

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 12:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S336S220036)

Reader #1: *****

	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	29
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
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 #8 - Panel - 8: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S336S220036)

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 narrative includes a clear rationale for the proposed project that will guide participants and teachers throughout the implementation (p. e24). The needs are clearly identified through the needs assessment process which is clearly connected to the logic model that outlines outputs and outcomes that would be meaningful to the communities served (p. e26 & e29).
- (ii) The goals, objectives and outcomes are clearly defined, measurable and will produce useful information on the impact and implementation of the project (p. e30). The logic model included in the narrative is well aligned to the goals and objectives and provides support for the chosen outcomes and the associated metrics based on inputs identified. For example, Objective 3.1 will focus on the launching of a nontraditional certification approach which is connected to the short-term outcome of a developed framework and back to the original objectives of the project (p. e29).
- (iii) The narrative includes a detailed plan related to how the current project will be implemented withing a thorough comprehensive approach to impacting participants and students (p. e30). The model proposed addresses elements of practice from the development of coursework, through coaching and dissemination of learned experiences which addresses all areas of an effective program (p. e32). Each phase of the implementation is clearly explained and connected to other phases through a logical progression (p. e31).
- (iv) The proposed model is soundly based in best practices and the most current research on teacher and student needs in schools. For example, the use of Improvement Science as a tool of continuous improvement focused on measurable data within the organization will be a useful method for participants to learn and use in their future careers. This process will also provide useful short cycle data that could be used to guide practice (p. e41).
- (v) The narrative includes a clearly developed plan to provide feedback to project administration (p. e43). The inclusion of specific feedback mechanisms connected to different project groups provides support for the ongoing iterative nature of the proposed feedback and how it will be communicated and used by participants (p. e44).

(vi) The narrative includes a clear outline for how the project will build capacity in participants to carry the work forward beyond the end of funding. For example, the training model that will be developed will impact new teachers and participants after funding ends (p. e46).

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses were noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses were noted.
- (iii) No weaknesses were noted.
- (iv) No weaknesses were noted.
- (v) No weaknesses were noted.
- (vi) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

- (i) The activities outlined in the evaluation will produce clear evidence of the impact of the planned activities (p. e47). The sources of data used to measure impact appear reliable and will produce results that will be used to draw valid inferences. For example, the use of graduation rates and enrollment of participants are clearly defined measures that could be used in the proposed analyses (p. e50). The use of a quasi-experimental design using propensity score matching will provide data that can be analyzed with the proposed statistical tests and will produce reliable impact data (p. e48).
- (ii) The evaluation is well connected to the goals and objectives in the project narrative and will provide results needed to demonstrate effect and information to drive implementation (p. e51). The evaluation includes many data collection tools that will measure data sources that are relevant to the identified outcomes and objectives. For example, the use of walkthroughs as well as participant surveys will provide robust data that will be used to evaluate the project (p. e52).

Weaknesses:

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

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

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

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

Strengths:

- (i) The narrative includes a detailed outline of the support that will be provided specifically by the lead applicant as well as the resources that will be provided by partner organizations. For example, the lead applicant organization will provide grants management expertise and the facilities to conduct the project activities (p. e53) which will enable the project to be executed as planned. The many resources to be provided by the lead applicant will allow for a thorough implementation.
- (ii) The narrative includes a sufficient budget for the federal dollars associated with the grant that will support the planned activities throughout the funding period (p. e201). For example, the funding provided to the Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (CSLOC) is sufficient to allow for the development of lessons and support provided to participants around those lessons (p. e216).
- (iii) The overall federal funding provided by to the grant is reasonable and would meet the needs of the project requirements. For example, the travel associated with this grant is reasonable and will meet the requirements of the project (p. e214). Also the salaries associated with the funded positions are reasonable for the expectations around their roles (p. e213). The various contracted services to different organizations are justified and fall in line with the required elements of the project (p. e216).
- (iv) The narrative includes a process to address the ongoing funding needs that will arise when the grant ends after 5 years (p. e57). The planned project is well developed and includes input and feedback from community members and the development of a committee to begin ongoing funding work at the initial point of funding (p. e58) which will keep the focus of program administrators on the need to carry forward the work.
- (v) The narrative includes many relevant partners that appear to be committed to the project based on the included letters and guarantee of matching funds (p. e61 & e191).

