

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 10:58 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (S336S220005)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	109

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (S336S220005)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of the Project Design (30 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
- (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.
- (vi) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

The logic model and design structure demonstrate a rationale designed to capitalize on the strengths and expertise of the UW–Madison team and each high-need school in MPS. Partners will collaborate through every phase, including recruitment, preparation, residency, induction, and evaluation—all critical components of successful residency programs (Darling–Hammond, 2006). (e18) The applicant provides limited goals and that are measurable objectives with activities that describe how each goal will be achieved. The program outcome will be accomplished through the measurable and timely objectives and strategies to recruit and prepare 36 Teacher Residency Program residents (via three cohorts spanning 6 years) who possess the requisite knowledge and skills to meet the needs of students with disabilities in MPS. (e18) A comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students which all students in UW–Madison SoE credential programs meet high academic standards and participate in intensive learning experiences that prepare them to become highly qualified teachers. The applicant project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice in that the TRP requires residents to complete a rigorous 47-credit (cr.) master's program in special education. (e32-e34) A corpus of research indicates teachers improve student achievement gains, and that their impact is greater than other school-level influences such as instructional group size or per-pupil expenditure (Boyd et al., 2008; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Kane et al., 2008; Master et al., 2014). Since the early 2000s, a cadre of prominent teacher educators has worked to reform teacher education so beginning teachers are better prepared to meet the needs of students on Day 1 of their teaching careers (Ball & Forzani, 2011; Windschitl et al., 2012). The performance feedback and continuous improvement success of implementation will include feedback mechanisms to facilitate improvement. The combined management team and an advisory panel structure will ensure that all partners and important stakeholders can provide input and direction into the implementation of the residency program, as well as ensure that TRP will achieve all project tasks on time and within budget. The advisory panel will collaborate with members of the management team to monitor progress, provide feedback, plan long-range implementation, and institutionalize activities of the residency program. The advisory panel will convene semi-annually and will consist of several key personnel. (e35-e36). The applicant will build capacity by addressing the TRP residency program which is based upon mutually beneficial partnerships among the UW–Madison SoE, UW–Madison College of Letters & Science, and MPS. All parties are highly supportive of the project and its potential to address a critical need within the state which will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. Letters of commitment are included in the

proposal. (e36, Letters of Commitment).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides limited details to the specific measurable goals for goals 2-5 (pg. e18 and e55-64).

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. B. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.**
- (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The applicant's Evaluators will provide valid and reliable performance data on the NxtGEN CO outcomes. Validity will be strengthened using mixed methods to allow the triangulation of results collected from both quantitative and qualitative sources. Existing SEHD surveys and teacher effectiveness rating tools will be used which allows comparison to historical data. The use of an external evaluation team will further support validity by minimizing researcher bias. Reliability will be supported by calculating inter-rater and internal consistency reliability for quantitative results. (e51) The evaluation team will use methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of NxtGEN CO. Evaluators will use traditional evaluation tools and methods (surveys, interviews, focus groups) that will be reviewed by The Evaluation Center's internal BIPOC caucus and local leaders in partner districts to assure cultural appropriateness. The evaluation consists of process-oriented, formative, and summative approaches and will be guided by four evaluation questions that align with the NxtGEN CO goals and outcomes. (e52-e55)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.**
- (ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.**

- (iii) **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**
- (iv) **The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**
- (v) **The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**

Strengths:

