

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 02:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The College-Ready Promise (U423A180016)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	33
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	23
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	96
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science</b>		
1. CPP1	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Total</b>	103	96

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 12: 84.423A

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

Applicant: The College-Ready Promise (U423A180016)

## 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 applicant advises, "Building on the lessons we have learned in our teacher effectiveness work and cohorts of schools focused on underserved students, we know that principals develop best in job-embedded, competency-based work focused on the most research-based practices that improve student achievement" (p. e25). Citing research to support the proposals statements, the applicant also advises, "Learning Forward (previously the National Staff Development Council) compiled a list of the qualities effective principals need (Mendels, 2012; see also The Wallace Foundation, 2012). They found that these principals shape a school-wide vision of commitment to high standards; cultivate leadership; focus consistently on improving instruction; and manage people, data, and processes" (pp. e25-26). As the applicant has thoroughly researched best practices for improving principal effectiveness, it is considered the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition. Additionally, studies regarding charter schools are limited. The proposed project is likely to add to the current body of research.

Citing research, each of the qualities of effective principals the project will address is well-described (pp. e26-28). The proposal describes how the proposed project's framework will build capacity in participating principals in each of these areas. It is noted the program will have four different support structures for principals including coaching, Network meetings, Accountability events, and Micro-credentials. The support structures are well-described (pp. e29-33). Professional Development content will be delivered through the micro-credentials. For example, any participant can learn more about a specific area by earning that aligned micro-credential. The integration of micro-credentials provides targeted content woven throughout the face-to face and virtual meetings and onsite coaching. A list of available micro-credentials is provided in Appendix G. A brief mention is made of a duration of "two cohorts of 17 months each" (p. e40). The training or Professional Development services to be provided by the proposed project is found to be of sufficient quality, duration and intensity to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those service.

The proposal has procedures in place to ensure a focus on those with greater needs, "In this project we will be working with charter school districts and schools to improve the effectiveness of principals and an associated leadership team. The biggest equity concern we have is that we will not reach the CMOs and students who most need it." To address this issue the applicant proposes to only recruit schools with at least 60% of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch,

recruit schools with at least 10% of students designated as English learners, advertise with state charter organizations which often reach even smaller schools and districts, travel to remote areas of Texas to recruit participants, and encourage schools to send peoples of color as part of their leadership team (p. e14). Statistics are provided supporting high need demographics in both California and Texas (p. e35). The applicant has selected 80 charter schools within the states of California and Texas. It is expected the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest need.

The proposal states, "The project builds leadership capacity by focusing on English learners, a particularly vulnerable group. As such, the work will be directly impactful for students" (p. e37). The instructional leader on a school campus is the principal. Developing principals' knowledge with regard to this targeted population will have a positive impact. As presented, it is considered the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant advises, "Our current focus builds on the importance of school leadership and includes cohorts of schools in Southern California, San Antonio, Texas, and nationally... Partners AIR and BloomBoard will build on their individual strengths to create a strong, continuously improving system that can be replicated beyond our grant." Along with AIR and BloomBoard, the TCRP will meet quarterly to monitor progress. Aspire Public Schools and Green Dot Public Schools are two of the school districts in Los Angeles (p. e34). AIR is the project evaluator. The applicant also advises, "Additionally, ResponsiveEd, Magnolia Public Schools and Uplift Education are interested in participating in this program (for letters of support, see Appendix C)" (p. e34). Only one letter of support is provided by a Texas school. This statement and the supporting letters of support raises concerns. It indicates not all collaborating partners have been established. More information is needed to determine 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.

**Reader's Score: 33**

#### **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 Federal funding.**
- (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:**

As stated by the applicant, "In this study, we serve 80 schools and approximately 640 school leaders in two geographic regions. This represents over 20,000 students who will directly benefit from improved leadership in their schools. These students will have teachers who are better able to address their needs and create schools that support success." The applicant expects the impact will go beyond the initial 20,000 students (p. e38). The proposed project will be implemented in a large number of charter schools throughout two states, Los Angeles County, California, USA and the State of Texas, USA (p. e6), and statistics are provided supporting high need demographics in both California and Texas (p. e35). The magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially in teaching and student achievement, is considered great.

