

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 02:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Kansas (U423A180029)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	18
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	103	97

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University of Kansas (U423A180029)

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 cites research supporting the proposed project's approach which is to "develop instructional and transformational leaders whose schools become equitable teaching and learning environments that improve student outcomes." The proposal continues by discussing how the approach to each of the four goals is exceptional as it offers an "Equity Leadership Series" for principals offering coordinated, job-embedded professional learning with their school-based teams along with aligned capacity building support for district leader. The approach also includes portable micro-credentials to demonstrate personal competencies, school-based self-assessment, rigorous external examination of fidelity data, and lastly, a model of practice for training equity leaders for national, widespread dissemination (pp. e24-29). Although the proposed project does not offer a "new or exceptional approach," it is based on current research-based practices. It is expected the project will positively impact high need student achievement, and possibly add to the current body of knowledge.

Professional development (PD) core content consisting of Learning Sessions, Job-Embedded Coaching, Measurement of Progress, Micro-Credentials, and Whole System Engagement is described. The project design ensures intense learning by "starting in the summer and continuing through job-embedded application of techniques and supported engagement with their school-based teams for the duration of two years." Professional Development content is addressed through a "learning session scope and sequence" provided in a table (pp. e29-30). Each content session is thoroughly described (pp. e30-32). A delivery system that includes job-embedded coaching, is well-described (p. e32). The delivery system and content are research-based and effective. It is considered 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.

This project "uses several collaborative structures to maximize effectiveness" including university partnerships, an Advisory Group, dissemination of curated open access resources via an accessible website, and the previously described district engagement (p. e36). Partnering with the applicant are the San Diego Unified (CA), Portland Public Schools (OR), Meridian School District (MS), and Teton County Schools (WY) as external sites. In addition, there are partnerships with higher education institutions located in close proximity to the school districts. These are the University of Southern

California, University of Oregon, Boise State University, and University of Mississippi. (p. e18). The proposed project has been found to involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Per the proposal, the Principal Investigator (PI) selected district superintendents serving concentrations of high need schools. (p. e38). Each district is discussed and statistics are provided supporting a "high needs" status, particularly with regard to low socio-economic status and limited English skills (pp. e39-42). Clearly the proposed project will provide services focused on those with greatest needs.

The proposal advises, "The hands-on learning that will occur while implementing MTSS means Principals will have a deeper understanding of leadership rooted in their own school experience." The job-embedded coaching is expected to provide principals the experience of determining the nature and content of coaching sessions. Coaches will offer on-going communication and feedback throughout the process" (p. e43). It is expected 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 noted.

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:

According to the applicant, based on peer reviewed evidence, "This project aims to increase the positive effect of equity leadership on implementation of MTSS and on student academic outcomes and related behavioral outcomes." The applicant believes the project will result in a statistically significant, positive effect on all students and subgroups in ELA and Math achievement (p. e43). Citing research, the proposal makes a good case. In addition, the variety of locations nationally strengthens this application. It is clear funds will result in student achievement nationally. The magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement is expected to be great.

The proposal explains, "The five year funding request of \$17.2M along with the cost share of \$5.7M equals a total cost of \$22.9M for the proposed service and research, which equates to \$123 per student in the participating districts. The detailed goals, objectives and outcomes anticipate 70 Principals will complete the Equity Leadership Series with secondary development of about 800 district and school-based team members as partners in schoolwide transformation, equating to a total cost of \$26.3K per person. When factoring in a very conservative estimate of 4,000 staff who will attend districtwide professional development events, the cost per person is only \$6K per participant or 22,000 staff who have the opportunity to attend, \$1K per person" (pp. e44-45). As explained, the costs are considered reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

It is noted, "The Equity Leadership Series is designed to build individual equity leadership capacities among Principals, and to develop district staff and school-based teams to sustain and expand equity leadership philosophy and practice in their school culture and as an enduring value in the whole local education system." As proposed, it is expected "sustainability will come from the team approach to transformation, distributed leadership practices embedded in the Equity Leadership Series, and hiring and promotion practices that value equity leadership" (p. e45). 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 is likely.

A variety of methods to disseminate the project's results are listed and described, "The dissemination plan includes broad-based web presence, a social media suite, an e-newsletter, publications in peer reviewed leadership journals and practitioner journals and presentations at national conferences throughout the five-year project" (p. e46). Results of the proposed project will be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Weaknesses:

Although it is likely the purposes, activities, and benefits of the project will continue at the end of Federal funding, there are no provisions discussed should future monies be needed.

