

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 11:14 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DePaul University (S336S220061)

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	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	19
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	4	2
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	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.336S

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: DePaul University (S336S220061)

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 by including strategies and components that are based on the rationale for the Chicago Teacher Residency: Preparing High Quality Teachers for High-Need Urban Schools project will include justification for the need for an expanded teacher preparation program, and evidence-based components of the design and framework. (e26) The applicant articulates three goals and 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 the CTR is expected to deliver on four Key Talent Priorities identified by the district as priority areas for improvement. (e43-e46) Specific goals include improvement in the pass rates and scaled scores for initial State certification or licensure. Preparation to train teachers to fill high needs roles, with a focus on high need instructional areas Acceleration by improving teacher retention rate; accelerate novice teacher effectiveness of teachers. (e45-e46) A comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students which involve collaboration that begin at the pre-service level. DePaul coursework and instructions includes modules on collaborating with all stakeholders involved in IEP's teams since this comprise an integral part of a special education teacher's work. (e45) DePaul M.Ed., project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice in special education was developed to integrate principles of research-based practice in preparation of preservice special educators (Leko et al., 2012). The performance feedback and continuous improvement success of implementation will include feedback mechanisms to facilitate improvement and sustainability of effective strategies created through multiple avenues for soliciting feedback from multiple stakeholders, residents, mentors, and ADs. The applicant includes a table demonstrating tools and feedback structures for effective continuous improvement. For Faculty feedback, DePaul University Supervisors will twice quarterly in the fall, winter, and spring; supervisors provide feedback on resident plan and instruction. (e 47, Appendix H). The applicant will build capacity by addressing education inequities that stand in the way of the city's most vulnerable students full potential. The applicant proposes to expand to prepare more new teachers with training in priority subject areas for developing 800 teachers over the next five year which will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. (e47)

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:

The applicant will use two categories of data sources to produce outcomes. Programmatic data and researcher collected data to answer the research questions. Programmatic data will include all existing data sources collected by DePaul/AUSL. Researcher collected data will include participant surveys, focus groups, and interviews which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. (e53) The applicant provides clear and concise goals and measurable objectives with activities that describe how each goal will be achieved. For each objective, the applicant states an aligned intended outcome. For Goal 1 proposes to increase the number of pre-service teachers prepared to fill high-need subject areas (prioritizing special education) within a network of high-need schools. The applicant clearly articulates the timeframe in which each of the objectives (Years 3-5) residents annually for hard-to-staff subject areas. The objectives clearly are specified and measurable. (e43)

Weaknesses:

Project design goals and objectives does not align with evaluation outcomes.

Reader's Score: 18

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 provides sufficient adequacy of resources facilities for residents to attend classes on campus weekly and a state of art equipment to facilitate optimal learning. Every resident and faculty member will receive a laptop for their professional use, software subscriptions, and IT support. (e61-62) The applicant's budget is adequate to support the proposed project. The applicant and AUSL have pledged match resources equal to 100% of requested Federal funds in accordance with grant program requirements. In addition, once attaining the 2023-2024 goal of a 125-resident cohort, the cost will be reduced to \$39,000 per resident and the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (e62) 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 applicant receives tuition revenue and ensures access to financial aid and scholarships. AUSL leverages public/private relationships to raise program sustaining funds from foundations, corporations, and individuals in the Chicago area and general operating funds are demonstrated commitment and evidence of broad support from stakeholders. (e63-e64)

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 clearly defined responsibilities and timelines for accomplishing project tasks which demonstrates that key tasks will be conduct on time. DePaul will lead the coordination, development and assurance of the content-knowledge development working with AUSL leadership and will manage the work of the evaluation team. The Joint Leadership team will have oversight for quality control and focus on capacity building at each organization efforts and outcomes. Monthly meetings with the Grant Steering Committee will provide general review, as well as feedback loops for continuous improvement. (e65-e66)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not include milestones in the project.

