

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/16/2024 12:49 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (S336S240004)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>         |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                        | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Evaluation Plan                       | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Adequacy of Resources</b>             |                 |               |
| 1. Resources                             | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan                       | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 100             | 100           |
| <b>Priority Questions</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priorities</b> |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 1                                 | 4               | 4             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 2                                 | 3               | 3             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 3                                 | 2               | 2             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 4                                 | 2               | 2             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 11              | 11            |
| <b>Invitational Priorities</b>           |                 |               |
| <b>Invitational Priority 1</b>           |                 |               |
| 1. IP 1                                  | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Invitational Priority 2</b>           |                 |               |
| 1. IP 2                                  | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 111             | 111           |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - TQP Panel - 4: 84.336S

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

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (S336S240004)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. A. Quality of 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. (5 pts) (Logic model must be present to get all 5 pts)

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

(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. (5 pts)

(iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (5 pts)

(v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project. (5 pts)

(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. (5 pts)

#### Strengths:

(i)The proposed program outlines a clear rational for the ROOTS program, including short-mid-long-term goals, clearly stated in the logic model. (e97)

(ii)Pre-program targeted support will be provided to ensure completion of all requirements and remove any barriers before entering residency. (e22).

(iii)The program will prepare and support graduates' understanding of how to support students using ELD standards, facilitating learning, and preparing equity-based assessments. (e25)

(iv)Measurable goals include increased recruitment of BIPOC teacher candidates, addressing shortage areas, outlined residency program, highly effective induction support with experienced induction coach offering support for two years. (e25)

(v)Proposed program goals include ongoing professional development addressing the social, emotional, and academic needs of students. Long-term outcomes will focus on a GYO BIPOC teacher pipeline sustaining teacher retention. (e26)

(vi)Collaborative partnerships with CSUMB and LEA; LEA to provide induction support for first 2 years. Recruiting from the LEA and placing residents in yearlong clinicals and diverse credentials allows the cyclical model will be sustained beyond the grant.

#### Weaknesses:

None noted

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Sub**

**1. Overview Statement**

**General:**

The ROOTS program outlines the urgent need for diverse, highly qualified teachers in California, particularly in high-needs areas, such as high-poverty and minority-serving LEAs. There is a focus on the educational needs of ELs and BIPOC students and a plan to offer support using educational goals that are equitable.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan**

**1. B. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (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. (10 pts)**
- (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. (10 pts)**

**Strengths:**

(i) Data will be collected from residents, mentor teachers, clinical coaches, faculty program coordinators, and program completers. (e50)

The data will be reviewed throughout the year and shared quarterly in Leadership Team Meetings. (e50-51)

(ii) Relevant stakeholders will be invited to meetings to share data, analyze findings, and offer collaborative data-driven decision-making. (e50)

(ii) External evaluators will collect ongoing formative data to improve recruitment efforts.

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

**1. Overview Statement**

**General:**

The program's exceptional evaluation plan will be completed by external evaluators and involve viewpoints of all stakeholders for collaborative decision-making efforts. The plan also includes regular data review meetings with the Leadership Team to analyze progress and continuous improvement, allowing for year-end adjustments.

**Reader's Score:**

**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. (6 pts)
- (ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project. (6 pts)
- (iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (6 pts)
- (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. (6 pts)
- (v) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. (6 pts)

**Strengths:**

- (i) The program has been operational for 5 years and includes committed resources from a variety of internal and external entities. (e60)
- (ii) Partnerships with local LEAs include the use of school facilities to reduce facility costs. (e60)  
Residents have dedicated access to tech suites, librarian, computer labs, and tech support. (e61).  
Utilizing faculty expertise, including workshop facilitation, keeps personnel and outside vendor contracts costs low. (e61-62)  
Ongoing induction support and mentor services are embedded in LEA's operational costs, decreasing the programs' financial responsibility (e62).  
The program proposes a holistic approach to teacher preparation efforts by partnering with LEAs and ensuring teacher retention to alleviate turnover costs. It also increases financial support that can be utilized in high-need schools and raises student achievement for underserved student populations (e64).  
The long-term success of the program is ensured by commitments from the university president of CIO and the COE dean. (e64)  
The program has been successfully executed and ensures building capacity throughout current and past funding periods with commitments from the COE dean pledging support of facilities, meeting space, admin support, and technology. (e64)

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Sub**

**1. Overview Statement**

**General:**

The program has commitments from the College of Education staff and LEA partnerships to bring down resident needs costs. These commitments are ongoing, ensuring support after the residency period. These partnerships allow the program to increase recruitment efforts and build lasting relationships.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the 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. (10 pts)
- (ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. (10 pts)

