

Grow Your Own Teacher

Competitive Grant Program

For North Dakota EPPs





**North Dakota Grow Your Own Program for
K-12 Teachers**
Request for Applications (RFA)

North Dakota Department of Public Instruction | September 15, 2023

Application Due Dates:
October 25, 2023

AGENDA

Part 1: Application Highlights

Part 2: Technical Response

Part 3: Application and Scoring Scenarios

Part 4: Submission Logistics

Part 5: Q + A



Part 1

Application Highlights

NDDPI Grow Your Own Competitive Grant Summary



North Dakota Grow Your Own Program for K-12 Teachers

Request for Applications (RFA)

North Dakota Department of Public Instruction | September 15, 2023

Application Due Dates:

October 25, 2023

- 10 pre-screened North Dakota EPPs are eligible to apply for this **competitive grant**.
- NDDPI plans to award \$1M this round of the grant program, in increments of **\$100,000 awards per cohort proposal**. EPPs may (and are encouraged to) apply for multiple cohort proposals.
- Candidates are **employed as full-time paraprofessionals** (or in a similar student-facing position) and work towards a bachelor's, master's, or post-baccalaureate licensure.
- EPPs should be prepared to enroll aspiring educators to **begin in January 2024**, and all programming must be **completed by June 30, 2026**, at the latest.
- Programs must meet all requirements of a **registered apprenticeship**.



Application Overview

Mandatory Requirements

1. Contact Information
2. LEA Partner Information
3. Statement of Degree, Certification, and Pathway Length
4. Statement of Agreement to Scope of Services
5. Statement of Approval to Certify
6. LEA Letter(s) of Support
7. Program Start and End Date
8. No Cost to Participants
9. Minimum One-Year of Residency Period
10. Online Coursework
11. Progressive Wage Schedule

Technical Response Items

1. LEA Partners
2. Participant Seats
3. Budget and Budget Narrative
4. Program Design
5. Program Activities and Courses
6. Details of Residency Model
7. Mentor Support
8. EPP-LEA Partnerships
9. Wraparound Supports
10. Science of Reading

Part 2

Technical Response

Technical Response

The applicant must address all technical response items and provide, in sequence, the information requested. The evaluation team members will evaluate the responses and assign a score to each item using the rubric below.

1 **LEA Partners:** Provide the applicant's full list of proposed LEA partners.

2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points
Applicant proposes to partner with 1 LEA.	Applicant proposes to partner with 2 LEAs.	Applicant proposes to partner with 3-4 LEAs.	Applicant proposes to partner with 5+ LEAs.

2 **Participant Seats:** Please provide the following:

- 1) A count of the number of participant seats that will be offered to each LEA partner for the proposed GYO program. Note: number of seats offered to each LEA can vary and should be based on size and need of LEA(s).
- 2) A count of the total number of seats offered to all LEA partners for the proposed GYO North Dakota grant program.

0 points	Sliding scale, max 19 points
Item is not addressed or is incomplete	Score = (number of total participants applicant can support within proposed budget / maximum number of total participants supported across all applications received) x 19

3 **Budget and Budget Narrative:** Submit a proposed budget (using the attached Appendix A: Budget Template), and an accompanying budget narrative. The budget must be annualized for each year of the program(s) and must categorize all proposed costs for the program(s). *Note: The budget should reflect total funds requested for all proposed programs. However, the budget narrative should clearly describe a breakdown per \$100,000 grant award, for the instance in which a proposal is partially funded. The budget narrative should include a detailed breakdown of participant costs, fees, mentor stipends, etc.*

0 points	1 point	3 points	5 points
The item is not addressed.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, but items are poorly detailed, contain several errors, and/or do not clearly align to stated program goals.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, but items are somewhat lacking in detail, contain errors, and/or only somewhat align to stated program goals.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, and items are well detailed, contain no errors, and are clearly aligned to stated program goals.

4

Program Design: Provide a description of intended program design. At a minimum, this description must outline the following:

- 1) How was the vision for the GYO program developed? What process was used to incorporate input from students, educators, paraprofessionals, and cultural liaisons in the community?
- 2) How did the applicant determine the proposed certification field(s) that will be offered? How was this determination based on the current needs, data trends, and existing talent pools within the partner LEA(s)?
- 3) Outline the candidate recruitment, screening, and selection process. Please also outline minimum qualifications for participants, including any HR requirements from the district. Who is the intended recruitment and talent pool for this program, and what degrees or credentials must intended participants currently possess in order to be eligible for the program (e.g., current education assistants with associate’s degrees, education assistants with a bachelor’s degree, or STEM professionals with at least a bachelor’s degree who are seeking a career change)?

