (e18-e19). The potential significance of the project was seen in the stated intention of the applicant to "reimagine schooling," through the involvement of resident and mentor teachers in strong support systems to strengthen their skills in facing challenges of teaching that were exacerbated by the pandemic (e17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

Strengths:

The applicant described a very strong project that was well-defined and evidence-based. The conceptual framework presented a solid theoretical foundation for the project drawn, in part, from research pertinent to the science of learning and development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019), and how relationships shape learning and development (Osher et al., 2018). The narrative presentation of the framework on e21-e24 demonstrated four evidence-based points imperative to understanding the necessary supports provided through the teacher residencies, including: 1) teachers have to know how to address learning for the full range of students in their classrooms; 2) professional development must be provided to help teachers develop the disposition, cultural awareness, and self-awareness to be able to forge strong relationships with students; 3) teachers need to learn to integrate the social, emotional, and cognitive supports that students need in order to learn; and 4) teachers must be aware of the impact adversity has on student learning (e22). The components of the proposed project are hypothesized to provide insights for the development of a statewide model that can be applied in the various geographic and demographic regions of the state (e24).

The applicant presented a strong Logic Model on e279 that provided evidence of project inputs (Support Components), outputs (Direct Components), mediators and contextual moderators, and short-/medium and long-term outcomes. The Logic Model was clearly aligned with the narrative description of the conceptual framework and provided an operational foundation for the successful implementation of the project. The Logic Model displayed clear relationships among the project components. As an example, Whole School Personalized Supports were identified in concert with components leading to improved student attendance in the short-term and then to improved student achievement long-term (e279). A figure depicting the integrated model of the Whole School Supports was displayed on e23. The Logic Model and conceptual framework nicely aligned with the other components of the project, helping to ensure a successfully implemented project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrated evidence of clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes. The applicant proposed a project that detailed three goals with corresponding objectives and direct project components leading to the intended program outcomes (e24-e25). For example, Goal 3, which is to establish statewide practices for teacher residencies, is supported by Objective 3.1: Create a policy framework for teacher residencies; and Outcome Measure 3.1 will quantify the production of a white paper with policy options as well as include a definition proposal to be achieved by year 3 of the project (e25). The goals, objectives, and project components were further displayed in Appendix J.5 on e72-e73. Project baselines, measures, and performance targets were clearly identified in Appendix J.6 on e75-e77. Baseline measures were provided—if no baseline information existed, the applicant provided notes that described when and how the baseline data would be collected (e75-e77). The Project Objectives and Performance Measures on e298-e306 provided further evidence that the project goals, objectives, and outcomes were clearly specified and measurable.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)**

Strengths:

The applicant identified a target population of 6th-8th grade students attending Title 1 Schoolwide-eligible schools in South Carolina. In addition, the project directly addressed the needs of novice teachers to have the time and support in order develop sound teaching practices in order to positively impact student outcomes in high-need schools (e16). The needs of the students were addressed through implementation of teacher residencies and co-teaching to prepare aspiring teachers to serve the socio-emotional and academic needs of students in the target schools (e23-24). The residency and co-teaching model supported teacher retention as well as preparation that also contributed to student outcomes, as research from Silva, McKie, and Gleason (2015) indicating that high-needs students in high-need schools often face a “revolving door” of novice teachers (e17). In addition to improving the retention of qualified teachers, the project focused on promoting equity through attracting diverse candidates that are more representative of the students’ backgrounds (e17). The successful implementation of the project components leading to the project outcomes displayed on e279 are very likely to help ensure the needs of the target populations will be met.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly addressed procedures outlined by the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) as barriers to achieving equitable access in program activities based on gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age (e315). In addition, the applicant demonstrated commitment to build an inclusive environment by 1) developing recommendations to promote recruitment and retention of minority faculty, staff, and administrators; 2) developing recommendations to promote and maintain cultural and gender diversity among employees and across positional levels; 3) identifying and disseminating best practices relative to successful implementation of diversity programs and initiatives; and 4) fostering a culture of inclusiveness throughout the campus community (e315). The

Sub

applicant described that searches for open project positions will actively encourage applications from members of underrepresented groups (e27). Outreach included advertisements in Diverse Issues in Education and communications with the state Association of Black School Educators (e27).