Reader's Score: 18

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:

Four project goals are named and well described by the applicant. (p. e23). In addition, five Expected Outcomes are presented (p. e20). An excellent table located in Appendix E links each goal to objectives, measures, and milestones (p. e169). Goals, objectives and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable.

Key personnel are identified and discussed in conjunction with their defined responsibilities (pp. e47-50). CVs for named staff are located in Appendix A. Key personnel are found to be well-qualified. Additionally, the table on page e169 provides a clearly defined timeline for accomplishing project tasks. It is expected the Management Plan will achieve the objectives of proposed project on time and within budget.

A figure is provided in Appendix E illustrating the continuous improvement cycle (p. e167). Procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project are considered adequate.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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/. 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:

An evaluation plan to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards is addressed. The applicant explains, "Summative evaluation will begin with a group randomized control trial using a wait-list design (Coalition for Evidence-based Policy, 2003) to evaluate the effectiveness of the Equity Leadership Series." Schools in each district will be grouped into matching pairs based on prognostic covariates (e.g., school size, serving grade levels)." Procedures regarding baseline equivalence, matched pair randomization, and differences between the immediate implementation and wait-list groups are also well described. Covariate adjustment during analysis will treat remaining imbalances. It is noted "five evaluation studies will produce evidence of effectiveness." Research questions, data sources, variables, and an analysis plan for each study is thoroughly discussed (pp. e51-52). Additionally, the proposal notes, "These research questions, with related analyses offer effectiveness data for establishment of WWC moderate evidence. They also contribute to the overall formative and summative evaluation of project goals, objectives and outcomes" (p. e56). It is clear the evaluator is familiar with the WWC standards and handbook.

Rapid Cycle Improvement (RCI) for systematic and periodic assessment for continuous improvement will be utilized. This will monitor progress "toward intended outcomes and generate action plans which enable adaptation of implementation that may produce more effects within the limited implementation period." The cycle consists of four components of formative evaluation located in Appendix E, Figure 10. The components will "be reviewed and revised quarterly by Co-Directors and the Evaluation & Continuous Improvement Team to ensure that data collected, analyzed and reported are used to guide project activities and ensure intended outcomes are met" (pp. e56-57). It is expected the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Quantitative data collection and analyses is described. For example, "Summative annual state assessments with their previously published content validity and reliability will be used for student level ELA and Math outcomes" (p. e58). In addition, several forms of qualitative data collection are included, such as classroom observations, checklists, activity logs, and focus groups (p. e59). 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.

Issues of reliability and validity are thoroughly addressed. Examples include a discussion of data collected through SWIFT-FIT, which will measure leadership changes at a school level. The applicant cites research and advises the SWIFT-FIT's "average Content Validity Index (CVI) for school features ranges from 0.87 to 1.0, with above 0.78 being adequate when six or more experts rated the items collectively. Experts further independently rated the items and sub-scales as adequate." Construct Validity was also discussed as well as inter-rater reliability. As described in the proposal, inter-rater reliability was addressed through the use of two trained assessors who "concurrently collected SWIFT-FIT fidelity data on randomly selected 20% of the waves of data for each school and computed an Inter-Observer Agreement." (pp. e58-59). The methods of evaluation are expected to provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

Weaknesses:

It appears the project co-directors are the evaluators. This indicates the evaluation will be conducted internally. Internal evaluators are likely to be biased.

Reader's Score: 19

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 02:26 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Kansas (U423A180029)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	103	98

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University of Kansas (U423A180029)

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 project is designed to support 70 highly effective equity leaders (principals) who will serve for more than two years after this grant program. There will be five key professional development activities, all supported by WWC with or without reservation validated researched outcomes that were favorable. The components are learning sessions, job-embedded coaching, measurement of progress using data, micro-credentials and whole system engagement (page, e20). The applicant provided extensive details related to the intensity and duration of each of these activities (page, e29-e35). In reviewing the details, the quality and duration is likely to lead to improvements. As an example of what will be learned during learning sessions, participants will learn how to develop highly effect reciprocal communication which should foster an environment supporting open communication (page, e30). An environment which fosters open communication is essential to the success of any organization. The collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of the project services is highly likely. The applicant has a plan which should allow for effective collaboration. The applicant will have an advisory group of the partners whose primary role is to ensure collaboration (page, e37). To ensure those with the greatest need will be the focus of this project, the Principal Investigator (PI) conducted a needs assessment to determine the match for this project. The districts identified are those with the greatest need. The statistical demographics related to all indicators which support classifying high-need students, were all met. For instance, in one district approximately 60% of the students qualify for free/reduced lunch (page, e39). Given the quality and intensity of the services for this grant, it is highly likely the needs of the target population will be served.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