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 partnership's Chicago Teacher Residency (CTR) program provides a full residency program in conjunction with four quarters and one intercession term of master's-level University coursework completed within DePaul University, COE. The successful complete of the 12-month program results in a participant receiving a fully accredited M.Ed. degree, a K-12.

Weaknesses:

It is not clear if the applicant meets Competitive Preference Priority 1a since they did not specify as: 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).

Reader's Score: 2

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 partnership's Chicago Teacher Residency (CTR) program provides a full residency program in conjunction with four quarters and one intercession term of master's-level University coursework completed within DePaul University, COE. The successful complete of the 12-month program results in a participant receiving a fully accredited M.Ed. degree, a K-12.

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:

The applicant is committed to creating a pathway for more non-white candidates to access a career in education. The school and training sites serve predominantly Black and Latinx students, they are intentional about recruiting and developing Black and Latinx teachers to staff high needs roles in high poverty public schools. (e22)

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:

The applicant proposes to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources for underserved students, K-12, in the district. To achieve this goal, the partnership will emphasize culturally responsive teaching, trains all teachers to serve special education students, and commit to providing equitable experiences and alternative engagement practices by leveraging community relationships and assets. (e24)

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:

The applicant did not address this criteria.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/07/2022 11:14 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 06:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DePaul University (S336S220061)

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	2
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	108

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.336S

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: DePaul University (S336S220061)

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:

DePaul describes a high-quality Project design, meeting each of the required criteria. No significant weaknesses were found. Especially notable Strengths are noted below.

Rationale: They present profound knowledge of the challenges in the district and promising/proven solutions (e26-42).

e43-44 (ii) In Table 2, Goals and Objectives, Outcomes and Measures, these are all clearly specified and appropriate measures. This is part of a comprehensive partnership effort to improve teaching and learning. Their effort is further supported by the Logic Model on pages e81-83.

e45 (iv) Current research supports their chosen practices.

Performance feedback and continuous improvement are built-into the design, which also will build partnership capacity and sustainability (v)(vi), page e47.

Weaknesses:

No notable weaknesses 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:

The applicant has designed a quality project evaluation, described on pages e48-60. No significant weaknesses were found among the many strong methods presented. Strengths below are some highlights of the clearly articulated evaluation plan.

The external evaluator, Basis Policy Research, will provide regular formative, quarterly, and annual summative reports, including for grant GPRA and HEA requirements. Their thoroughness is emphasized by their inclusion of GPRA & HEA, because these measures are often not referenced by other applicants. (e48-49)

e49-52: In Table 3, both major Research Questions and Sub-Questions are graphically presented.

Valid and reliable data sources are described on e53 and throughout, including programmatic data and researcher-collected data, e.g., surveys, focus groups, and interviews. (e53)

e58-60: Table 4, presents an appropriate Crosswalk of required measures, requirements, and objectives for the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found in meeting criteria (i) or (ii).

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 partnership brings together an impressive application of resources, addressing the five sub-criteria. The only question was about DePaul serving as the fiscal agent for their nonprofit partner AUSL, which is not mentioned until the end of the section. The application would have been strengthened by articulating the major roles of the Resource Partners in the Abstract or early Design section. DePaul still contributes significant staffing to the action plans. (e60-64)

Each of the five criteria are individually addressed by this strong, experienced collaboration. The budget is appropriate and reasonable for the activities outlined for each partner and their outcomes, also supported by Appendices A and D, cited on p. e60.

On e61, project Staffing is outlined clearly in table, with roles designated to Partners and their staff, including in-kind match and grant-funded time commitments.

The Resources for Criteria (ii)-(v) are met as described on pages e62-64, with reference also to Appendix A, the budget and budget narrative. Sustainability is promised through the ongoing partnership with AUSL, renewed every three years (e64).

Weaknesses:

e63: Not clear that DePaul will serve primarily as the fiscal agent for AUSL, a nonprofit they have partnered with.