**Strengths:**

i) External Evaluators will collect formative data annually to ensure student's needs are met, providing feedback to ROOTS personnel to ensure continuous improvement. (e40)

The director and asst. director are responsible for ensuring the project stays on budget through the following measures: monthly budget reports, quarterly budget meetings, bi-annual reporting, and annual budget meetings with the leadership team. (e71)

A communication plan is in place to ensure that all personnel are on the same page with regular updates, managed by the asst. director. (e72-73)

(ii) ROOTS partners are data-driven organizations that use data to drive organizational change and improvement with the goal of improving K-12 educational landscaping. (e76)

Collaborative efforts between partners, ROOTS personnel, and direct liaisons will work to analyze qualitative and quantitative data, identifying successes and needs for improvement. (e76).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

**1. Overview Statement**

**General:**

The management plan is set to ensure success of the ROOTS project. This plan will ensure objectives are met in a timely manner and stay within the proposed budget. The communication plan is strong.

**Reader's Score:**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 points). (Both subfactors (a) and (b) must be addressed to get full 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 502 of the HEA), Tribal Colleges and Universities (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. (2 pts) (Peer Reviewer please confirm that the proposed partner IHE meets the HBCU, HSI, TCU or other MSI status before points are awarded.)

**(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. (2 pts)**

**Strengths:**

The program is based in an HSI – Hispanic Serving Institution (eligible under section 502 of the HEA.

The proposed program goal includes partnering with high-need LEAs to address teacher shortage areas. (e16)

The program goals include offering pre-program support to remove barriers for BIPOC and first-gen candidates. (e16)

The program will facilitate a black student advisory group composed of COE black faculty to recruit and mentor Black students from the area. (e29)

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: 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 educators 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 program has designed efforts to alleviate barriers that may prevent First-Gen and BIPOC candidates from being successful. These include financial stipends, academic support, social/cultural groups, and support around mental and physical counseling. (e29)

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs (Up to 2 points). (Both subfactors (a) and (b) must be addressed to get full 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. (1 pt)**

**(b) Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students. Improving the retention of fully certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-need schools or shortage areas. (1 pt)**

**Strengths:**

The program intends to provide wraparound services including financial, academic, social, cultural, mental, physical. (e38)

The program will support BIPOC residents through the process by creating an affinity group to support and ensure that residents feel supported and increase success and retention in the program. (e39). The evidence of these needs being met will be analyzed through annual data collected by external evaluators. (e40)

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 4**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: 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 implements responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparation 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 program will provide ongoing workshops and professional development addressing social, emotional, and academic support. (e40)

Professional development efforts will include how-to workshops on identifying positionality and moving from coteaching to new teacher content incorporation. (e40)

Residents will complete an IDP – Individualized Development Plan as a means to link coursework, field experiences, and induction. (e40)

PD opportunities are based on in-person, hands-on, practice-based immersive experiences led by diverse faculty with expertise across multiple disciplines. (e41)

**Weaknesses:**

N/A



Invitational Priorities - Invitational Priority 1

1. Invitational Priority 1: Partnership Grants for the Establishment of GYO Programs and Registered Apprenticeship Programs for K-12 Teachers. (No Points Awarded)

Projects that establish or scale evidence-based and high quality GYO programs, including registered apprenticeship 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, by recruiting and developing teacher candidates from the communities the school or district serves. GYO programs must minimize or eliminate the cost of certification for teacher candidates and compensate educators for work in classrooms that is part of their certification program. Participants must not become the teacher of record prior to completing the certification program. Projects may also include high school dual-enrollment opportunities and registered teacher apprenticeship programs.

A project implementing a new or enhanced GYO program, including registered apprenticeship programs, must:

- (a) Be developed with the partner LEA to address the needs of its students and teachers;
- (b) Use data-driven strategies and evidence-based approaches to increase recruitment, successful completion, and retention of teachers supported by the project;
- (c) Provide standards for participants to enter into and complete the program;
- (d) Be aligned to evidence-based practices for effective educator preparation, and include practice-based learning opportunities linked to coursework that address state requirements for certification, professional standards for teacher preparation, culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogies, and the established knowledge base for education, including the science of learning and development;
- (e) Have little to no financial burden for program participants, or provide for loan forgiveness;
- (f) Require completion of a bachelor's degree either before entering or as a result of the certification program;
- (g) Result in the satisfaction of all requirements or full state teacher licensure or certification, excluding emergency, temporary, provisional or other sub-standard licensure or certification; and
- (h) Provide increasing levels of responsibility for the resident/ GYO participant/ apprentice during at least one year of paid on-the-job learning/clinical experience, during which a mentor teacher is the teacher of record.

