Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cook County School District 104 (S336S220063)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	26
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	30	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	15
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	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Cook County School District 104 (S336S220063)

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:

A comprehensive logic model has been included (e115). The logic model clearly identifies inputs, intermediate and final outcomes. Each of the project's elements have been identified as part of the logic model and correlated with intended outcomes. The provided logic model demonstrates a clear rationale for the project and will help to guide implementation of the project.

The project has included a collaboration system that is research-based (Weinstein & Shiferaw, 2017) and will include project's teams divided into governing and management systems (e25). Using a research-based system to promote collaboration increases the likelihood that the collaboration will prove effect and help achieve the project's goals and intended outcomes.

The proposed project will create a pipeline of well-qualified teachers, who will receive ongoing PD and training throughout their careers at the identified LEAs. This directly aligns to the needs assessment which identified uneven distribution of highly qualified teachers in the partnering LEAs (e108).

All districts in the state are required to have mentoring program, but administrators have identified the need for a more expansive and improved quality program (e110), which the proposed project is likely to provide given its structure and sound research-basis.

Goals and objectives of the project are measurable, well-articulated, and directly aligned to project outcomes (e28-32), which will help support project success.

The project will align with the Illinois State Board of Education's (ISBE) mandate that all clinical education programs increase the percentage of candidates of color enrolled by 15% over the next three years (e40).

Apprentice teachers will have clinical experiences in middle schools with special education mainstreaming and inclusion, and English language learners, to support a broad understanding of curriculum integration, planning across content areas,

and the academic and social-emotional needs of adolescents (e41). Infusing these aspects of teaching supports a comprehensive effort at improving teaching and learning.

Each element of the project's design has been grounded in research. For example, the collaboration system is based on the work of Weinstein & Shiferaw, 2017, who proffer that
collaborative systems of reform are effective in implementing school/university partnership programs (e55); and immersion in the culture of the communities where candidates will eventually teach is demonstrated to bolster the psychological motivation and commitment to teach students from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds, according to Waddell (2011) and Zeichner (2011) (e56).

The applicant has addressed various mechanisms for building educator capacity through its program. For example, the project will develop work teams to support project implementation at the local levels. This includes teams for recruitment, Apprentice Teacher Preparation and Clinical Practice, Dual Language Program Development, Reading and Literacy for All, Induction/Mentoring, Equity and Teacher Cultural Alignment, and Assessment. This knowledge will remain within the district beyond the scope of the project.

As part of the proposed project, current educators in the district can become apprentice teachers. Apprentice teachers will receive training and support on how to provide best practices to teacher candidates in urban settings (e43). This knowledge transfer will remain with these teachers beyond the scope of the project.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has indicated that mentors will be selected based on their effectiveness, "according to clear criteria measuring teacher quality" (e 30), but it is not clear from the information provided what these criteria will be. Establishing and understanding the specific criteria to be used in determining educator quality is vital to create an objective measure of evaluation and ensure that all teachers are receiving equally qualified mentors. Criteria for measuring the teaching quality of program graduates has also not been made clear (e32).

The applicant has provided limited information on how the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning in the identified districts. Although the project in and of itself has several components to address the development of quality teachers for the identified LEAs (e.g., arts integration, anti-bias training, restorative justice and trauma informed teaching, teaching students with low literacy, e 35), and the state has a mandate to increase the number of minority teachers in educator preparation programs (e40), it is not clear how this project fits into larger efforts within the district to improve teaching and learning. Integration of improvement efforts into the fabric of the district help support implementation and overall buy-in from educators and administrators. The applicant has also identified several ways in which it intends to implement a comprehensive effort (e37), but few specific and concrete details are provided. For example, the applicant has indicated that it will "develop infrastructures" and "institute policies" (e37), but it is unclear what these infrastructures or polices will be or how specifically they will be related to or impact the overall project or its outcomes.

The applicant has provided some information on how it will collect feedback and ensure continuous improvement, but specific details related to these processes are not clear, suggesting this process is not integral to the projects design. For example, the applicant has indicated that it will utilize performance assessments to gather performance feedback and continuously improve the program (e83), but limited information was provided throughout the application about the specific performance assessments to be used or how the applicant would evaluate and/or adjust, if necessary, implementation of the project based on performance feedback.

Reader's Score: 26

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 hired an external evaluator to work in tandem with the project's internal evaluation team (e62), this will help reduce the possibility of bias in the evaluation of the project and its outcomes.