More info is provided under the Management Plan section (e64), which mentions DePaul staff/faculty as coordinating aspects of the project. Only one point was deducted because of the overall Strengths in proposed Resources.

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:

A very strong Management Plan is laid out in this Narrative section on pages e64-65, and in Appendix H. Three teams or committees manage all project activities on a regular continuous improvement schedule, ensuring that timelines and milestones are met, or corrective actions can be made. DePaul and AUSL have collaborated previously, which should add to smooth management and sustainability of the project.

e64 outlines DePaul's major role, and AUSL's overall role is described at the top of e65.

Page e65 concisely presents a strong timeline of activities for accomplishing their objectives and responsibilities, for each

of the management groups: the Program Leads, the Joint Leadership Team, and the Grant Steering Committee, with more information in Appendix H.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found in this concisely-presented Management Plan section.

Sufficient details were provided in their descriptive outline (e65).

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:

Not selected, but their project meets the requirement of CPP 1 b) to increase educator diversity in their participating high-need schools.

The Panel agreed that it would be appropriate to award partial points for this.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not meet sub-criterion 1 a).

Reader's Score: 2

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 DePaul and AUSL partnership plan will support a diverse educator workforce for the selected high-need schools, so that their students learning achievements will be significantly improved. Their application was made all the stronger, because they clearly addressed each CPP in the Introduction section (e20-26).

e21: The project will support a diverse educator workforce, and its professional growth, to strengthen K-12 student learning. This CPP is met by the project.

Weaknesses:

The project, through its partners and evaluation plan, has provided a strong proposal articulating how they will support a diverse workforce toward improved LEA outcomes.

No weaknesses were found in meeting this CPP.

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 provides a set of strong activities to meet the SEL and Academic Needs of their high-need district, described in the Narrative Introduction section.

e23-26: The project will educate residents in how to meet their K-12 students' SEA needs. The Design of project activities addresses both CPP3 a) and b), and the evaluation will ensure that measures address these outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found in how the project will address the SEL needs of their underserved students, nor in their plans to implement evidence-based practices.

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:

This CPP was met as described, in particular, on pages 23-26, in the Introduction to the Narrative section. These CPP criteria was addressed, as well, throughout the other Narrative sections, as appropriate.

e23-26: The project promotes equity in K-12 students' access to educational resources and opportunities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses in their meeting this CPP 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:

N/A.

Weaknesses:

N/A.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 06:43 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/06/2022 07:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DePaul University (S336S220061)

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	30
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	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Panel - 5: 84.336S

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: DePaul University (S336S220061)

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 provides a strong rationale for the project, i.e., partnering with the third largest school district in the U.S. of which 69.8% students are identified as economically disadvantaged (pg. e27). This contributes to a strong rationale since it is a very large district with high number of students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

In addition, evidence is provided to further support the rationale such as more than half of CPS teachers have left their school within five years. The applicant provides that 23 of the 25 AUSL Partner Schools have made early commitments to serve as training sites for the 2022-23 school year (pg. e28). The applicant provides a strong case that special education is identified as high-need and teacher shortage within Illinois and COE added 439 special education teachers over the last five years with 8% of the college's total enrollment and 12% of the College's degree completers. This demonstrates a strong rationale to meet the need.

ii) The applicant presents three goals, objectives, and outcomes that are clear and measurable (pg. e43-44). For example, Goal 1 relates to increasing pre-service teachers to fill high-need subject areas and provides measurable outcomes such as recruiting 125 in year 1, 150 year 2, 175 in years 3-5.

iii) The applicant provides evidence that the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. For example, collaboration at the pre-service level and DePaul coursework and instruction modules include collaboration with all stakeholders (pg. e45). All residents are trained in Common Core State Standards.

iv) The applicant demonstrated a commitment to up-to-date knowledge on research and effective practices, i.e., the program is developed to integrate principles of research-based practice in preparation of preservice special educators (pg. e46). In addition, program faculty are involved in the preservice self-study process.

v) The applicant details multiple ways that it provides performance feedback and continuous improvement (pg. e47) such as soliciting feedback from stakeholders and identifying a comprehensive feedback structure. Together the multiple ways

feedback is gathered will contribute to the success of the program.

vi) The applicant cites a strong plan that this project will build capacity such as being part of their strategic plan (pg. e47). Since it is part of their strategic plan, it shows a commitment that it is a priority and this project will contribute in providing several years of data and results for the program's continued implementation.

