

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S425B200028)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	20
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	35
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	25
Sub Total	80	80
Total	80	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - FY20 REM - 5: 84.425B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S425B200028)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Highest Coronavirus Burden

1. A: Highest Coronavirus Burden (up to 20 Points)

(2) The extent to which the applicant has a high coronavirus burden based on indicators and information factors identified by the applicant in response to Application Requirement 3. (up to 20 points)

Strengths:

Sub criterion 1: High coronavirus burden (20/20 points)

The applicant demonstrates a high coronavirus burden based on indicators and information factors identified by the applicant.

The applicant provides comprehensive data and details to indicate they have a very high coronavirus burden. For example, on page e22, the applicant documents: New York State ranks first in terms of total COVID-19 positive cases recorded in the U.S., NY has more than two times as many cases as the next hardest-hit state, and NY has unemployment claims since March as 1,294% higher than one year prior.

The applicant also documents numerous other important factors on page e23 that indicate they demonstrate a high coronavirus burden that directly impacts students. For example, 48% of their essential workers have children living in the home and they cannot stay at home to help them navigate remote learning. In the fall, if students return to school, learning gains will be much lower in reading and math than in a typical school year.

On page e24, the applicant describes the impact of the quality of remote learning on students. For instance, high-quality remote learning will result in 3-4 months of learning loss by January 2021, while low quality remote learning will have 7-11 months of learning loss and no form of instruction will result in 12-14 months of learning loss. Importantly, the applicant also notes how the shift will make the problem 15-20% worse for low-income students and students of color. The applicant also states that economically-disadvantage students are more likely to be reviewing material instead of learning new concepts during remote learning.

Just as importantly, the applicant thinks about the parents of the students. They conducted a poll and found that 89% of parents are most concerned that their children will fall behind academically as a result of coronavirus (e25).

For all of these reasons, the coronavirus burden is very high and that is why the applicant appropriately plans a TRLE that focuses on the human capital aspect of rethinking education using teachers and educational leaders to effectively implement remote learning for students (e21).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services and Project Plan

1. B: Quality of Project Services and Project Plan (up to 35 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of project services and project plan.

In determining the quality of the project services and project plan, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (up to 5 points)

In addition, the Secretary considers--

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is an exceptional approach to absolute priority being addressed and includes a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority. (up to 10 points)

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project to respond to the needs of students. (up to 10 points)

(3) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (up to 5 points)

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (up to 5 points)

Strengths:

Equal access and treatment for participants who have been underrepresented
(5/5 points)

The applicant provides multiple ways they intend to provide equal access and treatment for participants who have been underrepresented. The application begins with the GEPA 427 statement on pages e10-e14 and highlights the barriers and ways they will overcome the barriers for underrepresented participants. The applicant includes a project plan with rapid infusion of capacity-building resources for teachers and educational leaders to help them advance remote instruction for vulnerable students and students with disabilities, English language learners, and economically disadvantaged students (e18). The applicant also highlights comprehensive ways they have looked at and analyzed data to take underrepresented participants into account and consideration in planning their project (e37).

Sub criterion 1: Exceptional approach with Detailed project plan (10/10 points)

The applicant provides a clear, exceptional approach with a detailed project plan. The applicant has a goal in mind to provide 190,222 teachers and education leaders with 450,000 hours of professional support to implement effective remote/hybrid teaching and learning practices. The plan is to reach over 1.9 million NY students and to make the professional learning resources available to other educators around the country (e49). It is a highly efficient and effective model because it focuses on investing in the teachers and understands that by using them as a vehicle and training them this is the surest and fastest way to improve student learning outcomes. This model gives the biggest bang for the buck because by training the teachers, they will want to continue teaching and will be able to transfer these skills to future projects and for future needs that pertain to educating students. In this way, the investment is sustained over time.

The plan provides evidence that they have taken families into consideration by surveying them to find out that 95% of them want more regular contact with or access to their child's teacher and as a result they plan for TRLE to make developing strong educator-family connections in remote/hybrid learning a key element of professional learning (e26).