**Strengths:**

- (b) Data of GYO programs shows that homegrown teachers have higher retention rates. (e45)
- GYO programs removed obstacles that prevent residents from entering and persisting in EPP's. (e45)

The program efforts will evaluate all program aspects to ensure student success. (e45)

The goal of this program is to promote sustained partnerships, provide supports (academic, financial, social, cultural, mental, physical). (e45)

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

## Invitational Priorities - Invitational Priority 2

### 1. Invitational Priority 2: Supporting Early Elementary Educators and School Leaders.

Projects that include professional development programs, professional learning communities, and peer learning collaboratives to support elementary educators and school leaders in meeting the wide range of developmental strengths, needs, and experiences of students at kindergarten entry through the early grades with a focus on one or more of the following strategies:

- (a) Intentional collaboration for systemic alignment for continuity of services, supports, instruction, relationships, and data sharing across K-2;
- (b) Effective and intentional transitions into kindergarten and through the early grades;
- (c) Instruction informed by child development and developmentally informed practices;
- (d) Partnerships with parents, families and caregivers to allow successful family engagement and everyday school attendance.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   07/16/2024 12:49 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/12/2024 02:38 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (S336S240004)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>         |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                        | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Evaluation Plan                       | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Adequacy of Resources</b>             |                 |               |
| 1. Resources                             | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan                       | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 100             | 100           |
| <b>Priority Questions</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priorities</b> |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 1                                 | 4               | 4             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 2                                 | 3               | 3             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 3                                 | 2               | 2             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 4                                 | 2               | 2             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 11              | 11            |
| <b>Invitational Priorities</b>           |                 |               |
| <b>Invitational Priority 1</b>           |                 |               |
| 1. IP 1                                  | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Invitational Priority 2</b>           |                 |               |
| 1. IP 2                                  | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 111             | 111           |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - TQP Panel - 4: 84.336S

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (S336S240004)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. A. Quality of 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. (5 pts) (Logic model must be present to get all 5 pts)

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

(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. (5 pts)

(iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (5 pts)

(v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project. (5 pts)

(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. (5 pts)

#### Strengths:

(i) The applicant presents a Logic Model. The applicant provides statistical data of evidence such as just 3% of ELs in county are meeting or exceeding grade-level standards in math, and only 5% are meeting or exceeding grade-level standards in English Language Arts (ELA). Only 3% of ELs complete requirements to make them eligible to attend college (Ed-Data, 2018). Monterey County schools serve second highest percentage (41.2%) of students identified as ELs in CA and highest number of migrant students in US; well above CA average of 19%. Yet, graduation rates for ELs are 68.9%, below CA average of 71.4%. In Monterey County, CA Assessment of Student Performance Progress (CAASPP) ELA results steadily declined since Covid-19, particularly for Latino and Black students (e20).

(ii) The applicant goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly outlined. For example, Goal 1: Recruit in consultation with high-needs partner LEAs highly qualified diverse residents through GYO to address teacher certification shortage areas; providing preprogram support to remove barriers for BIPOC and first-generation candidates will reduce the barriers and increase the number of teachers who receive their certification (e22). Objective 1.1. Recruit BIPOC residents to diversify the educator workforce through GYO. Outcomes 1.1: BIPOC resident targets annually to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable (e23-24).

(iii) The applicant presents a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The applicant's partner LEAs have taken the first step to improve teaching and learning by engaging in residency programs with CSUMB and helping to identify their needs to support reform. Their LEAs have identified human capital resources to support the collaborative partnership between CSUMB and partner school districts (e26).

(iv) The applicant presents a detailed design of the proposed project that reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. For example, ROOTS residents are in cohorts based on program, encouraging professional collaboration: research shows lead to a 3.6 times higher completion rate than students in a non-cohort model (Oldham,

2017). As designed in Meyers et al. study (2016; WWC 2020-011) strong evidence w/out reservation, ROOTS residents are charted to improve the effectiveness in classroom by allowing them to engage in meaningful investigations and support in making data-driven decisions to improve instructional quality and student achievement (e46). In addition to embedding work with specific core practices into university coursework provides future educators with sets of lived experiences from which to pivot their future, in-the-moment interactions in more high stakes situations (Lampert, 2010). Further, it provides an important bridge between what novice educators know and what they can do through practice or enactment (Kennedy, 1999) (e47-e48).

(v) The applicant presents effective performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project. Continuous improvement encompasses two notions: decisions should be based on data and evidence, and (2) a continuous improvement process is fundamental to engaging in and sustaining improvements in school and district practice (Hale et al., 2017). The ROOTS Project embeds ongoing continuous improvement work throughout its approach to the residency model and its partnerships (e50). In addition, the external evaluator will also share-out yearly quarterly data to the entire Leadership Team (i.e., District Liaisons, Program Faculty, Director, Associate Director, Recruitment Specialist, Credential Analyst). The meetings occur quarterly to ensure feedback is presented, data-driven decisions are made, and continuous improvement occurs throughout the year and not just at end; allowing for in-year adjustments to be made (e51).