0 points	2 points	4 points	8 points
The item is not addressed.	<p>The response thoroughly addresses one of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses two of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND/OR</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses all three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>

Technical Response

Technical Response

5

Program Activities and Courses: Provide a timeline of program activity and intended course schedule. This response should include, at a minimum:

- 1) Descriptions of how courses will be delivered (online, hybrid), and an outline of when courses will be offered (synchronous/asynchronous)
- 2) Course descriptions and full course schedule for the proposed GYO program, including number of credit hours for the degree

0 points	2 points	4 points	7 points
The item is not addressed.	Timeline and course schedule are unclear or incomplete, or two of the required components are missing or lacking in sufficient detail.	Timeline and course schedule are complete, but one of the required components is missing or lacking in sufficient detail.	Timeline and course schedule are complete, and all of the required components are provided in sufficient detail.

6

Details of Residency Model: Provide a description of the residency and 1-year minimum clinical internship model to be employed during the program. At a minimum, this response must outline the following?

- 1) How will participants gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the course of the grant?
- 2) How will cooperating teachers be chosen and paired?
- 3) What evaluation process will be established to provide feedback to participants throughout the program?

0 points	2 points	8 points	15 points
The item is not addressed.	<p>The response thoroughly addresses one of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses two of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses all three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>

Technical Response

7

Mentor Support: Outline how the applicant will develop and implement a mentoring program to support para-to-teacher participants throughout the duration of the program. Each participant must be assigned to a high-quality mentor teacher. This mentoring program must be developed in collaboration with the applicant's partner LEA(s), including representative administrators and cooperating teachers, and it must explain in detail how the program will be delivered to support emerging teachers. This plan must include:

- 1) Measurable objectives aligned to the InTASC teaching standards
- 2) Program activities
- 3) Timeline to complete the activities
- 4) Identification of staff involved in delivery of the program
- 5) Plans to evaluate and measure successful completion of the program by the apprentice
- 6) Budget for delivery of the mentoring program

0 points	4 points	9 points	15 points
The item is not addressed.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies 4-5 of the required components.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies all 6 required components, but some details of the plan are unclear or unconvincing.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies all 6 required components. Response reflects a high-level of collaboration with the partner LEA(s). Response is provided in clear and sufficient detail. The mentoring plan is highly likely to be successfully implemented and lead to positive outcomes for participants.

8

EPP-LEA Partnerships: Provide a description of the respective partnership roles between the applicant and the partner LEA(s). Please specify which parties are responsible for which elements of the program.

0 points	2 points	4 points	7 points
Item is not addressed	Narrative is incomplete and/or lacks a clear outline of responsibilities for each party.	Narrative is complete and includes a clear outline of responsibilities for each party, but lacks some level of detail describing responsibilities of each party in managing specific elements of the grant program, including recruitment, selection and placement of candidates, etc.	Narrative is complete and includes a clear outline of responsibilities for each party, with a high level of detail describing responsibilities of each party in managing specific elements of the grant program, including recruitment, selection and placement of candidates, etc.

9

Wraparound Supports: Describe in detail the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the EPP will offer to participants to ensure success during their completion of the program. Please provide the certification exam pass rates of participants from similar programs your institution has administered in the past. Outline what wraparound supports you provided to those participants and how supports for this GYO program would compare.

0 points	2 points	5 points	8 points
The item is not addressed.	<p>Narrative provides a poor level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are low or average, relative to other applicants.</p>	<p>Narrative provides a high level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are average, relative to other applicants.</p>	<p>Narrative provides a high level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants to ensure success both during and after their completion of the program. Narrative provides a clear outline of how support will be differentiated based on the experiences of the participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are high, relative to other applicants.</p>

10

Science of Reading: Outline how your program would promote understanding of the Science of Reading within all participants.

0 points	2 points	5 points	8 points
The item is not addressed.	<p>Applicant provides a poorly detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the “Science of Reading.”</p>	<p>Applicant provides a moderately detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the “Science of Reading.” Description lacks specificity around how the “Science of Reading” will be embedded.</p>	<p>Applicant provides a highly detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the “Science of Reading.” Description includes a high level of specificity around how the “Science of Reading” will be embedded within coursework for all participants.</p>

Part 3

Application and Scoring Scenarios

Application Scenarios: Considerations

LEA Partner(s): With which LEAs will you partner? What are their local priorities and needs?

