

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2017 04:51 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: XAVIER UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA (U423A170036)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Significance		
1. Significance	15	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Support for Personalized Learning Environments		
1. CPP 2	3	0
Total	108	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 8: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: XAVIER UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA (U423A170036)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.

(5) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

1. The applicant proposes to recruit, prepare, and develop 862 highly effective, culturally competent teachers from diverse backgrounds to serve in high-need New Orleans public schools (e12). The applicant states New Orleans will need to hire between 700 and 900 teachers annually by 2020, up to 40% from 2010. The applicant states existing project cannot continue without funding. The applicant states it will support multiple and varied pathways to teaching, NOLA EP partners will build on their particular areas of expertise to get New Orleans the teachers that it need, while providing high-quality development opportunities (e26).

2. The applicant states 80% of TFA teachers are considered top-quartile teachers, with results that place them within the top 25% of state teachers teaching similar subjects (e34). The applicant states TNTPs teachNOLA fellows are high performers, with almost 50% of them outperforming the statewide average, as compared to 39% of other first year teachers around the state (e34). The applicant articulates after the teachers complete either the Xavier, Loyola, or Relay's program, they will have a Master of Arts in Teaching and certification in their chosen field.

3. The applicant proposes to collaborate with national talent providers Teach For America Greater New Orleans (TFA), The New Teacher Project (TNTF), and Relay Graduate School of Education (Relay), two local universities, Loyola and Xavier, to ensure teachers receive ongoing coaching grounded in observation and feedback (e26-29). The applicant states that each program will work to recruiting, training and developing teachers, especially those of color and those from diverse backgrounds (e28).

4. The applicant states it will ensure alignment with new state requirements regarding teacher training (e39). The applicant states their project will help address the teacher shortage for New Orleans public schools, which threatens achievement. The applicant states the grant partners will work with public charter schools in New Orleans, which will service students in partner schools that are comprised of 50% -80% economically disadvantaged students. The applicant states 92% of public school students are people of color and 82% are black. Additionally, 35% of black families live in poverty, in comparison to 12% of white families. Regarding academic achievement, 25% of students of color in New Orleans have earned Mastery on states exams, in comparison to 47% for white peers. The applicant cites relevant

research that states culturally responsive pedagogy and positive racial identity can play major roles in promoting academic achievement, specifically for people of color.

5. The applicant states 82% of New Orleans public school students are black with 49% of teachers identified as black (e23). Therefore, the applicant proposes a project will address the needs of the target population, in that they plan to address achievement gaps related to cultural competence relating to race and bias (e25). Additionally, the applicant states 26% of students are performing at proficiency level in the target schools, thus teachers who accelerate learning faster are important in ensuring students stay on track (e41). The applicant states the implementation of their project in the partner schools have shown to be effective at raising student achievement(e41).

Weaknesses:

1. None noted
2. None noted
3. None noted
4. None noted
5. None noted

Reader's Score: 40

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and Student Achievement.

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

(3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the grant.

(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

1. The applicant describes project outcomes such as 862 highly effective teachers and 80% of teachers prepared by the NOLA Educator Project Partners will be teaching in New Orleans public schools for at least two years. Additionally, these teachers will serve 66% of public school students, 100% of whom attend schools with high concentrations of high-need students (e44). The project will also help solve the issue of filling teacher gaps in decentralized districts.

2. The applicant states it will work with the school district to reduce the need for outsourcing and outside philanthropy (e45-46). The applicant states the Orleans Parish School Board, regulate but not manage, current agencies for teacher training. The applicant states the partners in the grant will act as de facto recruitment, preparation and training for public schools, at an average cost of \$19,505 per teacher by Year 3, for 862 teachers.

3. The applicant states partners will use this project will support effective teachers, promote diversity, and strengthen cultural competency in the educator workforce and the partners will use the results to improve the ongoing programs at their organizations, locally and nationally (e46). The applicant states their partners will use this data to enhance and improve pre-service training, field experience assignments, course content, and coaching/mentoring support for current and future participants to ensure stronger outcomes for students.