(vi) The applicant presents designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The applicant project builds capacity through GYO pipeline to cultivate BIPOC teachers from the communities they serve. By recruiting from LEAs, placing residents in yearlong clinical placements in LEAs, and then providing diverse credentialed teachers to LEAs they can have a cyclical model that will be sustained beyond the grant. Further, the applicant commitment of LEAs to provide induction support for the first 2 years of teaching ensures residents are retained long beyond their service obligation; further ensuring sustainability beyond the grant (e51).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Sub**

**1. Overview Statement**

**General:**

The applicant clearly demonstrates a rationale for the proposed project. The applicant presents goals that will achieve outcomes. The applicant goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly outlined. The applicant presents a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan**

**1. B. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (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. (10 pts)**

**(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. (10 pts)**

**Strengths:**

(i) The applicant presents methods of evaluation that will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The applicant will perform independent samples t-tests that will determine if a statistically significant difference exists in preparation scores before and after the grant-funded intervention and for residents versus non-residents. For example, statistically significant increase in scores would provide evidence that adding new activities to the program positively influenced candidates' perceptions of their skills (EQ2); while significant difference across groups would signify residency activities increase perceptions of skills more than non-resident candidates. Similarly, paired-sample t-tests determine if Year 1-5 residents experienced a statistically significant change from fall to spring. This analysis method also informs success of PDs and their effects post-completion and one year out for participants, providing valuable replication activities if successful.

(ii) The applicant presents methods of evaluation that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant will employ a comprehensive mixed-methods approach to evaluate the ROOTS Project thoroughly. The approach will provide quantitative and qualitative data, enabling us to measure progress on ROOTS' goals, objectives, milestones, and outcomes. Throughout the grant, the evaluation will assess progress toward outlined outcomes and provide qualitative data (e53).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub****1. Overview Statement****General:**

The applicant provides an exceptional, detailed evaluation plan that will perform independent samples t-test to determine if a statistically significant difference exists before and after the grant funded intervention for residents versus non-residents. The mixed-methods approach will evaluate the project along with quantitative and qualitative data for collection.

**Reader's Score:**

**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. (6 pts)**

**(ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project. (6 pts)**

**(iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (6 pts)**

**(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. (6 pts)**

**(v) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. (6 pts)**

**Strengths:**

(i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization. CSUMB has a strong track record of implementing, managing, and executing federal funds and projects on time and within budget. Key project personnel have successfully executed federal grants and the Associate Director has worked on USDE grants for over 25 years. The applicant provides facilities, equipment, technology, personnel, and supplies have been pledged at no cost to project by 18 different entities (e60). The ROOTS Project is committed to ensuring residents have access to most current research and learning resources necessary for successful completion (e61). All partners have pledged significant personnel time, beyond facilities, equipment, and resources described above, for the success of The ROOTS Project. E&L Dept. contributes faculty from a variety of educational disciplines to ensure successful achievement of outcomes, milestones, and goals (e61).

(ii) The budget is sufficient to support the proposed project. The applicant provides a detailed 5-year budget with personnel total \$1,042,340, fringe benefits total \$348,902, travel total \$97,100, supplies total \$36,083, and contractual total \$200,000 (Budget).

(iii) The applicant presents a well detailed budget costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The budget cost total \$1,042,340.00. The applicant budget cost aligns with the scope of work (e577-e582).

(iv) The applicant clearly 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 applicant provided a 5-year budget (e577-e582).

(v) The applicant presents demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project for success of implementation during the project period. The extensive commitment of each partner demonstrates the project will be supported beyond the funding period. By committing human capital, facilities, supplies, technologies, and in-kind support partner LEAs have showcased the desire to expand current residencies. ROOTS Leadership Team is highly diverse: Director, Associate Director, and external evaluator are all women, two are Latina and first-generation college students. Project staff and faculty are highly diverse and all but two are from underrepresented groups. All ROOTS faculty have been K-12 educators before being academics (e65).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Sub****1. Overview Statement****General:**

The applicant provided ample resources to support the project. The budget is reasonable and aligns with the project's scope of work. CSUMB has a strong track record of implementing, managing, and executing federal funds and projects on time and within budget.