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 identifies an external independent research firm who will conduct the evaluation (pg. e48). The applicant provides six very detailed research questions that contain relevant sub research questions which will contribute to the evaluation outcomes.

The applicant describes a combination of surveys, focus groups, and interviews (pg. e53). The program evaluation plan details a combination of comprehensive formative and summative assessments which together will assess the program on a regular basis and allow the opportunity to make changes if necessary.

ii) The applicant provides six GPRA performance measures, with HES requirements, and program objectives (pg. e58-59). The methods of evaluation are very thorough and support the goals of the project.

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 cites many resources that will be leveraged to contribute to the success of the program such as grant management resources by DePaul University Office of Research, DePaul University facilities for when residents attend classes one day per week (pg. e60). Technology and equipment resources, software, and IT support are provided to every resident and faculty member.
- ii) The applicant provides evidence of in-kind support from the partners and the budget relates to the activities of the program which focus on student support and personnel costs.
- iii) The budget is reasonable provided the goals of the project. The applicant seeks to maintain a 125-resident cohort in 2023-24 which will provide each resident with \$39,000 of support.
- iv) The applicant provides that they have a long history of preparing teachers for high-need schools and that this partnership is committed to operating after the period of Federal funding has ended (pg. e63). They cite a model of tuition revenue and access to financial aid and scholarships to support the sustainability.
- v) The applicant demonstrates a strong commitment of each partner that will contribute to the success of the program (pg. e64). Some of the strong partner commitments include important public/private relationships to raise program sustaining funds from foundations, corporations, and individuals in the Chicago area and nationally.

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 strong management plan that seeks to achieve the objectives on time and budget (pg. e64-65). The management plan details that DePaul will lead the coordination, development of the content-knowledge working with AUSL leadership.

The plan includes Program Leads, Joint Leadership Team, and a Grant Steering Committee which meet on a regular basis, accordantly, to carry out objectives. Collectively, this structure represents a strong and supportive plan that will contribute to the success of the program implementation.

ii) The applicant provides that the partners will meet with stakeholders such as residents, mentors, and ADS to obtain continuous feedback (pg. e47). More importantly, the three program teams (Program Leads, Joint Leadership Team, and a Grant Steering Committee) will review data for ongoing improvement. This ongoing data review is very important to ensuring that any needed interventions take place.

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 applicant describes a long-standing commitment to building a diverse pipeline of teachers (pg. e20) through the participation in the Illinois State Board of Education Diverse Pipeline Pilot.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address its designation as a HBCU, HSI, or other minority serving institutions. Therefore, it is not clear that it meets Competitive Preference Priority 1a.

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 cites that the project will build a diverse pathway to schools with high diversity (pg. e21-22). The applicant intentional about the recruitment which will have the intended outcomes of increasing a diverse pipeline. The applicant partnered with schools that are diverse and they are intentional about recruiting diverse teachers (pg. e22).

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 applicant provides evidence of resources relating to socio-emotional learning (pg. e23). All leadership will provide support to check in on participants and regular scheduled sessions.

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 will assist in providing education equity through providing \$20,000 scholarship for each resident and payment of test registration fees for licensure tests (pg. e23). In addition the project emphasizes culturally responsive teaching, trains all teachers to serve special education students, and commits to providing equitable experiences and alternative engagement practices by leveraging community relationships and assets.

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 07:05 PM