The external evaluator selected to participate in the project has more than 20 years' experience as an evaluator and director of numerous federal, state, and privately funded grants, including Teacher Quality Enhancement grants (e62). Selecting and utilizing an evaluator with substantial experience in evaluation and grants similar to the proposed helps increase the likelihood of a successful evaluation that will provide valid and reliable performance data.

As part of the evaluation, safeguards (e.g., minimum .7 reliability threshold) have been put in place to help ensure the reliability and validity of performance data (e60). Using a reliability coefficient of .70 will support the reliability and validity of data, given that .70 is recognized among researchers as the minimum threshold for acceptable reliability.

The external evaluator, who has extensive experience in program evaluation, will develop and piloting all new instruments (e60). Piloting new instruments helps ensure their validity and appropriateness by testing them to ensure the tool will yield the information and insight desired and intended.

Baseline data for summative assessments will be collected at LEA partner sites at the beginning of each school year, while post-assessments will be administered in August of each project year (e63). Collecting pre and post data each year will help the applicant compare changes occurring throughout the project period and from the beginning to the end of each year. Dong this is both thorough and feasible.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has detailed some of the controls it has in place to ensure the validly and reliability of quantitative measures (e.g., minimum reliability coefficients, e60), but has provided limited information on the data collection tools to be used.

Instead, the applicant has used vague terms to describe data collection. For example, on page e64, the applicant indicates that "qualitative measures will include content analysis of documents such as…," but has not clearly and specifically articulated what elements will be used to evaluate each performance measure. Without such detailed information, it is difficult to fully ascertain the extent to which the data collection tools will yield valid performance data.

The applicant has not thoroughly described the evaluation methods for the project. While evaluation methods for GPRA measures and HEP (e51-67) are clearly delineated and include specific sources of data, less clarity is provided around the evaluation of data related to the project goals and outcomes. Instead, only vague terminology and examples are used to describe (e.g., "a pre assessment instrument will be administered to assess the knowledge and skills", e69; "Pre and post assessment instruments will be administered to new teachers to assess their students' critical thinking and academic engagement, e72). Without fully understanding this information, it is difficult to fully ascertain the extent to which the methods of evaluation are feasible and appropriate to the goals, objectives and outcomes of the project.

The applicant has indicated that "qualitative assessments will include…portfolios, written reports, journaling, minutes, course unit plans, lessons, and teaching materials" (e61), but has provided no information on when data are to be collected using these mechanisms or the frequency with which these data will be collected (e.g., journal entries, portfolios,

lesson plans).

Reader's Score: 15

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:

demonstrating strong and detailed commitments of each program partner (e144). Each partner has articulated its overall support for the project and lead applicant and detailed its specific commitments to the project.

The applicant has access to ample facilities to facilitate the project. Each school site will provide classroom use, meeting space, gymnasiums, media centers and STEAM labs for the project (e74). District partners and Chicago State University will also host the majority of meetings, seminars, professional development sessions, and other project activities as a support to the in-kind commitment (e73).

The applicant has budgeted approximately $3k (e182) each year to support the provision of supplies for project participants. These supplies include office supplies, 3D printers, copiers and computer access (e74). These supplies appear appropriate and adequate for implementation of the program.

The proposed budget appears adequate to support the proposed project (e175), given the expected number of teachers to be served (approx. 300, e76) and the services and supports provided (e.g., mentor teachers, induction, supplies, professional development, etc.)

Both the depth and breadth of the project support the reasonableness of the costs in relation to its objectives, design, and potential significance. Not only will the project produce certified teachers, it will provide these teachers with ongoing support throughout the early parts of their career. The project is expected to serve 7,200 students in high-need LEAs, 300 apprentice teachers and provide 200 200 classrooms and induction mentors across five years (e77).

Key partners have committed and documented in their letters of support to continue allocating financial resources for apprentice teacher recruitment, preparation, and support of additional cohorts of new teachers (e78). Project partners have also made a commitment to continue applying for other state and federal funding to continue supporting the project (e79). These commitments will help support sustainability of the project beyond current grant funding.

Preparing for sustainability following grant funding will be a continued focus during implementation of the grant. By September 30th of each project year, the Governance Council will have established and revised plans to institutionalize the project after federal funding ends (e29). Continually visiting and revising this plan will help ensure sustainability remains top of mind and a priority for all.