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses were noted.
- (ii) It is unclear what \$800,000 in salaries from the matched contribution will be used for in support of the project (e218). The lack of detail in the matched salaries inhibits the ability to draw conclusions around sufficiency of funds.
- (iii) No weaknesses were noted.
- (iv) No weaknesses were noted.
- (v) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 29

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 narrative includes a clear timeline with activities associated with the objectives of the project (p. e65) which will allow for implementation of activities in a timely manner. The timeline includes annual milestones that will guide the work of the project administration (e66). The plan clearly outlines the responsibilities of each key team member and their responsibility in the project (p. e.67).
- (ii) The implementation evaluation and planned administration meetings will facilitate the appropriate sharing of data and information to guide the grant activities (p. e68). For example, meetings between project administration and those involved with the implementation will allow for a discussion of how the project is proceeding and where specific adjustments can be made (p. e68).

Weaknesses:

- (i) It is unclear if the project director has the necessary experience to oversee a project of this scope and magnitude as this person has yet to be hired (p. e67). The interim project director is a full time faculty member and the narrative does not note if the his duties will be relieved while running the multi-million project.
- (ii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 19

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 narrative clearly outlines a project that will address the need for diversity in the teacher workforce by targeting specific underrepresented groups as participants. For example, the work being proposed in Oakland will provide specific services around equity and social justice in a Historically Black College and University (p. e18). The reforms proposed are based on identified needs and will utilize available resources to address these needs. For example, the proposed I Demand project will provide needed teachers of color candidates to engage in the project and potentially go on to teach in schools (p. e18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 narrative includes a clear focus on identifying high quality potential students who could be successful in the proposed project. For example, the 150 paraprofessionals of color who would be targeted by the project, could enter the program and receive certification to teach in high need schools, thus diversifying the workforce (p. e19).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 project includes a well-defined, evidence-based structure that will allow students to address specific needs around social-emotional learning and areas of equity which will allow them to be successful in the program as well as use these skills in their future teaching (p. e20). The modules identified in the narrative are clearly aligned and address issues such, as developing inclusive environments, that will benefit future students served by the newly credentialed teachers (p. e20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

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

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

- a) In one or more of the following educational settings:
 - (1) Early learning programs
 - (2) Elementary school.
 - (3) Middle school
 - (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 proposed project has developed curriculum and coursework for participants that will highlight equity issues in both their learning institution as well as in their future classrooms (p. e21). The micro-credentialing programs will allow the participants to learn skills to address equity needs in an ongoing manner using continuous improvement tools such as root case analysis which will allow them to continue to develop beyond the end of their program (p. e21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

Strengths:

The proposed project seeks to develop Grow Your Own systems at each of the sites that will participate in the funded program (p e22). These programs will work to develop human resources practices that will allow people currently working in their system to access resources that will allow them to obtain teaching certifications which would increase the diversity of the workplace.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/06/2022 12:19 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 01:59 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S336S220036)

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	29
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	3
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 #8 - Panel - 8: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S336S220036)