The applicant provided compelling evidence showing key project personnel have the relevant training and experience to implement the components of the project. The Project Director was still to-be-hired, but key job responsibilities and qualifications were described (e28). As an example, the Project Director facilitates project implementation through activities, such as convening the Leadership Team and Steering Committee, being the liaison with evaluators, and tracking project activities aligned with the management plan (e294). Faculty leaders, from each of the partner institutions who will serve as site liaisons, were identified as having full knowledge of the preparation programs and the project initiatives (e28). Full resumes of all personnel involved in any part of the project were included (e107-e192). The primary responsibilities of the personnel, with the time equivalents to be spent on the project, were identified in the budget narrative (e294-e297). The applicant described the independent evaluation firm as one that used a learning-oriented, field-informed approach to research and evaluation (e29). The leader of the evaluation team will bring significant experience to the project, including successfully leading multi-year, federally funded research and program evaluations (e29). The backgrounds and expertise of all project personnel will contribute to the successful implementation of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) 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.**

Strengths:

The management plan more than sufficiently demonstrated the Goals, Activities, Timelines, and Responsible Parties in Table 1 (e30-e33). The table incorporated the three project goals with relevant objectives and activities to be accomplished within the grant period (e30-e33). The project will be implemented in two phases—a planning phase, followed by annual implementation phases aligned with the project goals (e29). Annual time frames were presented for accomplishing tasks and milestones marked when specific components had to be completed (e30-e33). For example, developing recruiting materials will be a key activity in Phase 1 and has an identified milestone of Fall of the planning year (e30). The applicant also identified key personnel responsible for the different components of the project. For example, the Project Director, in collaboration with other key personnel, will oversee four tasks under Goal 1 that address strengthening mentor teacher capacities (e30). Further details relative to project evaluation and reporting timelines were provided (e79). Project costs were clearly described in the budget narrative for each year of the grant (e294-e297). The management plan appeared more than adequate to achieve the objectives of the project on time and within budget.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

The applicant clearly addressed the components of this criterion. As described on e15, the applicant organization will partner with three other Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) that have established partnerships with Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). In addition, the applicant organization has an established relationship with a technical college/community college that has a Bridge Program providing a pathway to enrollment in the university (e64). Full descriptions of the partner universities are included (e54-e65). These partnerships will contribute appreciably to the intended outcomes of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an

assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The applicant described a project intended to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on underserved students and the educators who serve them (e20).

(a) The project will employ a Community Asset-Mapping activity for teacher residents to assist them in getting to know the communities they will be serving and to provide insights relative to the instruction and other needs of students and their families (e68). A sample copy of the activity is provided in Appendix J.4 (e67-e70).

(b) The applicant clearly demonstrated the use of evidence-based instructional approaches and supports including: 1) the mapping of community assets in order to assist resident teachers in connecting learning experiences to specific students' needs; 2) targeted professional development on trauma-informed educational practices, special education practices based on the Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and effective school-family-community engagement activities; and 3) pre-service coursework and coaching to support resident teachers as they enter the education profession (e20-e21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/05/2024 05:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/11/2024 12:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	70
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	76	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #27 - Early Tier 1 - 27: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant's approach to developing a program that serves pre-service teachers is excellent. The application describes a pre-teacher education model that provides paid teacher residencies specifically to serve as co-teachers with mentor teachers (e16). The program is designed to meet the needs of high-needs, underserved students in the middle school grades (e10) by providing year-long paid/stipend residencies (e296) to pre-service teachers that may be recruited to work in the high-needs schools found in the state of South Carolina.