Candidate Profile: What are the experiences and needs of the LEA's target candidates?

Capacity: Given an award amount of \$100,000, how many candidates can you support per cohort? What is your capacity to support multiple cohorts (and therefore apply for multiple awards)?

Pathway: What degree(s) and license(s) will you offer candidates? Consider the below pathways:

- Associate's degree/some college credit → bachelor's degree + initial licensure
- Bachelor's degree → master's degree + initial licensure
- Bachelor's degree → post-baccalaureate licensure

Certification Areas: In what area(s) will candidates be credentialed upon completion of the GYO program?

Scenario 1: EPP#1 has a strong relationship with three LEAs. From needs analysis surveys of each of the LEAs, the EPP knows that there are teacher shortages in secondary mathematics and secondary science. From discussions with HR leadership in each of the LEAs, the EPP knows there are many current paraprofessionals with associate's degrees (~60 credit hours), who have already demonstrated interest in becoming future STEM teachers.

It leverages Pell Grant funds to drive down costs to \$8,333 per candidate. The EPP has the capacity to run two cohorts of twelve participants each, both beginning in January 2024. One cohort will pursue secondary mathematics, while the other will pursue secondary science. Coursework will be delivered in online/hybrid modalities. The EPP submits one application for two cohort programs, and it will receive a combined total of \$200,000 if both program proposals result in award.

Application Scenario

EPP #1

Proposal 1

- **Candidate Profile:** Paraprofessionals with associate's degree (~60 credit hours)
- **Partner LEAs:** 3 partner LEAs
- **Capacity:** 12 candidates total (\$8,333 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Bachelor's degree and initial licensure pathway
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online/hybrid
- **Certification areas:** Single certification in secondary mathematics

Proposal 2

- **Candidate Profile:** Paraprofessionals with associate's degree (~60 credit hours)
- **Partner LEAs:** 3 partner LEAs
- **Capacity:** 12 candidates total (\$8,333 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Bachelor's degree and initial licensure pathway
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online/hybrid
- **Certification areas:** Single certification in secondary science

Scenario 2: EPP #2 has an innovative online master’s degree program that allows it to reach anyone in North Dakota. Candidates can earn credentials in Secondary Social Studies or Secondary English through the online program, as well as dual certification in K-12 Special Education. It advertises this program to all North Dakota LEAs and develops partnerships with 7 of them. In total, the EPP submits five project proposals within its single application, for which it would receive \$500,000 if all awarded.

Application Scenario
EPP #2

Proposal 1

- **Candidate Profile:**
Career-changing professionals with bachelor’s degree
Partner LEAs: 7 LEAs across the state
- **Capacity:** 15 candidates total (\$6,667 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Master’s degree and initial licensure
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online
- **Certification areas:** Secondary Social Studies and Special Education certification

Proposal 2

- **Candidate Profile:**
Career-changing professionals with bachelor’s degree
Partner LEAs: 7 LEAs across the state
- **Capacity:** 15 candidates total (\$6,667 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Master’s degree and initial licensure
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online
- **Certification areas:** Secondary Social Studies and Special Education certification

Proposal 3

- **Candidate Profile:**
Career-changing professionals with bachelor’s degree
Partner LEAs: 7 LEAs across the state
- **Capacity:** 15 candidates total (\$6,667 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Master’s degree and initial licensure
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online
- **Certification areas:** Secondary English and Special Education certification

Proposal 4

- **Candidate Profile:**
Career-changing professionals with bachelor’s degree
Partner LEAs: 7 LEAs across the state
- **Capacity:** 15 candidates total (\$6,667 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Master’s degree and initial licensure
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online
- **Certification areas:** Secondary English and Special Education certification

Proposal 5

- **Candidate Profile:**
Career-changing professionals with bachelor’s degree
Partner LEAs: 7 LEAs across the state
- **Capacity:** 15 candidates total (\$6,667 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Master’s degree and initial licensure
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online
- **Certification areas:** Secondary English and Special Education certification

Scenario 3: EPP #3 offers full teacher licensure (but not a degree) in special education for individuals who have a bachelor's degree in an area other than education. Individuals can enroll in the program at any time, beginning as early as January 2024. EPP #3 reaches out to 10 different LEAs who are willing to employ candidates as paraprofessionals once they enter the program. Those LEAs cast a wide-net of potential applicants, primarily recruiting from parents and community members, and 6 of them are able to guarantee candidates for EPP #3. In total, the EPP submits one application with 6 partner LEAs, 3 project proposals in total, for which it would receive \$300,000 if all awarded.