The applicant has provided a multi-year operating model, detailing the relative costs for each project year (e175). This plan will help support the operation and allocation of funding each project year, to ensure fiscal responsibility.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The project includes seven work teams responsible for specific aspects of the project (e.g., recruitment, clinical practice, e82). Work Teams, in conjunction with the manage team, will meet every other week to: review timelines and milestones; monitor the budget; define the responsibilities of staff; implement an ongoing review of project plans; and monitor and modify the activities of the project based on feedback received (e82). Delineating work by project teams helps to clearly delegate responsibilities to ensure successful and on time completion.

The applicant has provided a management plan, to include objectives, activities, milestones, timelines and responsible parties (e89). Having a clearly structured plan will help to keep the project on track and ensure appropriate individuals are held accountable for relevant outcomes. This in turn helps to support completion of the project on time and within budget.

The applicant has clearly articulated the specific responsibilities of key personnel for the project e84-87). Clearly articulating each personnel's responsibilities will help enforce accountability and ensure the project is completed on-time and within budget.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has indicated that it will utilize performance assessments to gather performance feedback and continuously improve the program (e83), but limited information was provided throughout the application about the specific performance assessments to be used or how the applicant would evaluate and/or adjust, if necessary, implementation of the project based on performance feedback.

The applicant has also indicted that once per year, a forum will be held to discuss key issues and allow LEAs the opportunity to share successes and challenges around their respective problems of practice (e84), but it is not clear from the information provided how information from this meeting will be used to foster continuous improvement in the program.

The applicant has indicated that focus groups will be convened quarterly to discuss program impact, while parent and student interviews will be conducted bi-annually (e88). Although the applicant has indicated that interviews will be conducted, it is not clear from the information provided what information will be collected as part of the interviews or how it will be used.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

   comprised of a majority minority population helps support the recruitment and outreach to diverse candidates to participate in the project as apprentice teachers and eventual teachers of record.

   Within the Maywood-Melrose Park partner district, the majority of the students are Hispanic (55%) while a third (30%) of the students are African (e17). The project will concentrate outreach efforts for teacher candidates within the community of these LEAs. Doing so, will target a majority minority population and also recruit potential educators from the neighborhoods in which they will eventually teach (e19).

   In addition to recruiting more minority candidates, the applicant will work to address the attrition of minority educators (e18) by providing supports such as extended mentoring, professional development, journal subscriptions, opportunities to present at professional meetings, and supporting attendance at professional conferences. Apprentice teachers and principals will also be paired with mentors of similar backgrounds or at the very least, mentors who have been trained in culturally responsive mentoring (e19). Providing new teachers these supportive structures will help build their professional practice and collegiality among other educators. In doing so, new teachers will have increased opportunities to share and learn among peers and more experienced teachers.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses 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:

To address the shortage areas identified in the needs assessment (Early Childhood, Middle School, Special Education, and English language acquisition) (e108) the project will prepare 300 diverse teachers to obtain certifications in these high-need shortage subjects (e20).

Candidates will be well-prepare for the students they will serve, as a result of the DEI education (e21) and experiential, interdisciplinary course approach that will help improve their students' academic, social emotional, and behavior through an inclusive and safe environment (e20)

Coursework, clinical work, and induction programming will be aligned specifically to the Illinois Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning Standards, Illinois Educator Standards and Common Core, Illinois State and District Learning Standards (e207), helping to ensure that the new teachers are well prepared to teach and be effective in the system within which they will teach.

Course professors and master teachers from the partner districts will help apprentice teachers and school leaders build capacity to develop authentic relationships with students and families from diverse backgrounds, with an emphasis on Black and Latinx students (e22). Given that the demographic makeup of the partner districts is primarily black and Latinx students (e17), this will help support educators in understanding needs of the communities they will serve and to build relationships with students and families to facilitate student learning and education.

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:

The proposed curriculum for the project will intentionally integrate evidence-based SEL into all academic aspects of the programming (e22), to help ensure teachers are well prepared to address the social, emotional, academic, and career development needs of students.

Apprentice teachers will begin their teacher preparation with opportunity to unpack their personal identity, histories, and narratives to better understand personal biases (e22). Doing the work to identify and understand these biases support teachers in being cognizant of and addressing those biases, to the greatest extent possible, in real time, in order to provide equitable and culturally responsive education to the students they will serve.