The applicant's offices will be available on each campus for staff with rural staff housed on the community college campuses. All grant staff will be provided with technology. CU Denver faculty are highly skilled in different formats of course delivery, including remote (Zoom), online, face-to-face (F2F), or in a hyflex approach where students Zoom into F2F courses in Denver. Hyflex classrooms in both Denver and CCs are equipped with the high-quality technology (e.g. multiple cameras and mics) necessary to support student engagement and learning which is adequate for the project. Office of Academic Services and Advising provides seamless support for students from admissions to graduation. The Manager of Undergraduate Advising will advise NxtGEN CO students and has a long history of supporting diverse, first-gen students. (e55-e56) The applicant's budget is adequate to support the proposed project. Central personnel funded through the grant include roles for an overall NxtGEN Rural Coordinator, a project director, Director of the SEHD Success Center, R-TEACH community support, and an Induction/PD coordinator. A full-time recruitment and admissions specialist will coordinate recruitment activities across all four CC locations and will ensure high touch support from application to enrollment. NxtGEN costs are a very reasonable investment to produce the benefits of better prepared teachers who persist across a career affecting the lives and learning of thousands of children. The design of the grant and objectives are focused on this outcome and will have the following impact: 86 new teachers prepared to stay, teach, and lead across a long career and 60 candidates in the pipeline well on their way to becoming rural teachers. (e57-e58) A multi-year budget in Appendix H demonstrates how staff and activities will be sustained beyond the life of the grant. NxtGEN CO expands a proven model for diversifying the educator workforce and is built on a strong existing collaboration among three critical types of partners in the preparation of teachers for rural Colorado: a four-year institution, four CCs, and 26 eligible rural districts. (e59)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

Strengths:

An inclusive management team will effectively provide project planning and oversight which consists of dedicated leadership who are highly accomplished with years of relevant professional experience. The applicant outlines the major tasks, teams, and milestones of the grant which demonstrates that key tasks will be conducted on time. The LMT is responsible for administration and management of the project and oversees successful implementation of project activities in coordination with key personnel in teams. NxtGEN key personnel bring extensive professional expertise, content knowledge and management capacity to the project. PI has oversight of all aspects of the grant and all teacher pathways, coordination and communication with the partner community colleges. (e60-e62, Appendix D)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding one or both of the following:

- a) High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher

candidates.

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

Strengths:

NxtGEN CO propose to provide a high-quality teacher preparation program for rural Colorado. All the participating IHEs are Minority Serving Institutions. NxtGEN CO undergraduate preparation pathways include a full year residency in the final year placed in high needs eligible rural partner districts. The grant is aligned with the best practices for recruiting, supporting, and graduating predominantly first-gen, diverse students in this grow your own model where they will become teachers in their communities (Learning Policy Institute & the Public Leadership Institute, 2021). (e40)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

NxtGEN CO will increase the number of diverse, and effective teachers with licensure (certification) and dual endorsements. Curriculum in the NxtGEN licensure pathways ensure that teachers are well prepared with deep content knowledge, have strong pedagogical skills, and are prepared to provide culturally and linguistically sustaining teaching and learning experiences for their diverse students. NxtGEN CO will also increase the number of teachers with dual endorsements. All ELEM teachers will have a dual endorsement in CLDE and all SPED candidates will be eligible for an added endorsement in ELEM. (e41)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Meeting Student Social Emotional, and Academic Needs (Up to 2 points).

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on underserved students, through creating a positive, inclusive, and identity-safe climate at institutions of higher education, through one or more of the following activities:

- a) Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.**
- b) Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.**

Strengths:

NxtGEN CO's programs focus on equity and social justice, centering the lived experiences of diverse students in the curriculum and privileging an approach that builds upon the cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005) of students in the program. Student success supports are designed and implemented in culturally sustaining (Paris, 2005; Paris & Alim, 2017) systems and processes that name and take up the assets and strengths of our predominantly first gen and diverse students and fosters the maintenance of a strong cultural identity. (e41-e42)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 2 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

- a) In one or more of the following educational settings:**
 - (1) Early learning programs**
 - (2) Elementary school.**
 - (3) Middle school**
 - (4) High school**
 - (5) Career and technical education programs.**
 - (6) Out-of-school-time settings.**
 - (7) Alternative schools and programs.**

- b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.**

Strengths:

NxtGEN takes up an explicit equity-focused curriculum that integrates the following concepts across multiple courses: understanding and transforming structural barriers in schools and one's own positionality and biases; supporting culturally and linguistically diverse students and students with special needs; and culturally sustaining pedagogies across content areas. This preparation supports NxtGEN students in acquiring critical perspectives on schooling and society so that they can identify and reduce the barriers that exist for their students, create inclusive and identity-safe learning environments, teach in culturally sustaining ways, and advocate for student needs. (e42)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. Partnership Grants for the Establishment of Grow Your Own Programs

Projects that establish Grow Your Own programs that are designed to address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and/or geographic areas, or shortages of school leaders in high-need schools, and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal, or other school leader workforce.