**Application
Scenario**
EPP #3

Proposal 1

- **Candidate Profile:** Current paraprofessionals, school-based staff, and community members with bachelor's degree
- **Partner LEAs:** 6 partner LEAs
- **Capacity:** 12 candidates total (\$8,333 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Post-baccalaureate licensure
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online
- **Certification areas:** K-12 Special Education

Proposal 2

- **Candidate Profile:** Current paraprofessionals, school-based staff, and community members with bachelor's degree
- **Partner LEAs:** 6 partner LEAs
- **Capacity:** 12 candidates total (\$8,333 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Post-baccalaureate licensure
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online
- **Certification areas:** K-12 Special Education

Proposal 3

- **Candidate Profile:** Current paraprofessionals, school-based staff, and community members with bachelor's degree
- **Partner LEAs:** 6 partner LEAs
- **Capacity:** 12 candidates total (\$8,333 per candidate)
- **Pathway:** Post-baccalaureate licensure
- **Coursework Delivery:** Online
- **Certification areas:** K-12 Special Education

Scoring Scenarios

Scenario A

- Capacity: Low
- EPP Program Quality: High
- Clinical Experience Quality: Low

Scenario B

- Capacity: High
- EPP Program Quality: Low
- Clinical Experience Quality: Low

Scenario C

- Capacity: Medium
- EPP Program Quality: Medium
- Clinical Experience Quality: Medium

Which will score highest?

Scoring Scenario A

Capacity:
Low

EPP Program Quality:
High

Clinical Experience
Quality:
High

1	LEA Partners	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points
	<i>Capacity</i>	Applicant proposes to partner with 1 LEA.	Applicant proposes to partner with 2 LEAs.	Applicant proposes to partner with 3-4 LEAs.	Applicant proposes to partner with 5+ LEAs.
2	Participant Seats	0 points	Sliding scale, max 19 points; 2.85 points earned		
	<i>Capacity</i>	Item is not addressed or is incomplete	<p>Score = (number of total participants applicant can support within proposed budget / maximum number of total participants supported across all applications received) x 19</p> <p>Applicant will support 3 candidates. Let's assume that the maximum number of candidates offered by all applications is 20. This would give this application a raw score of $3/20 = 0.15$. For the adjusted score, we get $0.15 \times 19 = 2.85$.</p>		
3	Budget and Budget Narrative	0 points	1 point	3 points	5 points
	<i>Capacity</i>	The item is not addressed.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, but items are poorly detailed, contain several errors, and/or do not clearly align to stated program goals.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, but items are somewhat lacking in detail, contain errors, and/or only somewhat align to stated program goals.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, and items are well detailed, contain no errors, and are clearly aligned to stated program goals.
4	Program Design	0 points	2 points	4 points	8 points
	<i>EPP Program Quality</i>	The item is not addressed	<p>The response thoroughly addresses one of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses two of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses all three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>

Scoring Scenario A

Capacity:
Low

EPP Program Quality:
High

Clinical Experience
Quality:
High

5	Program Activities and Courses <i>EPP Program Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	4 points	7 points
		The item is not addressed.	Timeline and course schedule are unclear or incomplete, or two of the required components are missing or lacking in sufficient detail.	Timeline and course schedule are complete, but one of the required components is missing or lacking in sufficient detail.	Timeline and course schedule are complete, and all of the required components are provided in sufficient detail.

6	Details of Residency Model <i>Clinical Experience Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	8 points	15 points
		The item is not addressed.	<p>The response thoroughly addresses one of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses two of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses all three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>

7	Mentor Support <i>Clinical Experience Quality</i>	0 points	4 points	9 points	15 points
		The item is not addressed.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies 4-5 of the required components.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies all 6 required components, but some details of the plan are unclear or unconvincing.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies all 6 required components. Response reflects a high-level of collaboration with the partner LEA(s). Response is provided in clear and sufficient detail. The mentoring plan is highly likely to be successfully implemented and lead to positive outcomes for participants.