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 shares the basic rationale share among partners that all children should realize their full potential, exceptional teaching matters, instructional leadership fosters effective teaching and purposeful strategies can build capacity for change. (p. e23-e24) The logic model clearly illustrates the 4 phases and objectives. (pp. e164-e165, e210-e217) The applicant cites appropriate research that indicates 13% of Black students were more likely to attend college if they had a Black teacher by third grade. In addition, the applicant conducted a needs assessment, reviewed research that assessed the impact of teachers and leaders and created a logic model that defines the 4 phases. (p. e25, e29) The placement and services for teachers follows the research done by Parkinson, Salinger, Meakin and Smith that shows professional development and coaching can impact children's literacy. (p. e28) The program is designed to engage underrepresented groups to fill roles in high-needs schools through the partnership with Voorhees University. (p. e42) The applicant explains clearly the plan for the four phases of onboarding for teachers and educational leaders in the project named Leaders Investing in Future Teachers! LIFT. There is a clear need for this type of project as within the state 92% of teachers are White compare to 67% of the students, in the LIFT project 62.7% of students are Black while 33.5% of teachers are Black. In addition, in a little over a decade the enrollment in university education programs has declined 66% and teacher attrition is significantly higher than enrollment. (e. 27)
- (ii) The applicant provides a convincing set of goals, measurable objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project. For instance, each objective has the data source described, such as a rubric rating for increased effectiveness and assessment scores for ELA, math and science proficiency. This section includes a goal and outcomes for sustainability and replication which indicates planning for the future. (pp. e29-e30)
- (iii) The applicant describes clearly the clinical education equity strategies (phases 1, 2, 3, and 4) for the 4 cohorts/year with 25 students/cohort. extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. (p. e30) The applicant provides an appropriate set of priorities for placement of teachers into the lowest performing F schools with 50% or higher free and reduced lunches, the into D schools, C schools and so forth. In addition, the applicant explains the organizational plan for licensure, certification, fellows and micro-credentialling which combine specially designed coursework (courses listed) with experiential learning pathways and internships with monthly problem-solving gatherings. (p. e31)
- (iv) The applicant provides a design for the project which reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective

practice within the required coursework. For example, Pathway B for teachers requires, inquiry-based literacy instruction and student teaching practicum/internship, Elementary teachers requires reading in content areas and equity driven design and assessment and student teaching/internship. The clinical education component for non-traditional teaching fellows also offers up-to-date research by using face-to-face and virtual coaches. The selection of participants for the Fellows Pathway encourages diverse backgrounds as well as career step-ups and specialty areas for paraprofessionals. (p. e33, e40, e41)

(v) The applicant provides a number of strategies within the program where performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design. (pp. e43-e44) For example, each candidate is expected to create and update a digital portfolio which is utilized to measure student growth and update it with mid-term observation feedback with the educator evaluation. (p. e39) In addition, micro-credentialing will be the result of competency assessment processes with online modules, reflection, self-assessment and guided practice with a coach. (p. e34) The entire social, emotional, equity learning for cultural responsiveness is delivered in modules, with planning, assessment and peer review included. (pp. e35-e36)

(vi) The applicant addresses capacity and sustainability through the design of the project. (pp. e44-e46) For instance, personalized learning is stressed to assist educators/leaders to adopt effective implementation strategies that create a culture of belonging and that will increase the number of qualified teachers. (p. e46) This support of teacher growth and development will travel with the teacher if and wherever they move. (p. e37) This is especially important for new teachers so that they become more competent more quickly with coaching and creation of strength. Leadership coaches also help build capacity through feedback and collaborative teaching. (p. e38)

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses noted.
- (iii) No weaknesses noted.
- (iv) No weaknesses noted.
- (v) No weaknesses noted.
- (vi) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant plans to collaborate with EduShift, Inc. to conduct the process and outcome evaluation that shares data collection, analysis and feedback across partnerships. (p. e46) The PI will provide evaluation oversight and review the reports, tools, procedures and analysis. (p. e47) The project will have an impact evaluation based on a QED comparison study that meets WWC standards with reservations but meets substantively important. (p. e48) The FORECAST Action Model supports the logic model and outlines standard methods of evaluation will provide valid, a

timeline, protocols and reliable performance data on relevant and measurable outcomes across all partners. (pp. e49) The applicant provides an extensive study on teacher shortages that documents the decreasing numbers of educators and supports the need for the project. (pp. e86-e163)