4. The applicant states the NOLA EP will provide a venue for each residency partner to share strategies for building and sustaining high-quality programs and develop programs for their undergraduate teaching program to be compliant (e39). The applicant states Xavier and Loyola will share their findings with other universities and colleges of education seeking to do similar work across the country. The applicant states TFA, TNTP, and Relay, will share their results with other regions within their organizations that are pursuing similar strategies. Additionally, the applicant will disseminate their findings in publish white paper, blog posts and Education Cites.

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant states several of the partner schools will be using this grant, if funded, to continue services, but failed to provide pre and post evaluative data regarding student achievement and teacher efficacy. The applicant did not provide data to illustrate the correlation between teacher residency and student achievement in the partnering schools that are continuing their efforts to recruit, develop and train highly effective teachers.
2. No weaknesses noted.
3. No weaknesses noted.
4. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (1) **The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**
 - (2) **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.**
 - (3) **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

1. The applicant presents goals and objectives with measurable outcomes. The applicant aligns project objectives with staff responsibilities and milestones (e136-146). As example, the applicant states TNTP, will administer assessments which will provide actionable feedback to teachers throughout time in the program to drive student outcomes (e42).
2. The applicant states Xavier University will be responsible for project design and implementation. The applicant NSNO will lead project monitoring, work with the evaluator on formative and outcome evaluations, and facilitate collaboration on recruitment (e49). The applicant states Loyola will solicit feedback from candidates and mentor teachers and modify course objectives, content and activities over the life of the grant.
3. The applicant states students who complete Xavier's MAT program will be required to complete a mandatory university exit survey. The applicant states TFA commits to continuous feedback cycles with all constituents to improve programming (e51).

Weaknesses:

1. None noted
2. The applicant fails to provide time commitments of the project staff. It is unknown if the time committed to project is

reasonable to achieve project objectives.

3. The applicant fails to provide specific timeline for feedback from partners. The applicant fails to provide a specific timeframe for collecting information regarding project goals and objectives.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook 3.0: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>; and (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations" to the list of evaluation resources: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

1. The applicant states McREL International will be the external evaluator for the project. The external evaluation will focus on both implementation and outcome evaluation with the goal of identifying key components of NOLA EP and assessing fidelity of implementation and impact on proximal and distal outcomes (e146). The applicant states partner organizations will use formative evaluation results to improve program implementation each year of the grant. Additionally, the evaluation will examine changes in participant cultural competence, culturally responsive teaching practices, and performance (e53).

2. The budget and narrative presented in the application (e164-e169) are appropriately aligned with the project and matches the management plan. The applicant states 165 schools will be measured in the treatment and comparison groups. The applicant states it will examine the professional practice and student outcomes scores separately to analyze impact on both (e55). Additionally, the applicant states to determine and sample an appropriate comparison group for the treatment group, propensity score matching will be used (e57). The Evaluators will match treatment schools with non-participating schools in Louisiana based on school-level Compass and School Performance Score prior to the intervention, as well as school type and pupil-teacher ratio (e57).

3. The applicant states it will employ a school-level quasi-experimental matched comparison design to assess the effects of NOLA EP for school-level teacher and student performance. The applicant states McREL will meet monthly with NOLA EP partners to facilitate ongoing communication about evaluation activities, provide interim, annual, and final reports on fidelity and project outcomes and assist with and track federal 524b reporting annually (e51).

Weaknesses:

1. None noted
2. None noted
3. None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to address both of the following priority areas:

(a) Providing educator development activities designed to improve cultural competency and responsiveness skills that contribute to an inclusive school culture; and

(b) Improving the recruitment, support, and retention of educators from diverse backgrounds.