Strengths:

Partnership Grants for the Preparation of Teachers and the Invitational Priority to carry out an effective 'grow your own' pre-baccalaureate teacher preparation program. The applicant will build on the success of NxtGEN, bringing these critical elements to ECE, ELEM, SPED and middle school math and secondary science licensure pathways in four rural regions in southern Colorado, delivered in partnership with four rural community colleges (CC) and 26 eligible rural district partners (Appendix A: High Need LEAs).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/07/2022 10:58 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 06:40 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (S336S220005)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	111

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (S336S220005)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of the Project Design (30 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
- (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.
- (vi) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

An exemplary Project Design is presented by "Colorado U" Denver, addressing the GYO Invitational Priority, all Competitive Preference Priorities, and targeting high-need rural LEAs.

e17: The Introduction describes their Award-winning, notable program design.

e18: They have the experience to deliver on their Design, derived in part from a Previous TQP grant awarded in 2014.

e21-25: A clear Rationale to meet the project's identified needs is presented.

e27: Helpful references are provided to supporting information in other sections, e.g., in the Appendices. Also, Figure 2 graphically conveys their approach.

e41-42: Included the CPPs as part of detailed information for criterion (ii).

e43 (iii) A particular strength is Figure 3 that graphically presents key elements of the Strong and Diverse Teaching Profession they seek to achieve.

(iv) e46-47: Evidence-based practices are described that inform their Design including for Induction and Professional Development activities.

e48 (v): The factors are integral to their design, including the use of evaluation rubrics used throughout "CU Denver's" teacher education programs.

e49 (vi): "NxtGEN CO" will prepare 86 teachers, with 60 more along their pathways, by the end of the project period.

Weaknesses:

None were found.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. B. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

An extremely strong Evaluation Plan, which could serve as a model for other programs. The evaluation team is experienced with TQP, which will facilitate ongoing methods to provide valid and reliable outcome data. The evaluator will use Patton's proven "Developmental Evaluation" model, which focuses on partners' collaboration toward achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project.

e49-51: The project will use an in-house but independent group, "The Evaluation Center," within their School of Ed. The project will benefit greatly from continuing to partner with these evaluators who are experienced with the previous TQP grant.

e51: They will employ Patton's (2006) Developmental Evaluation Framework. Patton's research methods have focused on various models of "Utilization-focused Evaluation" over several decades. This is one of the strongest evaluation models, especially for partnership-based collaborations.

e52: Four evaluation questions are aligned with the project's goals and outcomes as shown in Appendix C1.

e52: Further details for the Evaluation Plan are included in Appendix C2.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this quality Evaluation Plan.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.
- (ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.
- (iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.
- (iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

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

Strengths:

The project is building on their experience with a previous TQP grant, and proven measures from those activities to ensure sustainability (e55-e60).

Their School of Ed (SEHD) will continue to provide appropriate resources for their NxtGEN CO program at the School's multiple campuses (e55).

Further, CU Denver will provide the services of several supporting offices, including a Student Success Center, and Office of Digital Learning and Technology (e56).

The budget is appropriate, using their "hub and spoke" approach for organizing their budget (e57).

(iii) The GYO approach will be used to stem the loss of rural teachers, preventing the higher costs of regularly having to re-hire/replace teachers.

(iv)(v) Pages e58-60 describe how the project will institutionalize key roles for sustainability, accomplished in part with matching resource contributions during the project. Page e59 refers one to additional information in Appendix H's multi-year budget.

Weaknesses:

o weaknesses in the Adequacy of Resources.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

Strengths:

This high-quality Management Plan is described on e60-66. The section begins with Figure 4, a graphic demonstration of the Leadership and Management Teams, including Evaluation. Further Strengths are identified below. No Weaknesses were found.

e60: Figure 4, Multiple Management Teams graphic description by four Goals.