   Weaknesses:

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:

The proposed project will work with two high needs LEAs, to meet the learning needs of all students in Elementary, Middle Level and in Early Childhood Education (ECE) programs in the participating schools (e33).

The applicant conducted a thorough needs assessment (e106) to examine sources of inequity and inadequacy and has implemented responses through the design of this project, to include preparing teachers in the identified shortage areas, recruiting and preparing more diverse candidates and implementing supports to reduce attrition and retain the candidates in the partner districts.

Two ways in which equity in student access will be addressed is through the development of culturally relevant materials

(e23) and the program's emphasis on cultural competency and students' special cognitive and socio emotional needs (e24). Professional development will also be centered around social-emotional learning (SEL) and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) practices (e24). Embedding this training into the program helps prepare teachers for integrating cultural competency and differentiated learning into all aspects of their teaching so that all students are equitably served.

Weaknesses:

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:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

Reader's Score:

Status:

Last Updated:

   0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/03/2022 04:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cook County School District 104 (S336S220063)
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	25
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	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Cook County School District 104 (S336S220063)

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 provided a clearly developed rationale for the proposed teacher preparation partnership with 14 PreK-8 high-need schools and the two high-need LEAs in targeted regions in Chicago. The project will prepare 300 diverse apprentice teachers to become multi-subject or single subject certified teachers employed in the high-need schools. The selected targeted schools are experiencing teacher shortages, low student achievement, high poverty areas and high teacher turnover. The proposed project will create an integrated, comprehensive system of recruiting, preparation and induction, and on-going mentoring of a diverse pool of participants in an innovative teacher preparation program that will address teacher attrition and student achievement. (pgs. e25-30)

   (ii) The applicant provided clearly specified goals and objectives that are aligned with relevant measurable outcomes. For example, the applicant indicated that the project goals and objectives are to: (1) establishing a system of collaboration among partners, (2) preparing apprentice teachers to be high-quality teachers for the high-need LEAs; (3) supporting Project Graduates and the quality of their instruction through an Induction Program; and (4) improving the academic achievement and socio-emotional development of LEA students. Some of the expected outcomes: 300 apprentice teachers from underrepresented backgrounds will be prepared to teach in the LEAs' shortage areas by acquiring innovative teaching and learning strategies and modes of instruction and 100% of the apprentice teachers will agree to teach for 3 years in the LEAs, and 7,200 students in TEAM's LEAs will improve their academic and socio emotional development. (pgs. 30-35)

   (iii) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project will engage in comprehensives efforts to improve teaching and learning and high academic standards for students. The applicant indicated that the proposed model is based on the research by DeWitt Wallace's' support of career pathways that are aligned with community based on-site clinical practices to enhance the teaching experience. The applicant felt that this model is a good fit for them because it meets the needs of the urban school districts in Chicago. Clinical practices in this area requires community support, thus leading to higher involvement with student achievement. There will be many career paths for paraprofessionals, early childhood assistants, substitute teachers and mid-career professionals. (pgs. e36-42)

   (iv) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project is aligned and reflective of evidence-based research and best practices. For example, the applicant focused on the collaborative team research, and it is reflected throughout the narrative. Citing several sources based on the work of Weinstein & Shiferaw (2017, Wang et al (2018)) and Olson, Lee, & Showalter (2022), the program will collaborate with nine partners to create a governance council and work teams to establish the collaboration system and institutionalize the collaboration in order to sustain the partnership after grant funds end. Each of these components is supported by research and they are likely to improve the outcomes. Through the collaboration the project will plan courses and clinical experiences tailored to preparing apprentice teachers for teaching in the high-need LEAs. (pgs. e25-30)

   (v) The applicant clearly demonstrated processes and procedures will be in place to engage collaborative teams in performance feedback and continuous improvement dialogue. For example, one of the project goals is to establish and maintain a Governance Council, Management Team, and work teams. Team will have met at least quarterly and the

Management Team weekly to focus on establishing and maintaining the system of collaboration. The district principals will be apart of the meetings to ensure continuous improvement and feedback for the project. A key component of the project is to engage teachers in reflection on practice, mentoring, and documenting student learning on a continuous basis. Information will be used in a variety of ways to manage progress towards the project's stated goals and objectives and to assess each year the degree to which milestones have been met for all of the project's objectives. (pgs. e56-58)