The applicant presented a solid case supporting the reasonableness of project costs in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. Per the applicant, "This program serves 80 schools and approximately 640 school leaders in multiple geographic areas. The total cost of the services (Total cost minus administrative and evaluation costs) is \$6.15 M, which translates to about \$12,800 per participant for three years or \$4,270 per participant per year." It is noted that, on average, schools spend about \$18,000 per teacher per year on professional development. Rather than provide a one-time professional development, the applicant is planning to provide sustained support for two cohorts of 17 months. The applicant advises "the overall loss of money from students not graduating is about \$4.5 billion in lost wages and lost tax dollars each year, and the graduation rate for English learners is 67% nationally. Studies have shown that each dropout recovered confers a net benefit to taxpayers of \$127,000" (pp. e40-41).

Within the proposal, the applicant advises, "Once a charter school, CMO, or district has gone through the program, the process of principals' using their skills, habits of mind, and continuous improvement cycles will continue. Some of the key people in continuing this work will be the principal coaches." Of importance, the applicant notes, "Since most of the large charter schools already have a budget for principal professional development, the continuation of this training will only be a repurposing of funds with little additional funding needed" (pp. 41-42). Taking into account the possible future need for monies strengthens this proposal. It is considered the project has great potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

A number of methods for disseminating the project results are presented. It is noted materials will be shared on the TCRP website, blog, and other social media (i.e., Twitter and Facebook). Additionally, the project evaluator will, "publish the findings from the evaluation on its website and in peer-reviewed journals. They will also present their findings at conferences, such as the American Educational Research Association (AERA) annual meeting, the National Charter Schools Conference, or the National Principals Conference" (pp. e42-43). 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 is considered more than adequate.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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:**

Three project goals are clearly specified, "Project Goals: 1) Provide research-based training and support to 80 current principals to help them increase their effectiveness with 20,000 students; 2) Create a pipeline of 640 future school leaders trained to be impactful principals; 3) Monitor, evaluate, refine, and disseminate the research-based system used to develop principals and school teams to inform districts and charter schools nationwide" (p. e19). Five outcomes are also clearly specified (p. e19). The project goals are well described and discussed (pp. e40). Corresponding objectives and measures are clearly specified in provided tables (p. e43-45). The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the

proposed project are found to be clearly specified and measurable.

Responsible personnel along with each person's qualifications and defined responsibilities is provided (pp. e44-46). All responsible personnel are qualified. Three tables, one per goal, provide a timeline along with corresponding objectives, staff responsibilities, and milestones (pp. e47-52). The applicant advises, "All partners, including the charter schools, have agreed to the budget and its adequacy to meet the goals and milestones" (p. e52). The management plan is considered more than adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

An implementation plan is provided within the Project Evaluation (pp. e56-58). Based on the plan provided in the Project Evaluation, it is considered procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project are more than adequate.

#### **Weaknesses:**

Within the Project Management text, information regarding planned procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project is minimal. The applicant primarily discusses how they are codifying and learning lessons from 3 previous pilots that are "nearing their end." One statement is made in regard to the proposed project, "For this project, we will have both quantitative data such as principal and teacher retention rates, student test performance, and surveys as well as informal conversations that will inform the current cohort and following cohorts" (p. e52). Referencing the implementation plan within the Management Plan would have strengthened this proposal. It would have provided information as to how the management team would utilize the feedback provided.

**Reader's Score:** 23

#### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

**(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**

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

**Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](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:**

Using a mixed-methods design, the proposed project will be evaluated by an external evaluator. This is a strength; as, external evaluators are experienced and unbiased.