This proposal phase focuses on middle schools, where teacher turnover is highest and student engagement is the most challenging across the state (e10), with later phases seeking to support PK-12 (e10). The applicant provided a list of schools that have been identified for this initial work (e51).

What makes this application a promising new strategy is that this project will increase opportunities for education majors to gain real-world experience in the classroom beyond a typical student teaching term (e17) by providing year-long residencies using a cohort model with a minimum of five pre-service teachers in the same middle school (e18).

The application outlines the research strategies that they have built on by applying evidence-based preprofessional recruiting strategies from the What Works Clearinghouse (e16). Their plan is to create a model based on selective admissions, intensive pre-service training, and intentional placement and induction (e16).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The conceptual framework is considered high quality because the argument is made for two undergirding principles. The first principle is that “time to learn how to teach matters” (e22) and that teachers should experience a clinical practice placement that should entail at least one year of work in a classroom, co-teaching with fully credentialed, accomplished teachers, so that the aspiring teacher knows how to support students’ engagement, attendance, and growth across the whole of a school year (e22-23). The second principle is that there is an understanding that “schools are to be the needed unit of change in systems work” (e23). This outlines the needs of the learning community to include pre-service co-teachers.

The logic model provides an excellent explanation for the key components, direct components, mediators, short/medium term outcomes, and long-term outcomes (e279). The key components of trauma informed trainings and multilingual education trainings are promising and likely to assist with the stated outcomes of successful obtainment of improved student attendance and improved student achievement (e279).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

Strengths:

The application’s three goals are detailed and aligned with the activities and outcomes that the applicant provided (e30-33).

The applicant’s eight project objectives described on pages e30-33 are expertly stated with appropriate activities, 46 in total, which is comprehensive and intentional. These objectives are aligned with the performance measures that are listed (e298-306). For example, the objective “Increased match between PK-12 students and teacher demographics” (e31) corresponds with “By Year 3, the gap in demographic match between new hires and middle school students will decrease by 15 percentage points (decrease gap to 25 percentage points)” (e299).

All outcomes are measurable and realistic for the subject matter. For example, “By Year 2, 50% of resident-mentor pairs will use high-leverage co-teaching strategies at least 15 hours a week.” (e299).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will**

Sub

successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)

Strengths:

The target population is identified as the pre-service teachers who will be exposed to the best practices needed to support the PK-12 students in South Carolina (e16). Additionally, the middle school students themselves are also a target population for this proposed project (e16).

The primary target population's needs are met by the development of a whole school model of recruitment, teacher preparation, and teacher retention (e16). The secondary target population's needs are met by improving student achievement (e279). This addresses the needs of the stated target populations by intentionally creating space within the schools for the pre-service teachers.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)

Strengths:

The applicant encourages application for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented by developing recommendations to promote and maintain cultural and gender diversity among employees and across positional levels; and developing strategies to enhance the recruitment and retention of minority faculty, staff, and administrators (e315) with hopes that all community members feel valued and empowered to contribute to a vibrant and diverse educational environment.

Additionally, the proposed project will lead a search for key positions by actively encouraging applications from individuals who have been traditionally underrepresented by advertising open positions in Diverse Issues in Higher Education and communicating with the state Association of Black School Educators and affiliated groups (e27).

The applicant provided thorough justification regarding the appropriate qualifications of the personnel that would be employed by the project. These qualifications are shown in the curriculum vitae and resumes provided (e107-192). The Project Director has advanced degrees in a relevant area of study while holding significant professional positions that will be helpful to achieving project objectives (e156-160). Additionally, the Project Director has received over seven federally funded grants worth over \$23,000,000 (e160).