(vi) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the proposed project has the capacity build on their work and show results beyond the grant period. For example, the applicant indicated that the project will continuously engage the collaborative teams on ways to improve the project. The need is great is the region, thus the partners are looking at ways to sustain the project into the future. One of the work teams will be created solely to look at results and search funding and ways to maintain the project beyond the grant period. As the project grows, teams will engage in conversations on how to improve the curriculum, recruitment, and retention strategies.(pgs. e59-61)

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 provided an adequate evaluation plan that is aligned with methods of evaluation that has the potential pf producing both valid and reliable on several levels in producing performance data for its relevant outcomes. The External Evaluator will be responsible for developing and piloting all new instruments. The performance assessments and the data resulting from them will measure data from the project's four objectives to assess: (1) the quality of and degree to which partnership collaboration occurs, (2) the performance and achievement of apprentice teachers, (3) the quality of new teachers' instruction, and (4) LEA students' academic achievement and social-emotional development. The assessment instruments will be used to access teacher performance for content and pedagogy and observation protocols of teacher instruction. (pgs. e60-64)

(ii) The applicant effectively demonstrated that methods of evaluation have been stated to access the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. The applicant indicated that the evaluation is being planned to provide a thorough analysis of whether the project's objectives have been met through a summative assessment and how the project can be improved as it is being implemented through a formative assessment. Benchmarks and timelines will be set annually to gauge whether the project's activities are meeting the partnership's objectives. In order to gauge the project's successes and areas of improvement, the evaluation will consistently throughout the program assess the apprentice teacher, school administrator, student, candidate mentor, induction mentor, school leader, principal candidate, and community representative performance using quantitative measures such as time-series pre-post questionnaires and surveys; state assessments of academic proficiency and academic content; assessments of apprentice teachers meeting state academic and social-emotional teaching and learning standards; standardized observation instruments; attendance data; enrollment records; and student standardized test scores. Qualitative assessments will include interviews, focus groups, portfolios, written reports, journaling, minutes, course unit plans, lessons, and teaching materials. Where appropriate, quantitative data will be analyzed with inferential, parametric analytic techniques including Pearson correlation, t-tests, ANOVA, MANOVA, and linear regression. (pgs. e64-68)

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 successfully demonstrated that the project will have adequate support for the project from the lead organization, Cook County School District, and the partners. The applicant indicated the partner teams have built an infrastructure for the project and all partners will provide adequate facilities, equipment, supplies, and other services resources. Space will be available to host the meetings, seminars, professional development sessions, and other project activities as a support to the in-kind commitment to TEAM. The TEAM project will provide apprentice teachers access to necessary supplies and equipment to perform assigned work related to project goals. This will include, but not be limited to the following: access to laptops computers and tablets, color printers, copy machines, 3D printers, robotics and coding devices, engineering materials, scanners, and digital curriculum resources. (pgs. e73-34)

(ii) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the budget is appropriate and adequate to support the proposed project. The applicant is requesting 4,205,540.00 federal and 4,205,540.00 match for a total of 8,411,080.00. For example, the applicant indicated that based on 300 apprentice teachers (Early Childhood, Middle School, Special Education, & English language acquisition) over five years and approximately $28,037 per mentor teacher, TEAM will cost a total of $8,411,080.00 to implement, which is adequate to support the 60 apprentice teachers per year. Apprentice teachers will also be provided with support in identifying and applying for grants, loans, and scholarships. Federal funds will be used as direct supports and services to participating TEAM apprentice teachers and mentor teachers. Grant funds will be used: to hire & compensate key instructional support staff for TEAM LEAs, and provide travel for project personnel, faculty, students, and partners traveling to program sites. (pgs. e75-78 and Budget)

(iii) The applicant successfully demonstrated that the costs are reasonable in relation to the what the project hopes to accomplish and the significance of the results. The proposed project will serve 7,200 high need LEA students, 300 apprentice teachers, 200 classroom and induction mentors and CSU faculty members over the five grant years. The project cost is approximately $1,092 per student, apprentice teacher, mentor, and faculty served each project year of the grant. TEAM and its partners also will provide additional support for the project in the form of additional private and public sector grants, and in-kind resources from all organizations amounting to $812,695 in year 1 and $848,211 in years 2-5, which amounts to a 100% in-kind match. (pgs. e78-80 and Budget)