(ii) The applicant provides convincing evidence that the evaluation methods are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project. For example, evaluators will purposefully gather feedback data, complete an internal formative process and evaluate fidelity. The timeline for the project includes creation of a baseline, data collection, data analysis, and a summative evaluation component to check out the magnitude of results. (p. e51)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

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

(i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

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

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

(iv) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant indicates a 100% match from partners (personnel, school districts, universities). For example, the LEA will provide \$1,659,000 in services to the project and the IHE will contribute \$345,000 to it. (p. e52) In addition, the in-kind contributions are details from the LEA for facilities, University for library services and Satellite office for LIFE teachers and leaders. The budget allocates appropriate funds for travel and personnel. (p. e54)

(ii) The applicant provides adequate evidence that costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the project. For instance, the applicant will provide supplies, curriculum materials, technology and in-service training for the Fellows and will contract with the other partners to deliver other critical career experiences. The grant funds will be utilized to support virtual support structures and other technology learning. (pp. e55-e56) The budget includes allocations for personnel, travel, contracts and supplies. (pp. e201-e209)

(iii) The applicant adequately demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant. For instance, the training model developed will help reduce the teacher shortage by recruiting from paraprofessionals which will continue past grant funding. The micro-credentials and clinical education will continue and

be refined through this grant. (p. e56) The applicant provides a multi-year financial and operating model and plan to serve 25 Fellows in each Phase 1-4. (p. e57) In addition, the applicant provides a district support plan that is specific to special education, STEM, literacy and languages. (p. e58) Commitment from partners is evidenced through a school advisory board, a LIFT advisory board, coaches and partners resources. (p. e60)

(iv) The applicant provides a cohesive and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the project to the implementation and success of the project. For example, Oakland University will provide facilities to host workshops, work on academic enrichments and practice within technology-based learning environments. (p. e54) The applicant provides a convincing plan using the administrative support of the Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence in planning the project and for fiscal management of it as well. Oakland University has a new clinical education program and expertise for stackable credentials which will serve the K-12 participants. Additional partnerships, such as Voorhees University, expand the diverse learning options for teachers into robotics and computer science. (p. e53) The relevance of Virtual Deeper Learning Networks for School Improvement will build sharing and learning networks across multiple cohorts. In addition, technology competence will increase and supplemental reading and math will expand. (pp. e60-e61)

Weaknesses:

- (i) The match in salary is not fully explained. There is a lump sum provide for personnel of \$264,000 but not details about the allocations plans.
- (ii) No weaknesses noted.
- (iii) No weaknesses noted.
- (iv) No weaknesses noted.
- (v) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 29

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

Strengths:

- (i) The management plan is cohesive and operates with teams, such as a planning team, instructional team and advisory boards. The staff include instructional personnel, pre-service clinical education program manager, leadership and instructional coaches, administrative assistant, and a Director. (pp. e64-e65) The applicant provides a cohesive management plan to achieve the objectives of the project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (pp. e66-e67) For example, the management plan includes details regarding equal access, implementation steps, feedback process and engagement of underrepresented groups. In addition, oversight for the budget is described with assistance from the Finance Office, an interim Project Director until a full-time qualified Director is hired, state regulations and a planning team. (pp. e62-e63) The applicant clearly describes appropriate qualifications for the Director which include a master's degree, doctorate preferred, K-12 experience, graduate degree curriculum development experience and specialty in equity. (p. e64)
- (ii) The applicant provides adequate procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the project. The management teams will solicit feedback from various stakeholder groups and include this feedback in

the continuous improvement plan for the project. For example, the Fellows will complete annual surveys regarding their opinions about the teacher preparation program. In addition, data will be solicited from the instructional and leadership coaches. (p. e68)