The applicant also includes three phases and numerous details and descriptions about each of the phases of the project plan. The plan is feasible and includes an external evaluator to document action research and identify most effective practices and prepare for the next phase. The plan shows that results from one phase help determine the actions steps in the next phase (Appendix 6A Logic Model). The plan also provides research-based evidence guiding the work (e41-42).

Sub criterion 2: Gaps identified and addressed to respond to needs of students (10/10 points)

The applicant identifies and responds to gaps to meet the needs of students (e101). The applicant identifies economic gaps and gaps for student learning and as a result TRLE will first focus on developing and disseminating professional learning resources in the following areas (e29-e33):

shifting to teaching online, families as partners, students with disabilities, English language learners/ multilingual learners, culturally-responsive sustaining education, and social emotional learning.

Sub criterion 3: Services will expand across remote learning and improve student outcomes (5/5 points)

The applicant demonstrates that services will expand across remote learning and improve student outcomes. To do so, the applicant includes a description of their services such as Field-initiated Action Research by teachers and educational leaders to address problems of practice, and problems of practice, effective practices, and core competencies. The applicant also describes specific details about the QRT framework aligned to the NYC teaching standards, and PLEs (e33-35). Finally, the applicant describes in detail their reasoning (e40-42) and ways they will improve student outcomes by presenting Appendix 6G (e104-106).

Sub criterion 4: Services reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice (5/5 points)

The applicant provides services that reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices. The applicant provides knowledge about a variety of effective practices and exactly how they will be using them in the project plan. For instance, they describe that through action research teachers and educational leaders will identify and address key problems of practice related to remote and hybrid learning within the context of their current learning environments through PLCs. Action research also requires teachers to engage parents and students in solving the problems and fosters authentic partnerships which are critical to the success of remote/hybrid learning environments. Also, the applicant intends to use trained PLC facilitators to help incorporate the voices and experiences of parents and students (e33). The applicant offers numerous services that reflect exactly on knowledge about research and effective practices.

Overall, the applicant outlines project services and a project plan that is complete with clear and specific intentions, ideas that flow logically, activities that in different sections are consistent with one another, and activities that are consistent with current, accepted knowledge and ideas in the field.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources

1. C: Quality of the Management Plan and Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers--

- (1) 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. (up to 5 points)**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (4) 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. (up to 10 points)**

Strengths:

Sub criterion 1: Plan is on time, within budget with defined responsibilities, timelines, milestones for accomplishing tasks (5/5 points)

The applicant provides a plan that is on time, within budget with defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing tasks. For example, TRLE will be managed by a Project Leadership Team made up of a multi-disciplinary group of NYSED staff as well as chiefs of the entities hired as contracts/partners. The PLT will meet monthly and as needed to make recommendations and produce deliverables (e42). The application also includes detailed descriptions of work and letters from the partners and contractors, as well as the main team members. The team is well thought out and the fact that they have such a strong team in place with a goal and mission is very promising. The application is organized as far as defining responsibilities and getting the right people involved in the project and services required to make this successful. They also appropriately lay out the two extra hires they will need for the team and the details about what the hires will need to do. There will also be an outside evaluator who will be measuring data, defined milestones and outcomes (e43-45).

The applicant documents an organizational chart (e107), Gantt chart detailing specific people and the milestones they are responsible for measuring (e108-110), outlines who the letters of support come from (e112), and includes the letters of support in the application.

The applicant includes the budget and timeline with milestones that make sense for accomplishing the project tasks.

Sub criterion 2: Proposed funds will support project (5/5 points)

The applicant provides a solid budget with proposed funds that will support and tie directly to the needs of the project. For instance, the personnel, fringe, supplies, and travel expenses are smaller and make good sense with the needs listed in the proposed plan. The applicant has contractual spend listed over three years at [REDACTED] which is the bulk of the money and that is going for the teacher training, deployment of resources, and the contractors that will be needed to help with the training on curriculum and such. This makes sense because it is a one-time, long-term investment in teachers that improves student outcomes and family engagement during hybrid/remote learning (e6).