(iv) The applicant reasonably indicated that there will be some resources and plans to secure more funding to operate beyond the project period. The applicant provided letters of support from partners who indicated that they are committed to the institutionalization of apprentice teacher recruitment, preparation, and support of additional cohorts of new teachers using their own funds. The President, Provost, and Deans at CSU have indicated that institutionalization is a long-term top priority. After federal funding, the applicant indicated an estimated 80% of the total budget will be needed per year to

institutionalize and enable program sustainability. The applicant also indicated that the funds from the grant will serve as seed money to help them build an infrastructure to sustain the program. The applicant also stated the fact that they have been able to match the federal funds with over 4 million dollars is a testament to their commitment. (pgs. e80-81)

(v) The applicant effectively demonstrated that there are commitments from all partners to ensuring successful implementation of the program. The applicant provide support letters from each partner. The partners are strongly committed to using all of their available resources to coordinate with other funding sources to support the project. For example, some of the partners will coordinate its TQP project with other federal and state sources of funding, including: a Full-Service Community Schools grant; a 21st Century Community of Learners grant; an Assistance for Arts Education Development and Dissemination grant; a School Climate Transformation grant; an ISBE Community Partnership grant; an English Language Acquisition grant. Schools have provided cash donations and in-kind donations for services. (pgs. 83-84)

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) No weaknesses noted.

(iii) No weaknesses noted.

(iv) While the applicant has good intentions for continuing the project after the grant period, the application does not provided a narrative that demonstrated a multi-year financial plan to support the project.

(v) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

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 provided a comprehensive and detailed management plan that clearly aligns the achievement and completion of program tasks and activities with the program objectives. For example, the management plan has identified the management structure, roles, responsibilities, and a timeline for implementation during the grant term. An operational timeline corresponding to the main milestones are located in the logic model. The project will be supported by multiple district departments to ensure quality or services, fiscal responsibility, implementation, and the evaluation. The applicant provided an organizational chart which clearly depicts the management structure with clear lines of responsibility. The applicant is proposing to commence with activities in Fall 2022, such as curriculum development (pgs. e 87-90).

(ii) The applicant clearly demonstrated processes and procedures will be in place to engage collaborative teams in performance feedback and continuous improvement dialogue. For example, one of the project goals is to establish and maintain a Governance Council, Management Team, and work teams. Team will have met at least quarterly and the Management Team weekly to focus on establishing and maintaining the system of collaboration. The district principals will be a part of the meetings to ensure continuous improvement and feedback for the project. (pgs. e88-90)

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 indicated that CSU is a Minority Serving Institution serving primarily African American and Latinx non-traditional, first-generation students; therefore, apprentice teachers will be recruited from these communities. Attention will be given to recruit teacher apprentices who are differently abled or have disabilities, and on recruiting at least 20% of currently employed paraprofessionals in the schools as many are parents of the students and would like to become teachers but have been prohibited from furthering their education goals due to cost and other family obligations. (pg. 38)

   (b) The applicant clearly demonstrated that one of the project features is the goal to diversify the educator workforce in shortage areas in participating schools, using a team and interdisciplinary approach to teaching and learning emphasizing how students can create meaningful academic and social/emotional knowledge. TEAM will immerse its apprentice teachers in the culture of the cities and communities in which they will be teaching and learning. In this way, new teachers are more likely to become committed, motivated, and better prepared to serve the students in the highest need districts. (pgs. 6-7)

   Weaknesses:

   (a) No weaknesses noted.

   (b) No weaknesses 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 clearly demonstrated that the proposed project will expand its current emphasis on increasing educator diversity by designing and implementing an intentional educator workforce pipeline that reflects the student demographics in targeted Chicago communities. Partners across TEAM are increasingly committed to the development of a recruitment and preparation pipeline that emphasizes the local context, while addressing barriers to retaining more teachers of color,

which undergirds the diversity and equity gap between student and teacher populations. Apprentice teachers will be recruited from underrepresented populations with a focus on candidates of color, those to teach in shortage areas (Early Childhood, Middle School, Special Education, and English language acquisition) and mid-career professionals from other occupations, former military personnel, and recent college graduates with a record of academic distinction. (pgs. e7-9)