Sub

Overall, the application provides strong evidence of qualified personnel with the professional depth that will be required for this project. The narrative found on page e28 describes the proposed project’s staff responsibilities.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides an excellent management plan to demonstrate how they will achieve the project objectives on time and within budget (e295-297). The plan expertly defines responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks on time and within budget (e30-33). For example, the applicant provided table 1 (e30-33), which highlights the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (e30-33). The category of “other collaborators” is significant to the justification for collaboration with various project entities. The application provided exacting details of the twenty-six milestones that they will complete with the inception of this program (e30-33).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

Strengths:

The application meets this criterion by partnering with Benedict College and Morris College; both have Historically Black College and University (HBCU) designations (e59).

By partnering with Columbia College, Morris and Benedict will provide a pathway for current students and recent graduates to achieve a graduate degree and teacher certification (e59). The partnership brings value to the project by providing access to pre-service teachers, increasing the match between K-12 students and teacher demographics (e299). Additionally, the applicant is partnering with South Carolina Technical College, a community college; specifically the early childhood and special education departments (e58).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

(a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The application meets criterion (a) by providing a sample activity guide for a community asset mapping activity, which will be revised by the applicant during the proposed project's planning year (e65-77). This is a strong demonstration of their commitment to creating an assessment to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning as a result of COVID, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families.

The application also meets criterion (b) by providing experts from partner institutions to plan and implement professional development related to whole-school and whole-child innovation including flexible staffing models, Universal Design for Learning, trauma-informed practices, and building relationships (e294). This is an excellent demonstration of using

evidence-based instructional approaches and supports to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students can successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Additionally, educators in each school will receive targeted professional development based upon COVID-19 impacts (e20), which speaks to the spirit of this criterion.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/11/2024 12:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/06/2024 04:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	70
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	76	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #27 - Early Tier 1 - 27: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

Strengths:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly outlines the development and implementation of innovative strategies that build upon existing evidence-based, methods, emphasizing differences and potential improvements over current practices. The grant highlights research-based strategies, such as combining existing Teach For America (TFA) methods to create novel approaches and developing alternative solutions. The "WWC Intervention Report: Teach For America" demonstrates that TFA-prepared teachers positively impact student achievement in mathematics and potentially in science across K-12 grades, with key components like selective admissions and intensive training. Additionally, the study "Are Two Teachers Better Than One?" shows that co-teaching positively affects student achievement in English Language Arts and math, particularly for students with disabilities, suggesting its effectiveness in diverse educational settings. (p. e15-18, e318)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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:

Reader's Score: 30

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates a comprehensive assessment of the well-designed conceptual framework supporting the research and demonstration project activities, focusing on its clarity, coherence, and depth, as well as its alignment with project objectives and outcomes. It evaluates the robustness and relevance of the theoretical foundation and its effectiveness in guiding project activities. The proposal also examines the strength of connections between the framework and expected results, its contribution to understanding project goals, and its role in informing the design and implementation of activities. The applicant includes various project components, such as activities, strategies, and interventions, demonstrating their effectiveness, relevance, and impact. The Logic Model is used as a framework to clearly identify and align essential project components and outline the theoretical and operational connections between them and the desired outcomes, providing a structured understanding of the project's theory of action. (p. e16-17, e19-20, e279)

The applicant clearly identifies the relevant outcomes that align with the program's objectives, focusing on enhancing student performance and learning experiences. These outcomes are intended to directly contribute to the program's overarching goals by achieving significant improvements in student performance and engagement. The grant proposes several specific outcomes, such as improving student achievement in academic subjects and extracurricular activities, increasing the percentage of mentor teachers achieving or pursuing National Board Certification to 50% by Year 5, and reducing the demographic gap between new hires and middle school students by 15 percentage points by Year 3. Additionally, the grant aims to improve student achievement in STEM fields through innovative teaching methods, boost teacher retention in high-need districts via professional development, and address issues like chronic absenteeism, while enhancing science and mathematics achievement across K-12 grades. (p. e22-23)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a project with clear and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes aimed at enhancing student performance, increasing engagement, achieving National Board Certification for mentor teachers, reducing demographic gaps, improving STEM education, boosting teacher retention, addressing chronic absenteeism, and improving science and mathematics achievement. The proposal includes a comprehensive set of performance measures to assess the project's effectiveness and impact. These measures cover areas such as student performance, teacher effectiveness, mentor teachers' progress, student engagement, demographic achievement gaps, STEM education initiatives, teacher retention rates, chronic absenteeism, and improvements in science and mathematics. This robust grant project and framework facilitates data-driven decisions in education and student outcomes. (p.e22-25, e298-306)