Sub criterion 3: Costs are reasonable in relation to objectives, design, and significance of project (5/5 points)

Costs are very reasonable and that is clear because the applicant has broken down the costs line item by line item and described them in specific detail in the budget narrative. The objectives, design, and significance of the costs in relation to the project therefore make sense (e168-173). For instance, the Rapid Deployment of resources is highest in Year 1 to help the students being impacted the most by COVID immediately. The costs for Field Based Action Research, Development the QRT Framework, PLEs, and other supports for teachers specific to instruction and for teachers to gain skills in remote instruction will cost a large sum of money in Year 2 and less in Year 3. Also, the evaluator costs and subject-matter experts costs stay consistent each year which makes sense because they can be contracted out ahead of time.

Sub criterion 4: Costs are reasonable in relation to number of people served and anticipated results (10/10 points)

The costs are quite reasonable and even low in relation to the number of people served and anticipated results. It is anticipated that nearly 200,000 teachers will learn how to teach effectively during remote learning so that nearly 2M students will learn and grow during the pandemic and so that families will feel supported. The cost per student is [REDACTED], or [REDACTED] per educator, or [REDACTED] per hour in coaching and only 5% of the costs are going towards administrative costs (e111).

The cost per student is actually much less than [REDACTED] when you take into consideration that this curriculum and the work of the teachers in New York can be utilized by teachers across the nation just as was done with EngageNY.

Overall, the applicant outlines a management plan and use of resources that are complete with clear and specific intentions, ideas that flow logically, activities that in different sections are consistent with one another, and activities that are consistent with current, accepted knowledge and ideas in the field.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S425B200028)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	20
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	29
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	23
Sub Total	80	72
Total	80	72

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - FY20 REM - 5: 84.425B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S425B200028)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Highest Coronavirus Burden

1. A: Highest Coronavirus Burden (up to 20 Points)

(2) The extent to which the applicant has a high coronavirus burden based on indicators and information factors identified by the applicant in response to Application Requirement 3. (up to 20 points)

Strengths:

- 20 Points
- The applicant provided ample data to show the impact Coronavirus has had on state
"New York State is in the 81st to 100th percentile"
"384,5000 people in New York have tested positive for Coronavirus"
"New York State ranks first in total positive COVID cases" page (e22).
- The applicant also provided information regarding how COVID has impacted education across the state of NY (Page e23). Having and including such detailed information is important for a few reasons. First, it proves the real impact of COVID on education and student groups. Second, it highlights the loss of learning that has taken place as well as what schools will need to do to catch students up in the coming school years. Third, this data provides insights on the percentage of students that will have challenges accessing remote learning opportunities and the further inequities that could arise from that challenge. This data will allow the applicant and its respective leaders to address these concerns in a strategic way.
- The applicant specifically addresses how COVID will affect the state's most vulnerable populations (Page e23).
- The applicant provided a thorough analysis regarding how COVID affected specific student populations by race and the overall hardest hit counties (Page e101).

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses noted – the applicant provided substantial information and data within this section. The applicant's response was thorough, comprehensive, and provided a very detailed depiction of how Coronavirus affected their state.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services and Project Plan

1. B: Quality of Project Services and Project Plan (up to 35 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of project services and project plan.