Applicants must respond to both of the priority areas in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

a. The applicant proposes to increase the student achievement in New Orleans public schools with high concentrations of high need students by recruiting, preparing and developing culturally competent teachers from diverse backgrounds (e21). The applicant proposes to implement cultural competence and culturally responsive pedagogy learning through various required courses. Students in Relay Graduate School of Education recruit, prepare, and develop over the course of the grant (e28). Additionally, students in Loyola's Masters of Art in Teaching program must take a Multiculturalism and Social Justice course that focus on teaching, learning, and student relationship contexts (e30).

b. The applicant states Xavier University will build recruitment to enroll a diverse cohort of teachers in NCFTR. The applicant states 78% of the initial cohort identify as people of color. The applicant states recruitment strategies will include preference for New Orleans natives, in addition to recruiting black, Latino/a and Vietnamese residents to serve (e28). The applicant states it will support efforts to retain teachers from diverse set of backgrounds including potential residents for success on Praxis exams to eliminate class-based barriers to entry and build strong relationships between relationships and mentors (e28).

Weaknesses:

- a. None noted
- b. None noted

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Support for Personalized Learning Environments

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to support teachers, principals, or other School Leaders implementing personalized learning environments in their classrooms or in classrooms in their schools, using data to inform their instruction, and increasing students' engagement, voice, and choice in their learning. Projects may support educators' implementation of college and career ready strategies such as project based learning, competency based education, or blended learning.

Strengths:

None noted

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address this criterion.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2017 04:51 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2017 03:43 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: XAVIER UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA (U423A170036)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Support for Personalized Learning Environments		
1. CPP 2	3	0
Total	108	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 8: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: XAVIER UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA (U423A170036)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.

(5) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

Several aspects of the proposed project demonstrate exceptional approaches to the Absolute Priority established for this competition. Through collaboration with 2 institutions of higher education and 3 nonprofit teacher talent agencies the proposed project will significantly (a) increase the number of highly effective, credentialed or certified teachers in high needs schools; (b) motivate the enrollment of new teachers and incentivize existing educators by offering varied educator degree or certificate programs through teacher residencies, university programs and summer institutes; (c) present a uniquely innovative and replicable model to other school districts of the benefits to educators, school districts and students of merging nonprofit educator organizations with Institutions of Higher Education; and (d) appropriately addresses the need for educator training in culturally responsive behaviors and instructional practices (pg. e21-22).

The applicant convincingly demonstrates that the training or professional development services provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. The quality, intensity and duration of training vary by partner focus. For example, Xavier students engage in a two year MA program with a full year residency prior to full time employment (pg. e27). The Relay teacher residents work within the school environment immediately with weekly supervised sessions with faculty and classmates (pg. e28). The Loyola University provides teaching certificates in grades 6-12 with on-site residencies, competency based skill development and coaching (pg. e29). Specific content and requirements, by each partner demonstrate sufficient quality, intensity and duration is included in the project design (Appendix A4).

The applicant provides compelling evidence that the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. For example, the applicant delineates the diversity and uniqueness of its partners approaches to educator and workforce development (teacher residencies, university residences, credentialing through summer institutes and in-classroom practicum experiences). These approaches maximize services to educators who may not choose the traditional route to obtaining a teaching degree or educator credential. Partners provide financial incentives for minority students through Federal Pell grants, reduced tuition and/or financial loans as well as to provide financial advisors to students throughout their enrollment in the program. The effort provides a streamlined system to recruit and retain highly effective, minority educators by giving

preferential hiring to residents (pg. e).

The applicant provides compelling evidence that the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs. The project provides the applicant alternatives to strategies currently employed within the target schools. The effort introduces the schools to a mentoring-coaching program for teachers embedded with professional development and training in culturally responsive practices and attitudes, opportunities for novice teachers to transition from theoretical to practical learning and opportunities for educators to participate in alternative pathways to achieve career objectives. The strategies are promising given each strategy targets specific outcomes that address needs within the State and targeted schools (e.g., lack of highly effective, minority educators in high needs schools, the demand for culturally responsive instructional practices and teacher retention. Addressing the need for high effective educators will result in improved academic outcomes for minority students at risk for educational failure, pg. e21-25).