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

- (a) The applicant plans to partner with the Center for Excellence for Educator Preparation and Innovation at Voorhees University which is a Historically Black College and University. LIFT will also partner with I Am In Demand, an organization that mentors Black and Hispanic men to assist underserved schools. (p. e18)
- (b) The applicant plans to improve academic achievement through improvements in educator effectiveness. For instance, the applicant plans to utilize LIFT which meets strong WWC evidence standards and enroll 100 teachers (change-agents) from non-traditional backgrounds who work as paraprofessionals, substitute teachers and new career entries. The applicant plans to partner with the Oakland University Center for Eradicating Racism which is committed to K-12 educational equity. The applicant provides evidence of expected outcome competencies with credentials for participants which will develop a support system, increase delivery quality, and build capacity in a diverse educator workforce. (pp. e16-e18) One system change is the ability for participants to earn licensure in 16 months rather than 24 months. (p. e18)

Weaknesses:

- (a)The applicant does not provide sufficient detail regarding how the project incorporates best practices for attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates.
- (b) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

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's pre-assessment identified 150 diverse paraeducators and substitute teachers who have undergraduate degrees and serve in the partners LEAs. The project has designed a dual certification process with the Oakland University School of Education for areas of critical need, such as secondary math and science, languages, computer science and ZA endorsement for early childhood. In addition, the applicant provides an extensive list of appropriate non-profit organizations from which to recruit, such as Black Greek Organizations, Geoscientists and Engineers. (p. e19)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

- a) Fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students.
- b) The applicant convincingly describes two acceptable practices to overcome the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses. For example, the project will design two competency based micro-credentials based on social-emotion learning equity and cultural systems-one for teachers and one for leaders. The applicant provides the content for modules that earn 4 graduate credits for teacher participants and 6 graduate credits for school leaders. 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.

Weaknesses:

- (a) No weaknesses noted.
- (b) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 4

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

- a) The applicant provides SEL training for 90% of the LIFT fellows. Both the teacher preparation program and the leadership will purposefully address equity in learning and school environments. Teachers will complete a competency-based component regarding SEL.
- b) The applicant describes SEL/Equity micro-credentials as a way to close the gap on the sources of inequity and inadequacy. The credentials are stackable so participants can complete two or three-month courses. The program includes analysis of student data, development of student skills, blended technology tool use and observation/ feedback. The idea is that in educator preparational programs and professional development programs educators are better prepared to create and deliver inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students when they have experienced this for themselves. (p. e21)

Weaknesses:

- a) No weaknesses noted.
- b) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

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

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

Strengths:

OK

Weaknesses:

OK

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 01:59 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 02:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S336S220036)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	29
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	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Panel - 8: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S336S220036)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The project demonstrates a strong rationale. The applicant has completed an extensive review of teacher and leadership research and assessed the impact of evidence-based practices to inform the LIFT initiative. LIFT is grounded in evidence-based, peer-reviewed research designed to meet the project goals, objectives, and outcomes. The program is designed meet the rigorous standards of the What Works Clearinghouse. The program uses a Logic Model that grounds LIFT in strong rationale that aligned to evidence of effectiveness. (pg. e. 25, 29)

(ii) The project goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable. The project goal is specified as raising the academic achievement of high-need students by improving educator effectiveness. Objectives include improving academic achievement in high-need schools, equipping educators with skills to promote 21st Century learning, increasing the number of educators who attain advanced certification, and increase the impact of LIFT through effective replication and scaled impact strategies. The applicant provided objectives that had measurable specific outcomes. (pg. e. 30)

(iii) The project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. LIFT is designed to provide four cohorts each year of up to 25 non-traditional candidates each for 100 candidates' total. This average to 60 teachers and 40 leaders from STEM fields and other needed competencies like literacy, special education, or languages with an accelerated pathway to becoming a classroom educator or a school leader in a high-need school. (pg. e. 30)