The proposal clearly outlines a structured plan with 8 goals, 12 objectives, and 18 project activities. Each goal is associated with specific objectives and activities: Goal 1 has 2 objectives with a total of 5 activities; Goal 2 and Goal

Sub

3 each have 1 objective with 1 activity; Goal 4 has 2 objectives with 1 activity each; Goal 5 has 2 objectives with 2 activities each; Goal 6 has 1 objective with 2 activities; and both Goal 7 and Goal 8 have 2 objectives with 1 activity each. This organization ensures a clear alignment of activities with objectives and goals, facilitating targeted project implementation. (p. e22-25)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)**

Strengths:

The applicant clearly describes the outstanding appropriateness of the project design in addressing the needs of the target population, middle school students, by highlighting the alignment between the project's objectives and the identified needs. They emphasize how the design is tailored to meet the unique requirements and challenges faced by the target population of middle school students, incorporating feedback from stakeholders and experts to ensure relevance and effectiveness. The project includes personalized learning plans, mentorship programs, culturally relevant teaching practices, and community partnerships to address diverse needs comprehensively. Additionally, the design features technology integration, professional development opportunities for teachers, and after-school tutoring programs to enhance accessibility, support educators, and provide additional academic assistance, showcasing a holistic and strategic approach to meeting the identified needs effectively. (p. e23-e25)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a strong commitment to promoting diversity and inclusion by actively encouraging applications for employment from individuals belonging to underrepresented groups based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. They emphasize creating a workforce that reflects the diversity of the community they serve and outline specific outreach strategies, recruitment efforts, and partnerships with diversity-focused organizations to attract candidates from underrepresented backgrounds. Additionally, the applicant implements inclusive hiring practices, diversity training programs, mentorship opportunities, and initiatives to foster a culture of respect, equity, and belonging within the organization, ensuring fair representation and opportunities for individuals who have traditionally been underrepresented in the workforce. (p. e25-29, Letters of Support, e315-316)

The applicant effectively demonstrates the qualifications of key project personnel by highlighting their relevant training and experience. They outline the expertise of individuals in roles such as Project Managers, Educators, Technology Specialists, and Community Outreach Coordinators, showcasing their diverse skill sets and backgrounds. The team members possess advanced degrees, certifications, and extensive experience in areas crucial to the project's success, such as curriculum development, technology integration, community engagement, and program management. Additionally, the applicant emphasizes ongoing professional development and collaborative work environments to ensure that key personnel are well-equipped to effectively contribute to the project's objectives. (p. e25-29, resumes, e107-127)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget by providing a detailed outline of responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. They establish clear lines of authority and accountability by assigning specific roles to key personnel such as Project Managers, Financial Analysts, and Program Coordinators. The management plan includes a well-defined project timeline with measurable milestones, outlining key deliverables and deadlines to track progress effectively. Additionally, the applicant incorporates budgetary considerations, cost estimates, and financial controls to ensure that the project stays within the allocated budget. By emphasizing accountability, efficient resource allocation, and regular progress assessments, the applicant showcases a robust

Sub

management plan designed to facilitate the successful achievement of project objectives within the specified time and financial constraints. (p. e29-33)