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) The applicant effectively demonstrated that the project is designed to foster a sense of belonging and inclusion for underserved students. The project is projecting to improve underserved students' academic and socio emotional learning through the creation of inclusive, identity-safe climates and evidence-based practices in a number of ways. CSU will continue to intentionally integrate SEL into all academic aspects of TEAM, such as viewing students as creators rather TEAM's academic approach engages underserved students deeply in the academic construction of knowledge, extensive group discussions of the underlying principles supporting fields of academic study, and the pursuit of studies which are

both relevant and meaningful to students' intellectual and socio emotional development. (pgs. e11-13)

(b) The applicant effectively demonstrated that evidence-based practices for advancing student success for underserved students will be interjected into the program components. The applicant provided evidence that there is a need in the LEAs for students to improve their academic achievement and to integrate SEL into rigorous academic inquiry, evidence-based SEL practices have been embedded into the teacher preparation curriculum, and teacher and principal development, given important research advancements that support whole child learning and its relative impact on the development of creating psychologically and physically safe school communities where students feel nurtured, secure, and supported. SEL skills and competencies will be back mapped into every teacher preparation course. TEAM apprentice teachers will begin their teacher preparation with an opportunity to begin unpacking their personal identity, histories, and narratives so that they are able to understand the academic, physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development in their inclusive classrooms. (pgs. e13-15)

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 effectively demonstrated that the project has been developed so that every aspect of the program will provide equitable learning environments, where there is an emphasis on culturally responsive pedagogy in direct relation to the school and community context. In the targeted school areas. All pedagogical practices and professional development programs in the elementary schools will examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy by emphasizing how activities can be inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status. Examining and incorporating these practices will promote diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) that will be central to ensuring that students have rich and ample cultural assets to draw meaning and develop culturally relevant materials.(pgs. e 16-18)

(b) The applicant successfully demonstrated that the project will engage in culturally responsive teaching practices that supports teachers to be immersed in the culture of the school while acquiring high-quality skills. Culturally responsive teaching practices affirm the intrinsic value of students' lived experiences and acknowledge that these experiences shape what students know and how they make meaning and learn. Project TEAM will establish avenues for teacher apprentices to be immersed in the culture of schools starting in the summer session of 2023, and continuously during the academic semester of 2023, the summer of 2024, and every year thereafter. The apprentice teachers will engage with the community and staff at the community based organizations, visit family members' homes, attend seminars and celebrations at community-based sites, participate events related to Latinx and African American history and culture. (pgs. e 18-21)

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:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score:

Status:
Last Updated:

0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/03/2022 04:23 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cook County School District 104 (S336S220063)
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	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Diverse Workforce	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Competitive Preference Priority 4		
1. Promoting Equity	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Grow Your Own	0	0
Total	111	111

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.336S

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

Applicant: Cook County School District 104 (S336S220063)

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 proposed program will rely on establishing a system of collaboration between all of the partners of TEAM which will use research-supported activities as presented in Weinstein & Shiferaw (2017), Wang et al. (2018), Bryk et al. (2010), and Olsen, Lee & Showalter (2022) (pg. e25). The need for the project is supported by evidence, such as 20%-21% of students in the target area are from low-income families, high turnover rates for teachers in the target schools (16.7% and 15.3%), and 60% of students served qualify for free or reduced lunch (pg. e17). The applicant's logic model on pg. e116 focuses on current inputs and outcomes that demonstrates the project's rationale. The goals and objectives (pp. e28-33) are clearly stated and measurable. The major components of the project are establishing a collaboration between TEAM partners, preparing high-quality teachers in high-need school districts, supporting project students and graduates, and the activities will result in improving academic achievement and SEL development in targeted schools (pp. e28-33). Best practices that will be implemented in the project include teacher mentoring and recruitment from the "local" population and the incorporation of DEI aspects into the curriculum (pg. e24). Continuous improvement and feedback, such as new teacher focus groups, interviews, and document reviews, will be integrated into all of the project's activities (pg. e88). The project leadership has pledged to support activities beyond the federal support and have identified external evaluation partnership.

Weaknesses:

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:

The evaluation plan in this application stands firmly on the validity and reliability of the data to measure the effects of the teacher development programs with pre-post time-series questionnaires and surveys as well as other student academic achievement measures (pg. e61). Qualitative data will be collected that include interviews, focus groups, portfolios, written reports, and document review (pg. e61). The project Management Team has retained Complement Consulting Group as the independent external evaluator, led by Dr. Jerry Olsen who has extensive evaluation experience (pg. e62). The project

activities are measurable and include both teacher outcomes at the short and intermediate outcomes and student outcomes for the long-term outcomes (pp. e116). The timeline for evaluation activities is clearly presented documented with regular milestones presented (pp. e89-93). The plan for collecting the data is detailed and included in the annual timeline of activities.