Existing staff, and the project roles to be hired, are identified on pages e61-62.

e62-65: A detailed Management Plan is shown in Table 2, by Goals, Major Tasks, Personnel & Teams, Milestones, and Timeline Years 1-5. This is a notable Strength, in particular.

Procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement are described well on pages e65-66, including bi-weekly, weekly, and monthly team meetings.

Additional continuous improvement efforts were described earlier in the Project Evaluation narrative, applicant page 33. (e66)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses to this section.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding one or both of the following:

- a) High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences)prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.**
- b) Reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.**

Strengths:

e40: Meets the requirements of CPP 1, both sub-criteria a) and b), including all participating IHEs are MSIs.

The participating MSIs have collaborated previously to demonstrate that they can, as a partnership, be effective in increasing educator diversity. (e41)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses in meeting CPP1.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

e41: The partnership supports growing a diverse Educator Workforce for their rural communities, and these educators' professional growth, toward strengthening K-12 student learning.

NxtGEN CO supports a diverse Educator Workforce through five professional pathways, and their professional growth, toward strengthening K-12 student learning. They provide both a Bachelor's degree pathway and a BA/MA option toward completing a full MA degree (e41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses. The project meets CPP2 as described above.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Meeting Student Social Emotional, and Academic Needs (Up to 2 points).

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on underserved students, through creating a positive, inclusive, and identity-safe climate at institutions of higher education, through one or more of the following activities:

- a) **Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.**
- b) **Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.**

Strengths:

e41-42: The project will meet students' SEA needs, especially for underserved students, based on evidence-based practices for advancing student success. They describe three Concepts that they integrate across three courses to achieve this SEL/SEA priority.

The project will meet students' SEA needs, especially for underserved students, based on evidence-based practices for advancing student success, as summarized in the Overview above. They include a focus on underserved, first-gen, diverse students (e42).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 2 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

a) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (1) Early learning programs**
- (2) Elementary school.**
- (3) Middle school**
- (4) High school**
- (5) Career and technical education programs.**
- (6) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (7) Alternative schools and programs.**

b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

(e42) A Strength of the application is that they addressed each CPP as a separate, identifiable section in the Narrative; not all applicants did that. In their description of activities to promote equity in access and opportunities, they include several steps, described below.

The project promotes equity in K-12 student access to educational resources and opportunities, based on literature and research. These efforts include creating an equity-focused culture, and offering an equity-focused curriculum. (e42)

Weaknesses:

None were found.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. Partnership Grants for the Establishment of Grow Your Own Programs

Projects that establish Grow Your Own programs that are designed to address shortages of

teachers in high-need areas, schools, and/or geographic areas, or shortages of school leaders in high-need schools, and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal, or other school leader workforce.

Strengths:

This Invitational Priority was met for a GYO program, with a goal of 330 diverse new teachers as an outcome, especially to address the needs of rural LEAs (e58).

The NxtGEN program is a GYO model for Rural LEAs in partnership with rural CCs/state colleges.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses. The IP criteria was met.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/06/2022 06:40 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 07:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (S336S220005)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	103

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: University of Colorado Denver (S336S220005)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of the Project Design (30 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.
- (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (iv) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.
- (vi) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

i) The applicant presents a strong rationale such as The University of Colorado Denver is a Minority Serving Institution with Asian American and Native American Pacific-Serving status and emerging Hispanic status and that 42% University of Colorado Denver students are Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (pg. e17).

The demographic data illustrates a commitment to diversity which will aid in the success of this project. The applicant cites that all programs have a social justice mission with curriculum and extended clinical experiences to support the learning of economically, culturally, linguistically, and ability diverse learners (pg. e17). This will help build cultural competence in students that will contribute to the project.

The applicant provided evidence of past success and experience in an undergraduate teacher preparation pathway program with extended clinical experiences (pg. e18). The past success illustrates a history of success in increasing diversity in the education workforce and teacher retention. This project builds capacity from the previous work.

The applicant presented a clear rationale for the stages of the program (pg. e19). The summer bridge is a strong way to be intentional in recruitment and to create equitable pathways to the program.