Scoring Scenario A

Capacity:
Low

EPP Program Quality:
High

Clinical Experience
Quality:
High

8	EPP-LEA Partnerships <i>Clinical Experience Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	4 points	7 points
		Item is not addressed	Narrative is incomplete and/or lacks a clear outline of responsibilities for each party.	Narrative is complete and includes a clear outline of responsibilities for each party, but lacks some level of detail describing responsibilities of each party in managing specific elements of the grant program, including recruitment, selection and placement of candidates, etc.	Narrative is complete and includes a clear outline of responsibilities for each party, with a high level of detail describing responsibilities of each party in managing specific elements of the grant program, including recruitment, selection and placement of candidates, etc.
9	Wraparound Supports <i>EPP Program Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	5 points	8 points
		The item is not addressed.	<p>Narrative provides a poor level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are low or average, relative to other applicants.</p>	<p>Narrative provides a high level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are average, relative to other applicants.</p>	<p>Narrative provides a high level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants to ensure success both during and after their completion of the program. Narrative provides a clear outline of how support will be differentiated based on the experiences of the participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are high, relative to other applicants.</p>
10	Science of Reading <i>EPP Program Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	5 points	8 points
		The item is not addressed.	Applicant provides a poorly detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the "Science of Reading."	Applicant provides a moderately detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the "Science of Reading." Description lacks specificity around how the "Science of Reading" will be embedded.	Applicant provides a highly detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the "Science of Reading." Description includes a high level of specificity around how the "Science of Reading" will be embedded within coursework for all participants.

Score: 74

Takeaway: A high-quality program and high-quality clinical experience with low capacity may be an overall average application.

Scoring Scenario B

Capacity:
High

EPP Program Quality:
Low

Clinical Experience
Quality:
Low

1	LEA Partners	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points
	<i>Capacity</i>	Applicant proposes to partner with 1 LEA.	Applicant proposes to partner with 2 LEAs.	Applicant proposes to partner with 3-4 LEAs.	Applicant proposes to partner with 5+ LEAs.
2	Participant Seats	0 points	Sliding scale, max 19 points; 19 points earned		
	<i>Capacity</i>	Item is not addressed or is incomplete	<p>Score = (number of total participants applicant can support within proposed budget / maximum number of total participants supported across all applications received) x 40</p> <p>Applicant will support 20 candidates. Let's assume that the maximum number of candidates offered by all applications is 20. This would give this application a raw score of 20/20 = 1.0. For the adjusted score, we get 1.0*19 = 19.</p>		
3	Budget and Budget Narrative	0 points	1 point	3 points	5 points
	<i>Capacity</i>	The item is not addressed.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, but items are poorly detailed, contain several errors, and/or do not clearly align to stated program goals.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, but items are somewhat lacking in detail, contain errors, and/or only somewhat align to stated program goals.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, and items are well detailed, contain no errors, and are clearly aligned to stated program goals.
4	Program Design	0 points	2 points	4 points	8 points
	<i>EPP Program Quality</i>	The item is not addressed.	<p>The response thoroughly addresses one of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses two of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses all three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>

Scoring Scenario B

Capacity:
High

EPP Program Quality:
Low

Clinical Experience
Quality:
Low

5	Program Activities and Courses <i>EPP Program Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	4 points	7 points
		The item is not addressed.	Timeline and course schedule are unclear or incomplete, or two of the required components are missing or lacking in sufficient detail.	Timeline and course schedule are complete, but one of the required components is missing or lacking in sufficient detail.	Timeline and course schedule are complete, and all of the required components are provided in sufficient detail.
6	Details of Residency Model <i>Clinical Experience Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	8 points	15 points
		The item is not addressed.	<p>The response thoroughly addresses one of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses two of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses all three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>
7	Mentor Support <i>Clinical Experience Quality</i>	0 points	4 points	9 points	15 points
		The item is not addressed.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies 4-5 of the required components.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies all 6 required components, but some details of the plan are unclear or unconvincing.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies all 6 required components. Response reflects a high-level of collaboration with the partner LEA(s). Response is provided in clear and sufficient detail. The mentoring plan is highly likely to be successfully implemented and lead to positive outcomes for participants.