To a great extent the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. For example, the applicant provides evidence of the need for effective minority teachers in classrooms with low income minority student populations. Currently only 26% of students meet proficiency levels. To address this deficit, project partners will measure and track teacher effectiveness through principal evaluations, classroom observation surveys (pg. e41), evidence of effectiveness on a culturally-responsive framework (pg. e42), progress in mastering key teaching skills and techniques (pg. e42), Praxis scores, onsite observations and planning, classroom management and other relevant factors that contribute to effective teaching practices (pg. e43).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 40

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and Student Achievement.

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

(3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the grant.

(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and Student Achievement, are far reaching and will significantly impact the students and educator pool. For example, 862 educators will impact a student population of 32,452 underachieving students in 55 schools across the city (pg. e44). A project of this magnitude will ultimately address the lack of Latino, African American and Asian educators in high needs schools.

To a moderate extent the costs are reasonable in relation to the number persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. For example, responsibilities for ensuring an adequate pool of effective teachers becomes the responsibility of the partners involved in this project and represents a cost savings to the district (pg. e45). In addition, the budget (Appendix) and pg. e12 include the provision of subsidized tuition costs and stipends for program participants which also suggests that costs are reasonable in relation to the numbers of teachers who will be served by the project.

There is great potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the grant. For example, the applicant will build upon and incorporate effective strategies from project participants (teachers, coaches, mentors, etc.) into existing program trainings (pre-service, course content, coaching/mentoring support, etc. pg. e46). In so doing, project effectiveness can be replicated after the Federal funding ends.

The applicant provides comprehensive evidence of its intent to ensure the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies on a local and national level (pg. e47). The applicant includes a frequency for dissemination of project effectiveness. For example, publication of articles, presentations at conferences, blog posts and social media will occur 4 times per year (pg. e47-48). Once annually for the three years of the grant, the applicant will conduct presentations in collaboration with Education Cities (pg. e47) and partners will visit at least one teacher training program and develop a white paper during the grant funded period (pg. e48). Such large scale dissemination efforts ensure that the benefits derived from the project can be used to facilitate effective teacher training programs throughout the nation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**
 - (2) 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.**
 - (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The applicant presents a comprehensive Logic Model (Appendix A3) that documents the inclusion of project goals, activities, outputs, short term objectives and long term outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. The project includes partner-specific management plans that delineate how activities will be implemented and measured (Appendix A3). For example, a major goal of this project is to recruit and train educators. Each partner has outlined a measurable objective and activities to achieve this goal. For example, Teach for America will train 100 first year teachers each year of the grant for a total of 300 highly effective teachers; TNTP will recruit and train 75-100 first year teachers, Xavier will train 25 residents in Year 1 and Relay will recruit and train 50 residents. The management plan is sufficiently detailed to ensure successful implementation of the proposed activities to achieve the desired results.

The applicant provides detailed, descriptive and comprehensive information demonstrating that the management plan will achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. Partners have delineated individualized timelines that outline the objectives, staff responsible, and milestones. Partner organizations are responsible for implementation of project activities and have provided Resumes attesting their qualifications (Appendix B2). Project tasks are explicitly stated in Appendix B3 of the application.

The procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project are

comprehensive. Examples include mandatory exit surveys (Xavier); bimonthly faculty observations (Relay) to guide organizational decisions. Loyola and Teachers for America will solicit feedback from candidates, mentor teachers and alumni. TNTP will collect participant surveys throughout the year to inform establishment of goals for continuous improvement. In addition, the partners maintain an internal evaluation team (pg. e50) to monitor project progress. It is highly probable these efforts will ensure feedback and continuous improvement of the effort.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide evidence of the amount of time key personnel for each project would designate to project activities which is essential when determining if they have allocated sufficient time to implement key objectives leading to expected outcomes.

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook 3.0: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>; and (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations" to the list of evaluation resources: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

The applicant provides convincing evidence that the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The results of the formative assessments delineated in the Logic Model will inform project participants of the effectiveness of the proposed strategies and activities and provide feedback to inform on-going efforts (pg. e51-52. Summative evaluation will employ a quasi-experimental design to examine the actual versus projected results of the project for the short and long term (pg. e52).