Weaknesses:

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:

The applicants express support for the TEAM program as provided by Chicago State's in-kind hosting of project meetings, seminars, and professional development activities (pg. e73). TEAM leadership support the initiative through project oversight and management at a school district partner (District 89) and fiscal management by CSU (pg. e73). The applicants will also contribute students for the project and support for the new teachers in the TEAM project as demonstrated in Table 1 on page e74. Supplies and equipment pledged by the TEAM project members are also included in the application (pp. e74-75). Serving over 300 new teachers in 5 years, this project will support new teachers with

$28,037 per mentor teacher, pay for professional opportunities, and hire key instructional support staff (pg. e76). A cost-analysis indicates that $1,092 will be used to support each student, apprentice teacher, or faculty served by the project (pg. e77). The applicant presents an adequate plan for resources beyond the federal funding through partnerships and community initiatives. Partnership between the TEAM project leadership seems to be strong.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The project management includes a detailed and clear timeline for implementation that also outlines evaluation activities as they relate and support formative feedback and project summative evaluation for each objective (Chart 1, pp. e89-93). The personnel identified in this section are well-qualified and experienced in this work as evaluators, district project leaders, or classroom-experienced teachers (pp. 84-87). There is a strong plan to provide teacher feedback through interviews, surveys, focus groups, and document reviews (pg. e61). The Management Team, CSU educator preparation faculty, and Governance Council will continue to review data collected and make recommendations to ensure the program is responsive to the needs of the TEAM partners (pg. e87-88).

Weaknesses:

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:

The applicant's partner higher education institution, Chicago State University, is a Minority-Serving Institution (MSI) with over 80% of students designated as racial or ethnic minorities (pg. e17). The applicant is a highly diverse school district with one of the partners documenting 55% Hispanic students and 30% of students are African American (pg. e27). The Teacher Educator Alliance Model (TEAM) is dedicated to targeted outreach to minority populations through a Grow Your Own program, the elimination of hiring bias, addressing attrition concerns through mentoring, and culturally competent support system (pg. e19).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 seeks to address critical shortage areas by recruiting a diverse group of teacher candidates and preparation for them to teach in Early Childhood, Middle School, Special Education, and English language acquisition (pg. e20). There will be systematic audits that review the curriculum, identify existing strengths, address needs and gaps with the new clinical work, and suggest areas for curriculum improvement (pg. e20). New experiential and interdisciplinary courses will be proposed based on the audits that will support the readiness for teachers within the shortage areas (pg. e20). These solid preparatory activities and courses will all be focused on increasing the number of teachers in shortage areas or that will serve underserved students.

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:

The systematic and intentional integration of all SEL topics into academic aspects is a strong approach to supporting the development of the whole child (pg. e22). Students will be engaged to construct their own knowledge of academic topics that will be relevant and meaningful (pg. e22). Rigorous academic inquiry and SEL embedded practices will be part of the curriculum that are supported by research to develop whole child learning and have an impact on psychologically and physically safe schools (pg. e22). TEAM apprentice teachers will address their own personal histories and narratives which will help them address their own biases and support the children in their own classrooms (pg. e22).

Weaknesses:

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:

The applicant proposes that 300 new teachers will be exposed to and engage with diversity, equity, and inclusions with supports through culturally relevant curriculum. The inclusion of DeI into the curriculum in the established grow your own program will support teachers' ability to serve diverse students' sense of holistic development (pg. e23). TEAM participants' professional development will reflect on their own experiences in order to create inclusive, equitable, and unbiased learning environments for all students (pg. e24).

No weaknesses noted.
Weaknesses:
Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority
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.
1.
Supporting the "grow your own" program by recruitment of current students to have an interest in teaching to the high- need students in their home districts, the TEAM approach will incorporate the aspects of DEI and culturally-sensitive classrooms which support the development of the whole child. The program will be not only self-sustaining with 60 new teacher preparation students participating each year, but it is anticipated to continue to attract and retain teachers that can be supported to serve their native communities.
Strengths:

No weaknesses noted.
Weaknesses:
 Score:
Status:

Last Updated:
Submitted
06/03/2022 04:23 PM