In determining the quality of the project services and project plan, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented

based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (up to 5 points)

In addition, the Secretary considers--

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is an exceptional approach to absolute priority being addressed and includes a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority. (up to 10 points)

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project to respond to the needs of students. (up to 10 points)

(3) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (up to 5 points)

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (up to 5 points)

Strengths:

Equal Access and Treatment/Quality of project services and project plan – The applicant outlined project services to ensure support for underrepresented communities. The applicant has ranked all 62 counties and outlined how it plans to support underserved populations within those communities (Page e37) Further, the details and analysis on pages e10-13 provided foundational context that strengthened the application. - 4 points

(1) – The applicant provided specific information regarding the TRLE plan to support students and families. The applicant provided a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority (Page e28). The applicant did a thorough job of including key stakeholders such as teachers, families, students with disabilities, ELLs, and others. – 8 points

(2) – The applicant addressed how the project will close gaps in services, infrastructure, and other key areas for the plan to be successful. Phase Two of the applicant’s process mentions using Informed Professional Learning Tools & Resources to close aforementioned gaps and learn from field experience (Page e34). The applicant also provided an in-depth analysis of counties and related needs of each (Page e101) 8 points

(3) – The applicant provided sufficient evidence to support that the proposed project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improved student outcomes. The applicant provided specific objectives, data, metrics, and evidence-based practices to ensure progress of the project (Page e40) - 4 points

(4) – The applicant provided a number of insights from research and up-to-date best practices – 5 points

Weaknesses:

Equal Access and Treatment/Quality of project services and project plan: The applicant may consider adding additional metrics to track progress for the underserved communities by race, income, and other demographic factors.

(1) – The applicant may consider including performance measures for years Y1 and Y2 (Page e104). Adding these measures would further strengthen the application and ensure consistent growth and communication throughout the grant.

(2) – The applicant may consider back-up plans to close gaps and weaknesses in service delivery if their original options don’t work as planned. Clarify if teachers will be doing action research throughout all three years.

(3) – The applicant may consider including all of the stakeholders that will lead each of these services to provide a better understanding of responsible parties and expected outcomes.

(4) – N/A – the applicant provided comprehensive research and evidence based best practices.

Reader's Score: 29

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources

1. C: Quality of the Management Plan and Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers--

- (1) 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. (up to 5 points)
- (2) The extent to which the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project. (up to 5 points)
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (up to 5 points)
- (4) 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. (up to 10 points)

Strengths:

- (1) – The applicant provided an adequate management plan to achieve the objectives outlined in the application. The applicant also identified a project leadership team and the key stakeholders from that team that will lead the work (Page e43).
 - The applicant provided a detailed logic model outlining key aspects of the work (Page e64)
 - The applicant provided a detailed Gantt Chart and performance measures that to outline how the work would progress throughout the grant (Page e108).
 - 5 points
- (2) – The applicant provided a detailed budget summary regarding cost for line items over the three years of the grant (Page e6). The applicant provided detailed information within their budget narrative that outline personnel costs and other budgetary line items (Page e169)
 - 4 points
- (3) – The applicant provided costs that are reasonable and aligned with the proposed solutions (Page e6). The applicant also provided a thorough analysis and details of their budget beginning on page e168 – 5 points
- (4) – The applicant provides reasonable costs for the number of persons to be served from this grant. An estimated 250 stakeholders, 25,000 educators, and \$1.9M+ students.– 9 points

Weaknesses:

- (1) – No weaknesses noted – the applicant provided a comprehensive response and their materials clearly outlined the responsible parties, timelines, and expected outcomes.
- (2) – The applicant cited an indirect cost rate of 32.3 % which is rather high for indirect costs. Additional information regarding why these costs are so high would be helpful (Page e6). Additional information from the applicant would be helpful to understand the [REDACTED] increase in cost in Y2 and the [REDACTED] reduction in costs in Y3 (Page e6)
- (3) – Additional information regarding Contractual costs, Budget Category 6, would be helpful to further understand how these funds will be used. Further, additional narrative would be helpful to understand some of the line items that are explained on page e170. With respect to PLE Development, \$0 are allocated in Y1, [REDACTED] in Y2, and [REDACTED] in Y3. The applicant provides a narrative of activities associated with these costs but does not explain why they will fluctuate so much over the three years.
- (4) – The applicant may consider outlining how this grant will support families and community leaders over the course of the entire grant. Engagement with stakeholders is mentioned as a priority in Y1 yet the focus does not seem consistent throughout the grant.