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:

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, e43). As stated by the applicant, "...we can confidently predict" (page, e43) that learning outcomes will increase as part of this project. This confidence is based on the fact that these services are directly related to other studies where the results were favorable and validated by WWC. Given this, the importance of this project and likelihood of seeing improvements in teaching and learning are high. The cost per student is approximately \$123, which is more than reasonable especially given the high likelihood of success (page, e44). Sustainability will be achieved because district leaders will shadow and eventually take the lead over this project, and the applicant will work with the district to build the same qualities of this project into their hiring and promotion systems (page, e45). The dissemination plan should enable others to use best practices from this project, as it will be available and/or presented in many venues such as a web presence, a social media suite, e-newsletter, and publications in peer-reviewed leadership journals, practitioner journals, and presentations at national conferences (page, e46).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

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:

The applicant in Appendix E provided clearly specified objectives and measurable outcomes. The details of the objectives, measurable outcomes and timeline were exceptional. As an example of a measurable outcome, by the end of Year 1, 100% of districts will establish a district-level leadership team to support Equity Leadership. A district capacity assessment will be used to measure this outcome. 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. 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. 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 in Table 6. 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, Table 6. The procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement is adequate. The applicant has a well-articulated formative evaluation. The applicant will use a Rapid Cycle Improvement, based on monitoring progress toward the stated outcomes, and then generate action plans for any implementation changes (page, e56).

Weaknesses:

It was also not clear how the applicant will ensure the objectives will be met on time and within budget. While the applicant provides a statement that a member of the management team will ensure tasks are accomplished on time and within budget, the application does not provide the specifics on how this would be accomplished (page, e47).

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/. 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 analyses of the key outcomes will be based on a randomized control trial design (RCT) that will meet WWC without reservations. The applicant will use matched pair randomization to balance the treatment and control groups to meet baseline equivalence (page, e52). The outcome measures are provided and are associated with the key variables of interests as related to this project (page, e52-e56). In addition, the following important evaluation information was provided with clarity: (a) the key evaluation questions which will guide the evaluation (page, e52-e56); (b) the measure/source (page, e52-e56 and Appendix H); (c) 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; (d) type of quantitative analysis for the impact questions was provided (page, e53). 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. HLM is an appropriate method; and (e) The applicant included the power analysis which determined the sample size and minimum detectable effect size (MDES) for the treatment and control group (Appendix F). Finally, for all of the instruments used to measure the outcomes of interests for this project, the applicant provided the reliability measures. Based on the numbers provided for reliability, the evaluation will provide reliable performance data on the relevant outcomes.

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 04:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Kansas (U423A180029)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	103	98

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: University of Kansas (U423A180029)

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 Absolute Priority 2: Supporting Effective Principal or Other School Leaders (page e60) or priorities established for the competition. (Pages: e23-29); clearly articulated goals. Incorporates/awards principals with micro-credentials.

(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 sufficient in duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. (Pages e29-36). Clearly articulated 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 involves the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. (Pages e36-37); identifies key partnerships across universities and school districts across five states.

(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. (Page e39-42); clearly identifies schools with the greatest need.

(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 address the needs of the target population or other identified needs. The design of the proposed project is appropriate to the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (Page e42-43)

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, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement were identified. (Pages e43-44); provide references and research pertaining to the impact that good leadership has on increasing 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.

(+5pts) The costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (Page e44-45); budget funds several key collaborators across several states. Explanation of costs per student and staff seems reasonable.

(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 proposed projects state ways in which the results are to be disseminated that do enable others to use the information or strategies. (Page e46); incorporates key state and national education groups.

Weaknesses:

(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.

(+4pts) 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 is presented. (Page e45); assumes district will incorporate learned strategies after funding ends.

Reader's Score: 19

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.

(+8pts) The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are specified and measurable. The proposed project stated the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved. (Pages e46-47) Appendix E

(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.

(+8pts) 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 was adequately accomplished. (Pages e47-40); incorporates a variety of teams and an Advisory Group comprised of "national stakeholders, equity organizations and family/community stakeholders."

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

(+8pts) The procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project were adequately identified. (Page e51; Page e157 -Appendix E, Figure 10)

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 24

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/. 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 produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook. (Page e51-53)

(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. (Pages e56-57); Rapid Cycle Improvement used for periodic assessment of four components of formative evaluation, and a logic model will be used to serve as a roadmap to track short and long-term 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. (Pages e57-58)

(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. (Pages e58-60)

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 04:48 PM