(iv) The project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. LIFT will create, implement, and expand a non-traditional preparation and teacher certification program for new teachers, anchored in the tenets of improvement science. The pandemic has highlighted technology gaps throughout the field of education. Teachers need to be able to teach using multiple learning strategies to effectively use technology as a tool to engage learners and to differentiate instruction which will create multiple learning pathways for students. Up to date knowledge in Computer Science, Pedagogy, Innovation, and Intervention micro-credential will empower educators to use technology as a tool to both differentiate instruction and close the achievement gap. (pg. e. 32)

(i) The applicant has set effective performance midterm and final observational feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project. Mid-term project observational feedback coaching involves virtual coaches observing students using a rubric that reflects state-approved educator evaluation protocols to assess teachers during the mid-point of their 16-month program. Midterm observations feedback will allow teachers make course corrections while they are still in the program. Final observation will take place in the final month of school, prior to the completion to assess growth and evaluate progress compared to baseline and mid-term observations. (pg. e. 39)

(ii) The project is designed to build capacity and yield results beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The applicant will develop a virtual improvement network that can be scaled nationally to build capacity in educators all over the U.S. This will make the training widely available so that teachers will develop high-quality learning to support all students. LIFT funding will empower partners to continue the training teachers to close education equity gaps that reduce opportunities for success for students of color and poverty. LIFT will support partnership beyond the grant period (pg. e. 45)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant has provided methods of evaluation that will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The project will collect qualitative and quantitative data from participants. The evaluation team will conduct quarterly enrollment, participation, and achievement data reviews to monitor results compared to proposed goal, objectives, milestones, and outcomes. The team will have monthly progress monitoring conference calls with Project Director. They will conduct focus groups and perform site visits to ensure fidelity with program's Logic Model. (pg. e. 43)

(ii) The methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. For example, project students will participate in effectiveness review protocols with the university to generate program outcome data and personal achievement data. Students will also complete annual surveys to provide operational data and project quality feedback and participate in Evaluator site visits. There will be a focus group to provide operational feedback. This measure will determine the effect the project is having on participants and will keep the project on track in meeting its objectives. (pg. e. 43)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. C. Adequacy of Resources (30 points)

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The applicant is providing support for the project, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources. The applicant also has committed onsite facilities, including satellite facilities, and is providing an in kind match for the project. The applicant has a technology infrastructure that supports online learning, facilitates undergraduate and graduate student academic research, and allows access to university resources through digital dissemination. The applicant will work with local school districts to host workshops, expand academic enrichment programs and increase technology-based learning opportunities for new educators serving low income students. (pg. e. 52)

(ii) The budget is adequate to support the proposed project. The budget includes information on salaries, travel, and program supplies necessary to program implementation. For example, part of the budget includes cost for technology. The project budget has funds to support technology maintenance of \$5000 per year and hardware and software for developing for the program. (pg. e. 54, 58, 202)

(iii) The costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. Evidence project objectives are being met will be through consistent data collection from diverse stakeholders, this will ensure the LIFT Multi-Year Financial Plan is both reasonable and attainable. To meet a program training objective candidates will complete specialized training in high-need, equity-driven, data-informed areas of practice to support training to develop program competencies to become completers and be employed in high needs areas. The program's annual training costs are \$20,000 per candidate with 25 annually with a program total of \$500,000 each year. (pg. e. 58, 206)

(iv) The applicant demonstrates that the project has the resources to operate beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan. The project has committed partners and evidence of broad support from stakeholders. The Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence will use virtual technology supports to re-tool educators who serve students in high-need schools so they can accelerate student learning. LIFT funding will allow the applicant and partners to launch and refine a virtual improvement network that can be scaled nationally. This will address national achievement gaps which have persisted because of systemic inequalities and inequities for teachers, leaders, and students. LIFT will continue the program and its partnerships beyond the grant period. (pg. e. 45, 58)

Weaknesses:

(ii) The applicant was not clear on the \$800,00 match for program salaries. The cost is listed with no clear details as to how this money will be spent. Details on budget items is needed especially when a large amount is being allocated for any purpose to demonstrate why it is needed. (pg. e. 58, 206)