Reader's Score: 23

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S425B200028)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Highest Coronavirus Burden		
1. Coronavirus Burden	20	20
Quality of Project Services and Project Plan		
1. Project Services/Plan	35	31
Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources		
1. Management Plan/Resources	25	24
Sub Total	80	75
Total	80	75

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - FY20 REM - 5: 84.425B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New York State Education Department (S425B200028)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Highest Coronavirus Burden

1. A: Highest Coronavirus Burden (up to 20 Points)

(2) The extent to which the applicant has a high coronavirus burden based on indicators and information factors identified by the applicant in response to Application Requirement 3. (up to 20 points)

Strengths:

The application demonstrated a high coronavirus burden. Response included that New York State is in the 81st to 100th percentile as calculated for the ESF-REM grant competition. Response was thorough and included other relevant information about how New York State has been impacted by the coronavirus. The response cited information that the state has the most recorded cases of COVID-19 in the nation and accounts for 18% of the nation's cases. Response included relevant student demographic data: New York State has large communities of SWDs (18%), ELLs (9%) and economically disadvantaged (57%) students.

The application was incredibly thorough in detailing the status of education for New York students. The deep analysis that included a breakdown of vulnerable such as SWDs, ELLs, and economically disadvantaged demonstrates that the New York is aware of the digital divide and the varying needs of their diverse student population. The application acknowledged that COVID disproportionately hit vulnerable students more. The disaggregated data demonstrates that the plan will intentionally provide high quality learning to these populations and will continue to measure their growth. The cited analysis done by McKinsey is used as insightful guidance that validates the proposed TRLE plan.

Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services and Project Plan

1. B: Quality of Project Services and Project Plan (up to 35 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of project services and project plan.

In determining the quality of the project services and project plan, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (up to 5 points)

In addition, the Secretary considers--

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is an exceptional approach to absolute priority being addressed and includes a detailed project plan for addressing the absolute priority. (up

to 10 points)

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project to respond to the needs of students. (up to 10 points)

(3) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will expand access to remote learning options and lead to improvements in student outcomes. (up to 5 points)

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (up to 5 points)

Strengths:

Equal Access and Treatment

The application includes a GEPA 427 statement outlining the commitment to equal treatment of all students, educators, employees and the general public. The response includes examples of nondiscrimination practices in hiring and policies. Response also includes the New York State Education Department Employment Opportunity Policy (p. e10-11). The response is fully-developed as it further details specific barriers foreseen within the proposal as well as solutions to address the barriers. Included are eight specific strategies that the applicant will implement to ensure equal access to and participation in all grant activities. The 8 strategies are aligned with overall proposal and include how equal access and participation will be carried out and the intended impact of the strategy. (5 points)

(1) The application states that the specific needs pertaining to accessing high-quality remote learning opportunities are to build the capacity of teachers and educational leaders to effectively implement remote learning for all. The Teaching in Remote/Hybrid Learning Environments model is designed to develop and deliver professional learning experiences aligned with a statewide Quality Remote/Hybrid Teaching Framework (p. e. 18). Application includes a detailed 3 Phase plan with specific actions for each phase and demonstrates strong alignment between the 3 phases (p. e 28-36). (10 points)

(2) Factors concerning equal access and equitable resources were identified through an analysis that ranked all 62 counties by level of impact due to COVID-19 and school building shutdowns as demonstrated in Appendix 6-D. The response states how this analysis will be used to differentiate resource allocations as part of Phase One work.

Another identified opportunity to ensure equitable resource allocation is the use of Regional Information Centers and the Project Leadership Team to distribute information to all non-public schools. (p. e. 37).