The program partners with rural partner districts and middle school math and secondary science and seeks to improve quality and retention of teachers through ongoing professional development (pg. e21).

The applicant created a comprehensive and thorough needs assessment with their partner schools to create a clear rationale (pg. e22); this is important in assessing the needs of partners and the field to have a high likelihood of success.

The applicant made a strong case that eleven of the twelve southern Colorado counties have the highest overall poverty rates in the state and that 80% of partner districts are performing below state average in English Language Arts and Math state assessments (pg. e22). This is important evidence to show the need and how this program will impact these students' learning outcomes because of recruiting and retaining effective teachers from diverse backgrounds.

ii) The applicant shares clear goals to partner with four community colleges and school districts (pg. e26). The project details four goals, objectives, and outcomes that are clear, achievable, and measurable (pg. e11-24).

For example, Goal 1: recruitment and admission focus on detailed steps to use a recruitment and admission specialist to work with community college recruiters and use CRM software to track student progress for just-in-time support (pg. e27-28).

The objectives are specific, measurable, and time-bound, i.e., eight recruitment events held each year, over 5 years with 146 teachers.

Goal 2: preparing quality teachers for partner rural school districts: clearly details the specific steps in completing this particular goal such as summer bridge program, paid internships and full year residency, equity-focused curriculum, and mentoring students (pg. e29-36).

iii) The applicant aligns their work with four strategies from the Teaching Profession Playbook: Building a Strong and Diverse Teaching profession (pg. e43). These four strategies together demonstrate a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning such as recruitment, high-retention and culturally responsive preparation, supportive working conditions, and competitive and equitable compensation.

iv) The applicant provided evidence-based practices in the program, NxtGEN CO (pg. e46). The proposal cites references for each practice that is included in the project and incorporates these practices in several ways i.e., using recruitment staff with local context to identify and support students, in-depth experiences through R-TEACH pathway, summer bridge early strategies, and student success coaches (pg. e46).

v) The applicant provides a clear and comprehensive plan for continuous feedback that is designed for continuous improvement (pg. e48). For example, the applicant designed tools to evaluate many outcomes of the project such as building cultural competence and course assessments. This feedback is very important to make any adjustments or interventions quickly.

vi) The applicant provides a strong plan to build capacity after the period of Federal funding has ended (pg. e49). For example, through the successful implementation, the application would have built capacity that will contribute to a strong infrastructure.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant provides that low enrollment would be a challenge of a community college, and collaborating would help to provide a set of courses in a predictable schedule for in-person and hyflex models, it is limited in describing details around course offering in which students would take for credit. For example, it is unclear about a commitment to offer these formats of courses and the number of offerings that would be offered as it relates to the education field of focus.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. B. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.**
- (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate**

to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

i) The applicant provides that the evaluation will be conducted by The Evaluation Center, which provides program evaluation as an independent self-reporting entity with access to campus research resources (pg. e50). They describe that a mixed-methods will be used from both quantitative and qualitative sources (pg. e51).

ii) The applicant cites the use of comprehensive surveys, interviews, and focus groups and other methods such as storytelling and journey mapping as ways to be inclusive (pg. e52). The applicant provides specific details regarding the evaluation questions, e.g., Evaluation question1: To what extent is NxtGEN CO successful in recruiting diverse, rural, and first gen students for the teacher preparation program?

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide details regarding how data will be shared with the various partners such as high schools and community college partners. A data sharing plan would help to illustrate the data sharing and collection from various partners.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.**
- (ii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.**
- (iii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**
- (iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**
- (v) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.**

Strengths:

i) The applicant cites the various offices that will provide support throughout the project such as CU Denver faculty who will provide the technology, zoom, online, face-to-face, and hyflex approach (pg. e55).