Scoring Scenario B

Capacity:
High

EPP Program Quality:
Low

Clinical Experience
Quality:
Low

8	EPP-LEA Partnerships <i>Clinical Experience Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	4 points	7 points
		Item is not addressed	Narrative is incomplete and/or lacks a clear outline of responsibilities for each party.	Narrative is complete and includes a clear outline of responsibilities for each party, but lacks some level of detail describing responsibilities of each party in managing specific elements of the grant program, including recruitment, selection and placement of candidates, etc.	Narrative is complete and includes a clear outline of responsibilities for each party, with a high level of detail describing responsibilities of each party in managing specific elements of the grant program, including recruitment, selection and placement of candidates, etc.
9	Wraparound Supports <i>EPP Program Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	5 points	8 points
		The item is not addressed.	<p>Narrative provides a poor level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are low or average, relative to other applicants.</p>	<p>Narrative provides a high level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are average, relative to other applicants.</p>	<p>Narrative provides a high level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants to ensure success both during and after their completion of the program. Narrative provides a clear outline of how support will be differentiated based on the experiences of the participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are high, relative to other applicants.</p>
10	Science of Reading <i>EPP Program Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	5 points	8 points
		The item is not addressed.	Applicant provides a poorly detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the "Science of Reading."	Applicant provides a moderately detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the "Science of Reading." Description lacks specificity around how the "Science of Reading" will be embedded.	Applicant provides a highly detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the "Science of Reading." Description includes a high level of specificity around how the "Science of Reading" will be embedded within coursework for all participants.

Score: 65

Takeaway: A high-capacity program that is otherwise low-quality is an overall average-to-low scoring application.

Scoring Scenario C

Capacity:
Medium

EPP Program Quality:
Medium

Clinical Experience
Quality:
Medium

1	LEA Partners	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points
	<i>Capacity</i>	Applicant proposes to partner with 1 LEA.	Applicant proposes to partner with 2 LEAs.	Applicant proposes to partner with 3-4 LEAs.	Applicant proposes to partner with 5+ LEAs.
2	Participant Seats	0 points	Sliding scale, max 19 points; 14 points earned		
	<i>Capacity</i>	Item is not addressed or is incomplete	<p>Score = (number of total participants applicant can support within proposed budget / maximum number of total participants supported across all applications received) x 40</p> <p>Applicant will support 15 candidates. Let's assume that the maximum number of candidates offered by all applications is 20. This would give this application a raw score of 15/20 = 0.75. For the adjusted score, we get 0.75 *19= 14.25.</p>		
3	Budget and Budget Narrative	0 points	1 point	3 points	5 points
	<i>Capacity</i>	The item is not addressed.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, but items are poorly detailed, contain several errors, and/or do not clearly align to stated program goals.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, but items are somewhat lacking in detail, contain errors, and/or only somewhat align to stated program goals.	EPP provides both a budget and budget narrative for the program, and items are well detailed, contain no errors, and are clearly aligned to stated program goals.
4	Program Design	0 points	2 points	4 points	8 points
	<i>EPP Program Quality</i>	The item is not addressed	<p>The response thoroughly addresses one of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses two of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses all three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response reflects a program designed with multiple meaningful opportunities for input from stakeholders.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The response reflects that certification areas were determined based on concrete data and an awareness of existing talent pool within partner LEA(s).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The response outlines a clear and detailed selection process that is fair to all applicants and maximizes participation.</p>

Scoring Scenario C

Capacity:
Medium

EPP Program Quality:
Medium

Clinical Experience
Quality:
Medium

5	Program Activities and Courses <i>EPP Program Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	4 points	7 points
		The item is not addressed.	Timeline and course schedule are unclear or incomplete, or two of the required components are missing or lacking in sufficient detail.	Timeline and course schedule are complete, but one of the required components is missing or lacking in sufficient detail.	Timeline and course schedule are complete, and all of the required components are provided in sufficient detail.
6	Details of Residency Model <i>Clinical Experience Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	8 points	15 points
		The item is not addressed.	<p>The response thoroughly addresses one of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses two of the three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND/OR</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>	<p>The response thoroughly addresses all three parts of the question.</p> <p>The response clearly outlines how participants will gradually take on more instructional responsibility over the grant. AND</p> <p>The response reflects a clear process for choosing and pairing cooperating teachers. AND</p> <p>The response reflects a consistent and transparent feedback process to ensure candidate growth throughout the program.</p>
7	Mentor Support <i>Clinical Experience Quality</i>	0 points	4 points	9 points	15 points
		The item is not addressed.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies 4-5 of the required components.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies all 6 required components, but some details of the plan are unclear or unconvincing.	Response outlines a plan that satisfies all 6 required components. Response reflects a high-level of collaboration with the partner LEA(s). Response is provided in clear and sufficient detail. The mentoring plan is highly likely to be successfully implemented and lead to positive outcomes for participants.