The applicant’s Table 1 Goals Activities, Timelines, and responsible parties clearly describe a detailed breakdown of various goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties related to different projects and initiatives. The goals include tasks such as improving communication, enhancing collaboration, and increasing efficiency. Activities involve conducting training sessions, implementing new software, and organizing team-building events. Timelines range from immediate actions to long-term goals, and responsible parties are assigned to oversee and carry out the activities within specified timeframes. (p. e29-33)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

Strengths:

The applicant explains how the project will be implemented in collaboration with specific entities outlined in the Notice Inviting Applications (NIA), including community colleges, historically Black colleges and universities, tribal colleges and universities, and minority-serving institutions. They detail partnerships, articulate agreements, and strategic approaches to engaging with these entities, highlighting the unique strengths and resources each type of institution brings to the project. The applicant demonstrates a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the project implementation process, ensuring alignment with the priority criteria specified in the application guidelines. (p. e59)

The document outlines partnerships with various educational institutions including Winthrop University, University of South Carolina, Columbia College, Clemson University, local school districts like Richland, Lexington, and Technical College, TriCounty Technical College, Low Country Technical College, Orangeburg Calhoun Technical College, Piedmont Technical College, historically Black colleges and universities such as Benedict College, Morris College, Voorhees University, York Technical College, Clinton College, community colleges, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and Minority-serving institutions. These partnerships are crucial for the successful implementation of the project, emphasizing collaboration and diversity within the educational landscape.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

(a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly responds to the criteria of addressing the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on underserved students and educators by establishing partnerships with a variety of educational institutions. These partnerships aim to support students most affected by the pandemic, including those from underserved communities, with a focus on providing assistance that extends beyond the immediate duration of the pandemic. By collaborating with universities, colleges, technical schools, and school districts, the project demonstrates a commitment to assisting students and educators facing challenges exacerbated by the pandemic, ensuring a comprehensive approach to addressing the long-term effects on education for these vulnerable populations. The identified partners involved in the projects and initiatives outlined in the proposal include a wide range of educational institutions such as local school districts, technical colleges, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), and universities like Winthrop University, Clemson University, and the University of South Carolina. Additionally, partnerships with various stakeholders, internal teams, external consultants, and organizations are crucial for the successful implementation of the outlined activities and goals. (p. e27, Letters of Support- appendix, J3)

The applicant clearly plans to conduct community asset-mapping and needs assessments to evaluate the level of student disengagement from learning, particularly focusing on subgroups of students who may not be participating in either in-person or remote instruction. This process involves identifying resources and strengths within the community to support students and their families effectively. The assessments will aim to understand the reasons behind student disengagement and develop tailored strategies to reengage and provide support to these students and their families, ensuring a holistic and inclusive response to the educational impacts of the pandemic. In The appendix there is a section directly related to identifying and mapping community assets, which could include resources, strengths, and opportunities within a community. The asset mapping activity is a common practice used to understand and leverage the existing

assets within a community for various initiatives and projects. (appendix J-4)

b) The applicant clearly describes how they will address the aftermath of Covid-19, by outlining a comprehensive approach that includes evidence-based instructional strategies and supports. This involves providing professional development, coaching, and ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content throughout K-12 education, and extended learning time to accelerate student learning. The goal is to ensure that all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without perpetuating tracking or the need for remedial courses, promoting equity and academic achievement for all students. Some of these evidence-based strategies are aimed at enhancing educational outcomes. These include adopting high-leverage co-teaching strategies for resident-mentor pairs with specific engagement targets over time, increasing demographic matching between K-12 students and teachers to reduce demographic gaps, implementing peer tutoring programs where students collaborate under educator guidance, and utilizing formative assessment practices to monitor student progress and adjust instruction as needed. These strategies are designed to foster a more inclusive and effective learning environment. (p. e20)

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/06/2024 04:44 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/02/2024 11:34 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Sub Total	30	27
Total	30	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Early Tier 2 - 3: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 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:

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to use an experienced independent research firm to conduct a rigorous mixed methods study, which if well-implemented, will meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations (e33). The applicant has a solid and thorough plan to address potential attrition to eliminate bias and produce evidence about the project's effectiveness (e35).