The applicant leverages the Office of Academic Services and Advising for providing technical and logistics to support students from admissions to graduation (pg. e56); the Office of Partnerships will oversee all clinical experiences; The Students Success Center will provide writing support and Praxis materials; the Office of Continuing & Professional Education leverage learning modules; and the Office of Digital Learning & Technology will provide professional development for faculty and technology development (pg. e40). Each community college, in their letters of support, cited matching in-kind funds which is evidence of institutional commitment to the project (pg. e136-140).

ii) The applicant budgets for key roles such as rural coordinator, project director, director of SEHD Success Center, R-TEACH community support, and an Induction/PD Coordinator (pg. e57).

iii) Costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance, i.e., the program seeks to prepare 86 new teachers who will stay, teach, and lead across a long career, 60 candidates in the pipeline to become rural teachers, and 40 pre-service mentors teachers (pg. e58).

iv) The applicant provides that the program will be sustainable through CU Denver and the partner community colleges contributing 100% of the matching funds (pg. e58). They provided a cost-revenue model, through their Budget and Finance office that builds on anticipated tuition revenue to support the critical roles after the period of Federal funding has ended.

v) The applicant provides a strong commitment from partners that will contribute to the success of the project (pg. e59). The commitment is evident from the four community colleges and 26 eligible rural districts. The applicant provides a vast network of partners are essential to successfully implement the project.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

Strengths:

i) The applicant provides a clear management team plan that aligns with the four goals of the project, i.e., recruitment & admission support; faculty curriculum, clinical preparation team, and student support team; induction & PD team; and dissemination and scale-up team (pg. e60). Table 2 (pg. e62-65) clearly illustrates the goals, personnel, milestones, and timeframe throughout the five years.

ii) The applicant provides that the recruitment & admission team, faculty curriculum team, clinical preparation team, and student support team, and induction & PD team meets either bi-weekly, weekly, or monthly to monitor, assess, and refine strategies (pg. e65-66).

This formative assessment will contribute to the overall success of the program. Secondly, the applicant provides details regarding monthly systematic data reviews with the Leadership and Management Team and the Evaluation Team. This bi-monthly progress is key to assessing results and adjusting if needed, as the project progresses.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding one or both of the following:

- a) High-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (eligible institutions under Part B of Title III and Subpart 4 of Part A Title VII of the HEA), Hispanic Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under section 316 of the HEA), or other Minority Serving Institutions (eligible institutions under Title III and Title V of the HEA) that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools (as defined in this notice) and that incorporate best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.
- b) Reforms to teacher preparation programs to improve the diversity of teacher candidates, including changes to ensure underrepresented teacher candidates are fully represented in program admission, completion, placement, and retention as educators.

Strengths:

The University of Colorado Denver is a Minority Serving Institution with Asian American and Native American Pacific-Serving status and emerging Hispanic status and that 42% University of Colorado Denver students are Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (pg. e17). All of the participating IHEs are minority serving institutions (pg. e40). The applicant aligns recruitment and student support with programming to support students from diverse populations.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides that the curriculum in the licensure and dual endorsements will increase the number of diverse and effective teachers (pg. e41). The program will increase teachers with dual endorsements.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Meeting Student Social Emotional, and Academic Needs (Up to 2 points).

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on underserved students, through creating a positive, inclusive, and identity-safe climate at institutions of higher education, through one or more of the following activities:

- a) Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.
- b) Implementing evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students.

Strengths:

The program focuses on equity and social justice in the curriculum and student support is based on culturally sustaining systems and processes to support students from diverse backgrounds (pg. e42).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

1. Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (Up to 2 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students.

- a) In one or more of the following educational settings:
 - (1) Early learning programs
 - (2) Elementary school.
 - (3) Middle school
 - (4) High school
 - (5) Career and technical education programs.
 - (6) Out-of-school-time settings.
 - (7) Alternative schools and programs.
- b) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, and

that may include pedagogical practices in educator preparational programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

The applicant includes an equity consultant and the SEHD Associate Dean for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion will work with faculty, staff in rural locations, and district partners to support equity focus in courses, internships, beliefs, and biases (pg. e42).

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. Partnership Grants for the Establishment of Grow Your Own Programs

Projects that establish Grow Your Own programs that are designed to address shortages of teachers in high-need areas, schools, and/or geographic areas, or shortages of school leaders in high-need schools, and increase the diversity of qualified individuals entering the teacher, principal, or other school leader workforce.

Strengths:

The applicant meets the invitational priority.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/06/2022 07:02 PM