The applicant advises the evaluation will be, “using a school level cluster randomized controlled design. The randomized controlled trial will take advantage of Learning While Leading’s cohort design—half of the 80 participating elementary, middle, and high schools will be randomly assigned to receive program services in January 2019, while the other half will be assigned to receive programming in the summer of 2020.” There are a number of advantages to a cluster randomized design, including meeting What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards without reservations for student achievement outcomes and producing rigorous impact estimates for school-level staff outcomes (p. e53). If well implemented, the methods of evaluation are expected to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

Data sources include “surveys, interviews, classroom observations, administrative data, coaching logs, and program documents” (p.e54). Additional measures include “school climate scores (as ascertained through an annual staff survey), ratings of teachers’ instruction (as measured through observations of teaching), and changes in students’ standardized test scores” (p. e54). Each data source is well described (pp. e55-58). The methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

A table illustrating three research questions and tying them to outcome measures and project objectives is provided (p. e55). In addition, the applicant states, “As described above, ongoing data collection efforts (coaching logs, document reviews, post-event surveys) will be used to track each school team’s progress over time and to provide ongoing feedback to TCRP. Post-event surveys and coaching logs will be collected through online platforms, which will facilitate the aggregation of responses and generation of descriptive statistics” (p. e60). Additionally, the evaluator will create implementation reports after the conclusion of the 2018–19 and 2019–20 school years (p. e60). Multiple forms of data collection are well-described, and a table is provided describing the evaluation implementation measures (pp. e57-59). It is clear the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes cannot be determined without a detailed timeline.

Validity and reliability are addressed and discussed, “As a randomized controlled trial, the study will produce unbiased, valid, and reliable estimates of program impact.” The proposal also discusses the identification of a sufficiently powered sample size for the impact analysis. (pp. e58-59). It is considered validity and reliability have been considered and methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science**

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: Science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

**Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based Professional Development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   07/02/2018 02:21 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2018 01:25 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The College-Ready Promise (U423A180016)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	33
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	23
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	96
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science</b>		
1. CPP1	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Total</b>	103	96

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 12: 84.423A

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

Applicant: The College-Ready Promise (U423A180016)

## 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 proposed project represents an exceptional approach. The applicant is focusing on evidence-based activities, where all were reviewed by WWC with or without reservations, and the studies found statistically significant positive effects on learning outcomes. Principals will learn how to use data analytics for decision-making purposes. The principals will be part of a network of other leaders working on similar issues. The principals will receive one-on-one coaching. The principals will implement job-embedded improvements. All of these activities have been shown by WWC with or without reservations to have a positive effect on student outcomes (page. e24-e25). All of these activities will be delivered with sufficient quality, intensity, and duration, which should lead to improvements in practice among the participants of this program. For instance, as related to one-on-one coaching, the coaches will initially meet with the principal weekly, and if travel is an issue virtual meetings will take place (page, e29-e30). The quality of these activities will be assessed periodically, as the applicant has a thorough plan for implementation fidelity (page, e56). The services will be provided by a number of partners who demonstrated commitment with letters of support provided in the appendices. The applicant also has a management plan to ensure the partners will collaborate in an efficient manner to maximize the effectiveness of the project services. All partners will meet quarterly to monitor progress, assess implementation data, and solve problems if necessary (page, e34). The applicant is specifically focusing on English learners, these students represent 25% of all the students as part of this grant region, but only 4% pass state standardized tests (page, e36). The plan is for these leaders to learn how to use data effectively to target exactly the students who need support, this should allow for more of a targeted approach to improving student learning.

### Weaknesses:

Although the applicant has cited evidence-based studies to support the project design, this could have been strengthened by the applicant providing the specific details related to the effect sizes found with these WWC with or without reservations studies.

### 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 Federal funding.
- (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:

This applicant's proposal is based on WWC with or without standards research studies, where similar outcomes of interests (students' gains) were shown to increase positively (page, e24). The importance of this project is related to the number of students who could benefit, over 20,000. In addition, the possibility of replication is strong, hence, extending the reach to many more students in other states. The applicant provided a reasonable and strong argument why the cost are reasonable, taking into consideration that the overall loss of money to our economy is \$4.5 billion in wages and lost tax dollars when students do not graduate (page, e41). There cost is about \$12,800 per participant for three years. This is very reasonable for professional development dollars if a school is serious about improvements. There are two primary reasons why the potential for the incorporation of the project activities are highly likely after the end of the federal grant. First, continuous improvement should continue because principals will be using their newly acquired skills based on habits of mind. Secondly, the project activities do not contain any proprietary or copyrightable pieces, which means the districts can continue with many of the services once learned (page, e42). The dissemination plan should enable others to use best practices from this project, as it will be available and/or presented in many widely known venues such as American Educational Research Association (AERA) conferences, National Charter Schools Conference, peer-reviewed journals and websites.

#### Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

### 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 on pages e43-e44 provided clearly specified objectives and measurable outcomes. As example of a measureable outcome, train 640 additional school leaders on effective leadership. This outcome can be objectively assessed by the evaluator to determine if it was met. The other outcomes were similarly defined. The applicant provided the qualifications and experience of the project lead and key personnel assigned to this grant, e45-e46. The qualifications and experiences of these key personnel are appropriate based on the number of years cited and previous work experience cited by the applicant. Although not required, the applicant has named an independent evaluator, this will remove any perceived biases. The applicant provided the objectives, staff roles/responsibilities, milestones and timeline which are all appropriate based on the project design. This information was clearly presented (pages, e47-e51). The applicant provided the amount of time the key personnel will be assigned to this grant, and the FTEs are appropriate to ensure quality oversight (page, e206-e210). The applicant plan for continuous improvement is sufficient and should allow for incremental improvements if necessary. The evaluator will create reports after the first year, and these reports will be used to make any adjustments necessary in subsequent years (page, e60).

**Weaknesses:**

It was not clear how the applicant will ensure the objectives will be met on time and within budget. This was not specifically addressed in the grant.

**Reader's Score:** 23

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

**(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**

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

**Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](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 evaluation plan is exceptional, and the analyses of the key outcomes will be based on a randomized control trial (RCT) that will be WWC without reservations. The RCT will be based on a cluster randomized design which has many advantages (page, e53). The outcome measures are provided and are associated with the key variables of interests as related to this project (page, e55). As an example related to student academic achievement, Smarter Balance and STAAR information will be available. These are standardized measures which are both reliable and valid. In addition, the following important evaluation information was provided with clarity, (a) the key evaluation questions which will guide the evaluation (page, e57); (b) the measure/source (page, e57); (c) the stated detectable effect size, based on the sample

sizes the applicant provided for the impact questions related to the teacher and student outcomes (page, e59); (d) type of quantitative analysis for the impact questions was provided. This information is important to determine if an appropriate method will be used to address the nested nature of the data, students-in-classrooms, classrooms-in-schools, and schools-in-districts. The applicant will use an appropriate method, hierarchical linear modeling, and the models were provided and appropriate based on the variables of interest (page, Appendix J). The applicant's discussion related to the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes was sufficient. The applicant has a detailed plan for implementation analysis, and the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes is highly likely given the plan. As stated by the applicant related to implementation data being collected, "These measures will be collected, analyzed, and reported on during the course of Cohort 1 to inform ... improvement efforts" (page, e57).

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science**

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: Science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

**Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based Professional Development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant did not respond to this competitive preference priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not respond to this competitive preference priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/29/2018 01:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2018 05:05 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The College-Ready Promise (U423A180016)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	35	35
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	25
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	100
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science</b>		
1. CPP1	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Total</b>	103	100

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 12: 84.423A

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

Applicant: The College-Ready Promise (U423A180016)

## 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 extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition:

(+7pts) The proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition. The proposed project addresses: Absolute Priority 2: Supporting Effective Principal or Other School Leaders

(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:

(+7pts) The training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project is 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 involves the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(+7pts) 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 is focused on those with greatest needs.

(+7pts) The services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs are evident in this proposal

(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

(+7pts) The design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 35**

**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 Federal funding.
- (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 importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

(+5pts) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project.

(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.

(+5pts) The proposal requests a reasonable amount in relation to the number of persons to be served and 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 Federal funding.

(+5pts) There is potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the Federal funding.

(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.

(+5pts) The dissemination strategy that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

**Weaknesses:**

None.



Reader's Score: 20

### 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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(+9) 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.

(+8) 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.

(+8) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

#### Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 25

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

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

**Note:** Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](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 extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(+5pts) The methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

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

(+5pts) The methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(+5pts) The methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

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

(+5pts) The methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science**

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: Science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

**Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based Professional Development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

**Strengths:**

None.

**Weaknesses:**

Does not address the competitive preference priority of promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, or Math (STEM) Education, With a Particular Focus on Computer Science.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   06/29/2018 05:05 PM