Scoring Scenario C

Capacity:
Medium

EPP Program Quality:
Medium

Clinical Experience
Quality:
Medium

8	EPP-LEA Partnerships <i>Clinical Experience Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	4 points	7 points
		Item is not addressed	Narrative is incomplete and/or lacks a clear outline of responsibilities for each party.	Narrative is complete and includes a clear outline of responsibilities for each party, but lacks some level of detail describing responsibilities of each party in managing specific elements of the grant program, including recruitment, selection and placement of candidates, etc.	Narrative is complete and includes a clear outline of responsibilities for each party, with a high level of detail describing responsibilities of each party in managing specific elements of the grant program, including recruitment, selection and placement of candidates, etc.
9	Wraparound Supports <i>EPP Program Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	5 points	8 points
		The item is not addressed.	<p>Narrative provides a poor level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are low or average, relative to other applicants.</p>	<p>Narrative provides a high level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are average, relative to other applicants.</p>	<p>Narrative provides a high level of detail around the academic, career, and certification preparation support plan that the applicant will offer to participants to ensure success both during and after their completion of the program. Narrative provides a clear outline of how support will be differentiated based on the experiences of the participants.</p> <p>Past certification exam pass rates are high, relative to other applicants.</p>
10	Science of Reading <i>EPP Program Quality</i>	0 points	2 points	5 points	8 points
		The item is not addressed.	Applicant provides a poorly detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the "Science of Reading."	Applicant provides a moderately detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the "Science of Reading." Description lacks specificity around how the "Science of Reading" will be embedded.	Applicant provides a highly detailed description of how coursework offered as part of the proposed GYO program will provide participants with adequate training in the "Science of Reading." Description includes a high level of specificity around how the "Science of Reading" will be embedded within coursework for all participants.

Score: 81

Takeaway: A well-rounded application is necessary for a competitive application.

Scoring Scenarios

Scenario A: 74

- **Capacity:** Low
- **EPP Program Quality:** High
- **Clinical Experience Quality:** Low

Scenario B: 65

- **Capacity:** High
- **EPP Program Quality:** Low
- **Clinical Experience Quality:** Low

Scenario C: 81

- **Capacity:** Medium
- **EPP Program Quality:** Medium
- **Clinical Experience Quality:** Medium

Takeaway: A well-rounded application is necessary for a competitive application.

Part 4

Submission Logistics

Submission Guidelines

Page Limit and Formatting: There is no minimum or maximum page or word limit for individual questions or for the entire application. Applicants are encouraged to respond to each question thoroughly but concisely. Standard formatting conventions of 1-inch margins and 11–12-point font are encouraged.

Submitting an Application: EPP applicants must submit all application materials, via email, to Assistant Superintendent Laurie Matzke at dpiasstsupt@nd.gov by 11:59 p.m. Central Time on October 25, 2023. Paper copies of this application will not be accepted. Applicants should follow all instructions as outlined in the “Steps to submitting an application” section below.

Applicants must only submit one application to the NDDPI for consideration. However, EPPs may submit (and are encouraged to submit) more than one project proposal as part of their single application and therefore may receive more than \$100,000 in total. EPPs who wish to submit more than one program proposal should follow the submission instructions outlined in Appendix C.

Steps to submitting an application:

- 1) Address all application components in sequential order.
- 2) Clearly label each section (i.e., mandatory, technical, budget).
- 3) Ensure it is clear to which item each response corresponds.
- 4) Save application as a single PDF.
- 5) Submit a PDF copy of the application, via email, to dpiasstsupt@nd.gov.

Application Schedule

Event	Time	Date
Pre-Bid Meeting		September 11, 2023
Request for Applications Released		September 15, 2023
Questions Due	11:59 p.m.	September 22, 2023
Questions Addressed by NDDPI		September 27, 2023
Application Deadline	11:59 p.m.	October 25, 2023
Notice of Contract Award		November 27, 2023
Proposed Contract Start Date **		January 1, 2024

*Note: all questions should be submitted to the email address dpiasststupt@nd.gov.

**Note: All contract signature deadlines and proposed contract start dates are tentative and subject to all final approvals once grant awards are determined.

Part 5

Q + A