**Reader's Score:**

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

### 1. D. Quality of Management Plan (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the 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. (10 pts)
- (ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. (10 pts)

#### Strengths:

(i) The applicant provides a comprehensive management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. The Director and Associate Director will provide monthly budget reports, quarterly budget meetings, bi-annual reports to funders, and an annual budget meeting with the Leadership Team (Director, Associate Director, external evaluator) to review expenses and project projections for the next fiscal year (e71-e72). ROOTS Leadership Team is highly diverse in addition with qualifications and experience in K-12. The Associate Director has over 25 years of experience planning, implementing, and successfully executing USDE grants. The Associate Director will be the direct liaison to the LEAs with a longstanding and sustained relationships with partners. In addition, the applicant provides sufficient time to the project (e65-e68). The applicant has presented a detailed timeline including clearly defined responsibilities, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks demonstrating that the project will be completed within timeline and budget (e77-e82). Resumes were included in the application (e98-e246).

(ii) The applicant provides detailed procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement to the proposed project. The applicant noted that all partners on ROOTS are data-driven organizations that continuously improve K-12 educational landscape through use of data to drive organizational change and improvement. In addition, the external evaluator ensures formative and summative data are collected from all stakeholders continuously. Through sustained and highly collaborative partnerships, ROOTS personnel and district liaisons will work in tandem to collect and analyze multiple forms of qualitative and quantitative data to consistently identify successes and areas for improvement (e76).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

#### Sub

##### 1. Overview Statement

#### General:

The applicant provides a comprehensive management plan that includes resumes for the staff. The applicant provides detailed procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement to the proposed project, which will ensure project success and goal meeting. The management plan will ensure sustainability.

**Reader's Score:**

#### Priority Questions



## Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 1

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 points). (Both subfactors (a) and (b) must be addressed to get full 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 502 of the HEA), Tribal Colleges and Universities (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. (2 pts) (Peer Reviewer please confirm that the proposed partner IHE meets the HBCU, HSI, TCU or other MSI status before points are awarded.)

(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. (2 pts)

#### Strengths:

(a) The applicant Education and Leadership (E&L) Department has met/excelled in all 5 common standards (i.e., institutional infrastructure, candidate recruitment and support, course of study, fieldwork, and clinical practice, continuous improvement, and program impact) and met all 61 program standards by CA Committee on Accreditation across all programs. All courses are aligned to CA Teacher Performance Standards (TPEs), include practice-based teacher preparation, model effective evidence-based practices (EBP) and prepare residents to be highly qualified effective teachers. The applicant's most recent formative assessment by program completers demonstrated high-quality comprehensive teacher preparation program prepared students across all programs to be effective teachers (2023). (e17-e19)

(b) The applicant's recruitment is centered around GYO model and utilizes individualized strategies to build out a robust digital, print, and human capital marketing campaign. The ROOTS Project integrates strategies from various studies to recruit, train, and retain a diverse teaching workforce. (e27) Additionally, they will create an affinity group and design a corresponding social media campaign to target students of color, first-generation, and underserved students with bachelor's degrees at CSUMB and in local communities (e28).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 4

## Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 2

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: 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 educators 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 presents a project to increase the proportion of well-prepared, diverse, and effective educators serving students, with a focus on underserved students, they have ensured adequacy of resources at CSUMB to increase the number of BIPOC teachers with certification in LEA defined shortage areas. The applicant has expanded its centers and supports to promote recruitment and support of BIPOC candidates, such as HRCBE and El Centro (e30).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs (Up to 2 points). (Both subfactors (a) and (b) must be addressed to get full 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. (1 pt)**

**(b) Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students. Improving the retention of fully certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-need schools or shortage areas. (1 pt)**

**Strengths:**

(a) The applicant proposed to provide sense of belonging for underserved students, including BIPOC candidates and first-generation students and are all EBP for advancing student success for underserved students(e38-e39)

(b) The applicant proposed way to support BIPOC residents from recruitment and retention through certification and graduation is to create an affinity group for BIPOC candidates. This affinity group provides wraparound services including social, emotional, cultural, mental health, and academic support to ensure BIPOC residents are not just recruited into the program, but fully supported throughout their time to ensure successful completion of credential plus MAE degree. The affinity group will be led by two Black faculty in the E&L Department and the Co-Director of HRCBE; with events being held at the HRCBE (e39).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 4**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: 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 implements responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparation 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:**

(b) The applicant propose that residents will receive MTSS including financial, academic, emotional, social, physical, and mental health support to ensure state certification attained and MAE completed (e23).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Invitational Priorities - Invitational Priority 1**

**1. Invitational Priority 1: Partnership Grants for the Establishment of GYO Programs and Registered Apprenticeship Programs for K-12 Teachers. (No Points Awarded)**

Projects that establish or scale evidence-based and high quality GYO programs, including registered apprenticeship 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, by recruiting and developing teacher candidates from the communities the school or district serves. GYO programs must minimize or eliminate the cost of certification for teacher candidates and compensate educators for work in classrooms that is part of their certification program. Participants must not become the teacher of record prior to completing the certification program. Projects may also include high school dual-enrollment opportunities and registered teacher apprenticeship programs.