The project includes 6 relevant research questions that examine the changes in the level of cultural competence, cultural responsiveness and performance of minority educators in high needs schools. The applicant provides adequate methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes. For example, a quasi-experimental design will be used to assess formative and summative data using treatment and comparison groups in 55 schools (pg. e54-55).

The applicant presents useful information to demonstrate that the evaluation will produce evidence about the project's

effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations (pg. e54-59).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to address both of the following priority areas:

(a) Providing educator development activities designed to improve cultural competency and responsiveness skills that contribute to an inclusive school culture; and

(b) Improving the recruitment, support, and retention of educators from diverse backgrounds.

Applicants must respond to both of the priority areas in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a quality response to this competitive preference priority. For example, through the partner collaborations, educator participants are enveloped in a canopy of supportive strategies, training and professional development designed to improve cultural competence and responsiveness skills that contribute to an inclusive school culture. For example, in-classroom, on-site coaching, reflective practice and instructional practice skill development is provided by Teach for America and Teach NOLA and TeachNOLA (TNTP) pg. e30. Descriptions of the professional development provided is included in the goals, objectives, partner description of services and outcomes (Appendix A3). All partners include strategies for improving the recruitment, support, and retention of educators from diverse backgrounds as depicted in the Logic Model (AppendixA3).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Support for Personalized Learning Environments

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to support teachers, principals, or other School Leaders implementing personalized learning environments in their classrooms or in classrooms in their schools, using data to inform their instruction, and increasing students' engagement, voice, and choice in their learning. Projects may support educators' implementation of college and career ready strategies such as project based learning, competency based education, or blended learning.

Strengths:

The applicant did not respond to the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to the competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2017 03:43 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/08/2017 02:31 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: XAVIER UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA (U423A170036)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	40	40
Significance		
1. Significance	15	13
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	21
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Support for Personalized Learning Environments		
1. CPP 2	3	0
Total	108	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 8: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: XAVIER UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA (U423A170036)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. 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:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.

(5) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

The exceptional approach for this project is related to the partners and their history in working together to produce highly effective teachers. The partners have more than 40 years of producing high quality teachers, pg. e34. As related to one of the partners of this grant, 80% of their teachers are considered in the top-quartile of teachers, with approximately 50% of these teachers outperforming the statewide average on a measure of teaching effectiveness. In addition, the applicant provided evidence based research as related to the effectiveness of all the partners which are part of this grant, pg. e34. The components of the program in Table 1, is sufficient in quality and intensity, pg. e24. The components have already resulted in significant student achievement, see Appendix A4. The collaboration of the partners is planned. The lead applicant will act as the lead facilitator and will meet quarterly with all partners to monitor progress, problems and share best practices, pg. e38. Based on the statistics provided in Appendix A1, the applicant is clearly focusing on those students with the greatest need. In addition, given that the applicant has already been successful in raising the achievement outcomes of these students with the greatest need, there is no reason to believe they will not continue to be successful, pg. e34-e35. Finally, and most importantly, the applicant's project design is directly related to a cited WWC with moderate evidence study, pg. e36. The applicant provided information related to the moderate evidence study and explained how their project is similar. For instance, the intervention will involve, (a) an induction training for teachers; and (b) ongoing observations and feedback coaching. These are similar interventions used in the cited WWC moderate evidence study, pg. e36.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified

Reader's Score: 40

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and Student Achievement.

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

(3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the grant.