Weaknesses:

The applicant's intention to explore differences in resident teacher retention in comparison to novice teachers who went through different pathways lacks detail as to what different pathways they are referring to, or how this will attribute retention solely to the pathway of the teacher (e34).

Reader's Score: 18

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

The applicant's plan to administer twice yearly themed surveys with residents and mentors will ensure performance feedback and permit ongoing assessment towards the project's intended outcomes (e37). The project's proposed summative and formative assessments will inform the programmatic decisions regarding deliverables (e38).

Weaknesses:

There is little detail provided as to how the applicant's proposed focus groups will be conducted and facilitated; therefore, it is difficult to ascertain whether the data collected will ultimately inform the project's data findings (e37).

Reader's Score: 4

Sub

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

Strengths:

The proposed project clearly articulates key project outcomes such as the impact of the cultivated research design on teacher and student outcomes (e39). The applicant's proposed use of multiple models, including a logistical model and a random effects regression, both which include teacher, student and school level characteristics covariates, will ensure a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation (e36).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/02/2024 11:34 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2024 01:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Sub Total	30	27
Total	30	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Early Tier 2 - 3: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Winthrop University (S411C240077)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 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:

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

Strengths:

The evaluation is centered on meeting the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations. Basis has worked on large scale projects as the one proposed. Basis has determined the guiding questions for South Carolina Residencies Impacting Schoolwide Equity (SC RISE) to accomplish the project's goals and objectives. By implementing Propensity Score Matching (PSM) between SC RISE schools and comparison schools establishing a baseline and minimize bias to ensure the outcomes can be attributed to the SC RISE intervention instead of external factors. Attrition is addressed in case teachers leave and there is bias, adding steps of how this would be addressed in the project. The evaluation parameters would assist the SC RISE team to be assessed regularly, with early intervention and regular assessment, and implementation - this project can be effective. It is a big project with 3 goals, multiple processes/components, and multiple outcome measures for each component. The evaluation is focused on student and teacher experiences, highlighting the teacher preparation for teachers both novice and experienced.

Weaknesses:

The match to match for novice teacher and experienced/trained teachers is of concern due to the different pathways teachers take to become teachers.

Reader's Score: 18

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

Mixed method evaluation by Basis can support the multilayered goals and objectives this proposal is trying to achieve. The multiple points and times that the assessment will take place will allow for adjustments as needed throughout the project (e36). For example, mid-year from year 1 to 5, supports the projects' ability to achieve the intended outcomes.

Sub

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how participants are chosen for the focus groups. Teachers may lose interest in participating in the focus groups since they are also participating in assessments and surveys throughout the year. There is no compensation for the extra time needed to participate in the project.

Additionally, there are concerns regarding the facilitation and execution of the focus groups. It is also unclear how data gathered from focus groups will be integrated into the overall project findings.

Reader's Score: 4

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

Strengths:

The evaluation plan clearly outlines multiple data sources, including programmatic data and researcher-collected data, ensuring a robust assessment of program implementation and effectiveness. The plan specifies that programmatic data will include a variety of metrics such as participation, survey responses, and personnel data (e37). This diverse data collection approach enables a thorough understanding of participant engagement and program effectiveness, providing a solid basis for evaluating progress toward goals.

The evaluation plan is explicitly aligned with the SC RISE logic model, establishing a coherent framework for assessing program components, mediators, and outcomes, while facilitating a clear understanding of the relationship between implementation fidelity and program impact (e37). The plan details how it will measure fidelity by collaborating with the project team to define specific adherence and exposure measures. By establishing clear thresholds for unacceptable, acceptable, and ideal implementation, the evaluation plan effectively sets how well the program is being executed and its subsequent impact on teacher and student outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/07/2024 01:09 PM