A project implementing a new or enhanced GYO program, including registered apprenticeship programs, must:

- (a) Be developed with the partner LEA to address the needs of its students and teachers;
- (b) Use data-driven strategies and evidence-based approaches to increase recruitment, successful completion, and retention of teachers supported by the project;
- (c) Provide standards for participants to enter into and complete the program;
- (d) Be aligned to evidence-based practices for effective educator preparation, and include practice-based learning opportunities linked to coursework that address state requirements for certification, professional standards for teacher preparation, culturally and linguistically

sustaining pedagogies, and the established knowledge base for education, including the science of learning and development;

- (e) Have little to no financial burden for program participants, or provide for loan forgiveness;
- (f) Require completion of a bachelor's degree either before entering or as a result of the certification program;
- (g) Result in the satisfaction of all requirements or full state teacher licensure or certification, excluding emergency, temporary, provisional or other sub-standard licensure or certification; and
- (h) Provide increasing levels of responsibility for the resident/ GYO participant/ apprentice during at least one year of paid on-the-job learning/clinical experience, during which a mentor teacher is the teacher of record.

**Strengths:**

(f) The applicant proposed to recruit, train, and support number of highly effective certified BIPOC teachers to diversify the teaching workforce and improve educational outcomes for K-12 students throughout the 98-mile service area and beyond (e16).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Invitational Priorities - Invitational Priority 2**

**1. Invitational Priority 2: Supporting Early Elementary Educators and School Leaders.**

Projects that include professional development programs, professional learning communities, and peer learning collaboratives to support elementary educators and school leaders in meeting the wide range of developmental strengths, needs, and experiences of students at kindergarten entry through the early grades with a focus on one or more of the following strategies:

- (a) Intentional collaboration for systemic alignment for continuity of services, supports, instruction, relationships, and data sharing across K-2;
- (b) Effective and intentional transitions into kindergarten and through the early grades;
- (c) Instruction informed by child development and developmentally informed practices;
- (d) Partnerships with parents, families and caregivers to allow successful family engagement and everyday school attendance.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/12/2024 02:38 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/12/2024 09:07 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (S336S240004)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>         |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                        | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Evaluation Plan                       | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Adequacy of Resources</b>             |                 |               |
| 1. Resources                             | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan                       | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 100             | 100           |
| <b>Priority Questions</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priorities</b> |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 1                                 | 4               | 4             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 2                                 | 3               | 3             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 3                                 | 2               | 2             |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 4                                 | 2               | 2             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 11              | 11            |
| <b>Invitational Priorities</b>           |                 |               |
| <b>Invitational Priority 1</b>           |                 |               |
| 1. IP 1                                  | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Invitational Priority 2</b>           |                 |               |
| 1. IP 2                                  | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 111             | 111           |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - TQP Panel - 4: 84.336S

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

Applicant: University Corporation at Monterey Bay (S336S240004)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. A. Quality of 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. (5 pts) (Logic model must be present to get all 5 pts)
- (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 pts)
- (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. (5 pts)
- (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (5 pts)
- (v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project. (5 pts)
- (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. (5 pts)

#### Strengths:

- (i) The program builds upon successes of current residencies for STEM and SPED, expanding to include bilingual education and a focused recruitment of Black teacher residents (e15). County served by program has teacher shortages and teachers do not represent the diversity of students. The program is designed recruit, prepare, and retain BIPOC teachers (all of whom are EL certified through the program) in high-need areas to teach the high-need students of the county CSUMB serves (e19-20).
- (ii) Specific and measurable outcomes are named, for example: recruit, train, and support 94 diverse residents over the five years of the grant during the 19 month program; increase BIPOC teachers by 5% annually for a total of 100% in year 5; 100% retention rate in high-need LEAs for new teachers upon completion of the program for at least 3 years; 100% of residents are provided pre-program support to remove barriers to entering the residency (p. e8, e15, e22-24).
- (iii) CSUMB's credentialing programs have received state accreditation as rigorous teacher induction/preparation programs (e25). Additionally, CSUMB partner districts have identified areas of teacher shortage, and the program prepares teachers for those areas (e26).
- (iv) Program is identified as a Grow Your Own (GYO) program, programs that research has shown have higher retention rates and remove obstacles for entry and preparation for participants (e45). The residency portion of the program has also been shown by research to promote diversity of new teacher and retention of those teachers (e46). Program also includes a year-long clinical experience under the guidance of a mentor (e46), residents are placed in cohorts, which research shows improves participant completion rates (e46), and engage in extensive teacher practice experiences to prepare them for the classroom (e47). Additionally, participants receive MTSS support throughout the program (e48) and are placed in content-specific PLCs (e49).
- (v) External evaluator will collect formative data throughout the project to improve residency and recruitment efforts. Data will be examined monthly (e59)/quarterly by leadership team (e50-51).