Entities that provide professional learning experiences will be required to provide equal access and treatment for project participants. This will be monitored through required reports on teacher participation, satisfaction and completion of PLEs. This teacher analysis will be important for meeting the needs of students. (7 points)

(3) The proposed TRLE approach is building off of prior large-scale professional learning initiatives and therefore has a strong likelihood of expanding access and options to improve student outcomes. The response noted how prior difficulties that were experienced in the former model are being addressed in the TRLE model by ensuring that the approach is field-driven and effective for teachers. Ownership and teacher input are important components that advance implementation fidelity that will lead to improve student outcomes. This was connected in the response that includes cited research that demonstrates that including stakeholders will ensure stronger implementation fidelity and improved outcomes. Appendix 6-G states objectives and goals that are aligned with the proposed plan. (4 points)

(4) Response includes cited research that there is a positive correlation between professional learning and student outcomes. This cited research addresses the proposed plan that focuses on educator professional learning experiences. Additional cited research in Figure 1 is aligned and connected to the components of the proposed TRLE design. (5 points)

Weaknesses:

(Equal access and treatment) No weakness noted.

(1) No weakness noted.

(2) Plans to address underrepresented students were included in Phase One plans but not detailed outside of that. Phase 2 and 3 were directed at educators, which aligns with the overall project plan; however, the plan would be strengthened if student measures were continued throughout Phase 2 and 3 as well. The application identified the barrier of family engagement and accessibility of devices, but the response did not include thorough connection of how this barrier will be addressed and continuously monitored throughout the plan.

(3) Response is well-developed in that it addresses some alignment with how it will be carried out and subsequent impact. Response would be strengthened and more fully developed if it included specific year over year benchmarks for each of the 3 phases for the different academic bands listed in the plan. Measuring student outcomes would ensure greater accountability.

(4) No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 31

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan / Adequacy of Resources**1. C: Quality of the Management Plan and Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points)**

In determining the quality of the management plan and adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers--

- (1) 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. (up to 5 points)**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed use of funds will adequately support the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. (up to 5 points)**
- (4) 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. (up to 10 points)**

Strengths:

(1) Appendix 6G details objectives and performance measures. Appendix 6-I details a timeline for project milestones and ownership. Information included in the appendices reflect adequate objectives and timeline within the proposed budget. Plan is broken down into multiple phases. The application clearly connects the different phases and how results from one will directly impact the goals of the next phase. Plan includes constant surveying to ensure resources are going to hardest-hit communities.
(5 points)

(2) Line items are detailed and aligned to the proposed plan. For example, the summarized key learnings from Phase One are linked to the first steps of Phase Two. Trained professional vendors will provide PLEs aligned with the NYS Professional Learning Standards, designed to help teachers build core competencies for remote/hybrid learning and use those competencies to improve their own practices, and—of critical importance—include guidance for tailoring the PLEs in

relation to pedagogies, content knowledge and assessments.

External evaluator to monitor fidelity. Deploy trainers to work with teachers. Proposed personnel costs stated in the budget narrative are adequate for the job description and project responsibilities for implementing TRLE. (4 points)

(3) Appendix 6G details objectives and performance measures. Appendix 6-I details a timeline for project milestones and ownership. The costs listed in the budget are well-detailed and reasonable in relation to the proposed project. (5 points)

(4) Response stated that professional learning experiences will be delivered by professional development providers that are trained and approved by NYSED to ensure consistent quality of services statewide. This approach aligns with creating buy-in and fidelity that will result in greater student outcomes. Application stated that by the close of the three-year grant period, TRLE will provide 190,222 teachers and educational leaders with 450,000 hours of professional support to implement effective practices in remote/hybrid teaching and learning. Response includes estimate that the proposed plan will reach over 1.9 million students at a cost of approximately [REDACTED] per student.

(10 points)

Weaknesses:

(1) No weakness noted.

(2) The indirect cost included in the budget is [REDACTED] which is a significant amount of the budget. The budget narrative would be strengthened with added specificity outlining the change in cost for contractual services (line item 8) from year to year and how that specifically aligns with proposed plan.

(3) No weakness noted.

(4) No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 24

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/20/2020 12:55 PM