Reader's Score: 29

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

Strengths:

(i) The management plan will achieve the objectives of the project on time and within budget, and include clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant has a clear timeline for project activities, for example, in years 1-4 the program cohort implementation is broken into the four phases. The phases include coursework, micro-credentials, virtual improvements, and replication with scaled impact. Grant managers will ensure the delivery of program services in accordance with the project timeline and logic model. The grant managers, advisory board and evaluators will monitor progress, ensure fidelity, and assess milestones accomplishments. (pg. e. 62)

(ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. Grant managers will solicit feedback from diverse stakeholders to ensure the continuous improvement of the LIFT program. Surveys will be administered to program administrators and participants throughout the grant period to generate feedback necessary to promote continuous project improvement. For example, LIFT Fellows will complete an annual survey on their opinion regarding the quality, intensity, duration and content of the LIFT teacher and leader preparation program. (pg. e. 68)

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:

b) The applicant has a project aimed at accelerating the path of improvement for schools by creating a pipeline of diverse teachers and school leaders who are trained and committed to transforming students. The plan is to implement a competency-based approach in training that demonstrates that academic underperformance can be transformed by a team of highly competent, skilled, and effective teachers and school leaders. The idea behind the program is that historically K-12 education and schooling in the U.S. has not been built on equitable practices. Schools functioned as a place of sorting and labeling students through consistent practices of systemic and institutional racism. To address this inequity professors at the program have been instrumental in shaping and redesigning the programs in teacher and school leader preparation programs.

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:

The applicant sees need of not only meeting the current demand of preparing, certifying, and placing teachers and school leaders in schools which have been historically underserved but to also diversify the teachers and school leaders entering the pipeline. As a part of a pre-assessment and analysis for program the program staff have identified more than 150 paraeducators and substitute teachers, from diverse backgrounds, who currently have an undergraduate degree. The program provides a certification pathway for teachers who are currently certified in another content area, but who wish to obtain dual certification in one of the following critical shortage areas in the state special education, secondary science, secondary mathematics, world languages, computer science, secondary communication arts, bilingual education, or early

childhood education. (pg. e. 19)

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:

a) The applicant will meet student social, emotional, and academic needs by using the evidence-based conceptual framework developed by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. This program design has two competency based micro-credentials one specifically for teachers Social-Emotional Learning, Equity, and Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and one for leaders Social-Emotional Learning, Equity, and Culturally Responsive Systemic Change. Students will access micro-credentials during their first year. The core standards of SEL that CASEL addresses provide five broad and interrelated areas of competencies are self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. The goal is to empower both new teachers and school leaders to apply the program's core standards in their classrooms and schools to create a sense of belonging for students.(pg. e. 20)

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:

a) The applicant will meet student social, emotional, and academic needs by using the evidence based conceptual framework developed by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. This program design has two competency based micro-credentials one specifically for teachers Social-Emotional Learning, Equity, and Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, and one for leaders Social-Emotional Learning, Equity, and Culturally Responsive Systemic Change. Students will access micro-credentials during their first year. The core standards of SEL that CASEL addresses provide five broad and interrelated areas of competencies are self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. The goal is to empower both new teachers and school leaders to apply the program's core standards in their classrooms and schools to create a sense of belonging for students.(pg. e. 20)

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:

b) The applicant's program is promoting equity in student access to educational resources and opportunities. Program teachers and instructional leaders will complete their SEL and Equity micro-credentials. This certification will help to close the achievement gap and will help educators create and sustain environments that provide equal access to teaching and learning programs for all students and educators. Educators in the program will learn to deconstruct barriers that impact equity and then turn to the challenge of closing achievement gaps in racial and socio-economic groups of students. The Progressive Credential program is learning experience that can be divided into two, three-month courses beginning with SEL and Equity as a prerequisite for enrollment in the Closing the Achievement Gap Credential. (pg. e. 20)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 02:05 PM