(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant provided evidence based research as related to the effectiveness of all the partners which are part of this grant, pg. e34. Therefore, the outcomes likely to be achieved are highly probable. The applicant provided a sufficient discussion as related to why the costs are reasonable in relationship to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits, pg. e45. The cost will be approximately \$19,000 per teacher candidate. This cost is reasonable based on the outlined services and outcomes to be provided. In addition, the applicant put this number in a context associated with a comparison to the cost of replacing teachers in districts serving a similar profile of students. The applicant has a plan for the incorporation of the project activities beyond this federal grant. The partners will use all of the learnings that will be generated, to improve the ongoing programming at their respective organizations, pg. e46. The plan for dissemination of the results is strong. All of the partners will work with an already identified non-profit, with the specific purpose of this non-profit disseminating the results. This non-profit has an already extensive network for the purpose of dissemination to the appropriate outlets interested in this type of research, pg. e47. Finally, and most significant as stated by the applicant as related to the importance of this effort, "...a national proof point by creating a partnership for how teacher recruitment, preparation, and development partners can collaborate to meet teacher pipeline needs in decentralized districts" pg. e44. It will take a village to improve the state of k-12 public education in the US.

Weaknesses:

Given that many of the partners have worked together in the past with a proven track record. The significance section could have been strengthened by the applicant providing data, related to the current teachers in their program and those successes and failures.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) 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.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant provided the qualifications and experience of the key personnel assigned to this grant, Appendix B2. The experience and education are appropriate to lead a grant of this size. The lead applicant has significant experience with federal grants. In Appendix B3, the applicant goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable. Also, in Appendix B3, the applicant included clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing the

project tasks.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not discuss how they would ensure the proposed project would be on time and within budget. As stated in sub-criterion C.2, the applicant must discuss and ensure how the proposed project will be on time and within budget. Another area of concern was the amount of time the project lead and key personnel will be assigned to this grant. The FTE for these key positions was not provided, without this information, it is difficult to determine if the time will be sufficient and provide the needed reasonable resources for this grant.

Reader's Score: 21

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook 3.0: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>; and (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations" to the list of evaluation resources: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

The applicant will utilize an external evaluator with proven experience in evaluating grants of this magnitude. Utilizing an external evaluator is important to remove any perceived biases as related to the evaluation of the grant. The evaluation plan is based on a quasi-experimental design with appropriate matching. The applicant discussed their plan to collect formative and summative data with the purpose to improve the project plan throughout the grant period and to assess the overall project at the end of the grant period, pg. e49-e50. This information will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress. In addition, the following important evaluation information was provided with clarity, (a) the key evaluation questions which will guide the evaluation; (b) the measure/source; and (c) data collection timing and frequency of the collection of data. Finally, the applicant provided other key evaluation information, (a) the stated detectable effect size, based on the sample sizes the applicant provided for the impact questions related to the teacher and student outcomes; (b) the types of quantitative analyses which will be used to answer the appropriate evaluation/research questions, a multilevel model analysis will be used which is necessary given the nested data of students-in-classrooms, classrooms-in-schools, and schools-in-districts, pg. e51-e59. Finally, the applicant provided the reliability indices for many of the measures that will be used on pg. e56.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to address both of the following priority areas:

(a) Providing educator development activities designed to improve cultural competency and responsiveness skills that contribute to an inclusive school culture; and

(b) Improving the recruitment, support, and retention of educators from diverse backgrounds.

Applicants must respond to both of the priority areas in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The applicant plan for improving cultural competency as related to sub-criterion (a) is provided throughout the application for each partner specifically. There will be several partners contributing to this effort. As an example of one of the partners, their students will be required to take a Multiculturalism and Social Justice course focusing on race, class, as related to classroom teaching and learning for students of color. As related to sub-criterion (b), the applicant provided a detailed discussion related to the recruitment, support, and retention of educators from diverse backgrounds throughout the grant. One of the partners, Teach for America, the primary goal is to recruit students of color, pg. e31.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Support for Personalized Learning Environments

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to support teachers, principals, or other School Leaders implementing personalized learning environments in their classrooms or in classrooms in their schools, using data to inform their instruction, and increasing students' engagement, voice, and choice in their learning. Projects may support educators' implementation of college and career ready strategies such as project based learning, competency based education, or blended learning.

Strengths:

This competitive preference priority was not addressed by the applicant.

Weaknesses:

This competitive preference priority was not addressed by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/08/2017 02:31 PM