(vi) The GYO component of the program will build capacity beyond the grant period (100% of program participants are retained for at least 5 years in LEA partner schools) the program personnel will share replicable activities to IHEs and LEAs (e30, 52).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Sub**

**1. Overview Statement**

**General:**

The application demonstrates need for the projects proposed. It does an exceptional job identifying specific teacher shortages in partner LEAs and is designed to meet those shortages. The program builds upon successes of current residencies for STEM and SPED, expanding to include bilingual education and a focused recruitment of Black teacher residents.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan**

**1. B. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (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. (10 pts)**

**(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. (10 pts)**

**Strengths:**

i - Methods of evaluation include participant surveys of preparedness to teach (perceived preparation related to TPEs, extent field placement reflected in coursework, ability to support ELs/use evidence-based instructional practices) and examination of retention rates (e52-53).

ii - Evaluator will collect quantitative and qualitative data (surveys, interviews, focus groups) and focus on recruitment, preparation, and retention of program participants and are feasible, aligned to program goals, and thorough. A timeline for data collection is included in the application as well. (e39-e56).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

**1. Overview Statement**



**Sub**

**General:**

The proposed evaluation plan identifies multiple ways the program evaluator will collect and disseminate data related to the program. Program personnel and partners will regularly examine this data to continuously improve the program.

**Reader's Score:**

**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. (6 pts)**
- (ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project. (6 pts)**
- (iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (6 pts)**
- (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. (6 pts)**
- (v) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project. (6 pts)**

**Strengths:**

i - Many program activities will take place in partner LEA schools and CSUMB facilities, technology, personnel, etc. have been pledged at no cost to the project (e60). Residents are also provided with free access to multiple software programs (e61). Additionally, CSUMB faculty teaching program residents come from a variety of disciplines to ensure broad preparation of residents (e61).

ii-Requested amount is \$5,794,925 over five years (e8) and appears to be reasonable to support program goals.

iii-Budget narrative shows that 69% of budget goes directly to resident stipends (e63) and application details that program retention rates save partner districts money over time (e64).

iv-CSUMB has institutional capacity to support program beyond grant period through in-kind support (e64). LEAs served by program have also committed in-kind support for program beyond the grant period (e65).

v-Partner support letters demonstrate resources pledges at no cost to project (space, marketing, etc.) (p.577-583/appendix E/e page numbers are not viewable as they are overwritten).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Sub**

**1. Overview Statement**

**Sub**

**General:**

The project narrative details the support from the host institution and LEA partners, includes reasonable costs, and resources to support the program beyond the grant period are listed. The only limitation is the lack of clarity on how residents will have access to computers.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the 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. (10 pts)
- (ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. (10 pts)

**Strengths:**

i-Project faculty have experience as K-12 educators, project leadership and staff is diverse and reflects diversity of program participants. Project leadership has experience managing large-scale projects and previous TQP grants. An overview of project personnel and their responsibilities is also provided (e65-67) and a timeline for project monitoring by director and associate director is also provided (e70. e77-82).

ii-A communication plan is included in the project narrative and details how project personnel will track progress on performance outcomes (e73). Additionally, a variety of quantitative and qualitative measures will be used by project personnel and LEAs for the purpose of continuous improvement (e76).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

**1. Overview Statement**

**General:**

The management plan provides clear descriptors of staff responsibilities and timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as how the continuous improvement cycle will operate within the project.

**Reader's Score:**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 4 points). (Both subfactors (a) and (b) must be addressed to get full 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 502 of the HEA), Tribal Colleges and Universities (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. (2 pts) (Peer Reviewer please confirm that the proposed partner IHE meets the HBCU, HSI, TCU or other MSI status before points are awarded.)

(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. (2 pts)

**Strengths:**

(a) Applicant identifies as a Hispanic-serving Institution (e4, e18) and Minority Serving Institution (e18). Program includes a one-year clinical experience in a high-need school and incorporates research-based best practices (e45-49).

(b) Applicant is expanding program to specifically recruit more Black teachers into program as the number of Black participants has been lower in previous years than projected (e15).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: 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 educators 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 program builds upon successes of current residencies for STEM and SPED, expanding to include bilingual education and a focused recruitment of Black teacher residents (e15). County served by program has teacher shortages and teachers do not represent the diversity of students. The program is designed recruit, prepare, and retain BIPOC teachers (all of whom are EL certified through the program) in high-need areas to teach the high-need students of the county CSUMB serves (e19-20).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

### Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 3

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs (Up to 2 points). (Both subfactors (a) and (b) must be addressed to get full 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. (1 pt)**

**(b) Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students. Improving the retention of fully certified, experienced, and effective educators in high-need schools or shortage areas. (1 pt)**

**Strengths:**

(a) Program includes MTSS program for all residents to support their financial, academic, mental/physical health, and social/cultural health before, during, and after the program (e48).

(b) Program has 100% 5-year retention rate in high-need schools and shortage areas (e30).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

### Competitive Preference Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority 4

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: 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 implements responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.**

**Strengths:**

- a-Program participants serve residencies in high-need elementary, middle, and/or high schools in partner LEAs (e41).
- b-Program residents engage in extensive teacher practice experiences to prepare them for teaching diverse students in the classroom (e47).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Invitational Priorities - Invitational Priority 1****1. Invitational Priority 1: Partnership Grants for the Establishment of GYO Programs and Registered Apprenticeship Programs for K-12 Teachers. (No Points Awarded)**

Projects that establish or scale evidence-based and high quality GYO programs, including registered apprenticeship 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, by recruiting and developing teacher candidates from the communities the school or district serves. GYO programs must minimize or eliminate the cost of certification for teacher candidates and compensate educators for work in classrooms that is part of their certification program. Participants must not become the teacher of record prior to completing the certification program. Projects may also include high school dual-enrollment opportunities and registered teacher apprenticeship programs.

A project implementing a new or enhanced GYO program, including registered apprenticeship programs, must:

- (a) Be developed with the partner LEA to address the needs of its students and teachers;
- (b) Use data-driven strategies and evidence-based approaches to increase recruitment, successful completion, and retention of teachers supported by the project;
- (c) Provide standards for participants to enter into and complete the program;
- (d) Be aligned to evidence-based practices for effective educator preparation, and include practice-based learning opportunities linked to coursework that address state requirements for certification, professional standards for teacher preparation, culturally and linguistically sustaining pedagogies, and the established knowledge base for education, including the science of learning and development;
- (e) Have little to no financial burden for program participants, or provide for loan forgiveness;
- (f) Require completion of a bachelor's degree either before entering or as a result of the certification program;
- (g) Result in the satisfaction of all requirements or full state teacher licensure or certification, excluding emergency, temporary, provisional or other sub-standard licensure or certification; and
- (h) Provide increasing levels of responsibility for the resident/ GYO participant/ apprentice during at least one year of paid on-the-job learning/clinical experience, during which a mentor teacher is the teacher of record.

**Strengths:**

a-CSUMB is partnered with three LEAs in Monterey County. Additionally, CSUMB partner districts have identified areas of teacher shortage, and the program prepares teachers for those areas (e26).

b-Program has a specific recruitment, preparation, and support plan (e27-30).

c-Participants must have a bachelor's degree with at least 2.67 GPA, have clearance and background check complete, provide letters of recommendation, and meet additional writing, speaking, and content knowledge requirements (e32-33).

d-Program is identified as a Grow Your Own (GYO) program, programs that research has shown have higher retention rates and remove obstacles for entry and preparation for participants (e45). The residency portion of the program has also been shown by research to promote diversity of new teacher and retention of those teachers (e46). Program also includes a year-long clinical experience under the guidance of a mentor (e46), residents are placed in cohorts, which research shows improves participant completion rates (e46), and engage in extensive teacher practice experiences to prepare them for the classroom (e47). Additionally, participants receive MTSS support throughout the program (e48) and are placed in content-specific PLCs (e49).

e-Program participants received a \$40,000 stipend (e33).

f-Participants must have a bachelor's degree with at least 2.67 GPA to enter program.

g-Program satisfies requirements for full state teacher licensure (e16).

h-Program provides one-year clinical experience and residents take on growing responsibility over the course of the experience (e23).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Invitational Priorities - Invitational Priority 2**

**1. Invitational Priority 2: Supporting Early Elementary Educators and School Leaders.**

**Projects that include professional development programs, professional learning communities, and peer learning collaboratives to support elementary educators and school leaders in meeting the wide range of developmental strengths, needs, and experiences of students at kindergarten entry through the early grades with a focus on one or more of the following strategies:**

- (a) Intentional collaboration for systemic alignment for continuity of services, supports, instruction, relationships, and data sharing across K-2;**
- (b) Effective and intentional transitions into kindergarten and through the early grades;**
- (c) Instruction informed by child development and developmentally informed practices;**
- (d) Partnerships with parents, families and caregivers to allow successful family engagement and everyday school attendance.**

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/12/2024 09:07 AM