

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/09/2020 01:59 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools (S374A200020)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	23
Sub Total	30	23
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	25	25
Sub Total	45	45
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones		
1. CPP 1	10	8
Sub Total	10	8
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - TSL - 3: 84.374A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools (S374A200020)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining evidence of the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

Overall Application Impression:

The applicant has identified several weaknesses in services and infrastructure and provided evidence for several opportunities to address them (pg.e19). The applicant proposed a plans to implement an approach that will allow for improving the goals by recruiting high-quality teachers and employees at each level of the organization, retaining high-quality teachers by providing opportunities for growth and advancement, and creating a framework for development and structure for support for each tier of the career pathway (pg.e20). The plan provided detailed, explored observation metrics and offered a well-justified rationale for what its observation tool consists of and how the evaluation will be done (pg.e50). The applicant needs to provide how the formative evaluation process, qualitative (surveys), and quantitative measures will be analyzed to determine project effectiveness, including the detailed rationale for their need in the budget justification. Without this information, the applicant did not sufficiently address the criterion.

Strengths: The applicant has provided the evidence and description of the weaknesses in services, infrastructure, and opportunities for the identified five schools that meet the criteria for the TSL program. The gap includes students' grades, English Language Arts Proficiency, Math Proficiency, percentage of economically disadvantaged students, teacher's shortage (50%), and 33% educator turnover in the last five years, less than 35% of LPS teachers had more than three years of teaching experience. The number of years with the current principal, retaining the teachers after years, across the network, 76% is economically disadvantaged (pg. e21). The applicant has identified the project strategies that focus on teacher and talent development by recruiting and retaining high-quality employees by providing opportunities for growth and advancement, and creating a framework for development and structure for support for each tier of the career pathway.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve Relevant Outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and

Sub

Federal resources.

General:

Strengths: The applicant presented evidence that the proposed project will integrate and build on similar efforts to improve existing funding streams from other programs supported by the community, State, and Federal resources. For example, applicant began researching and designing an integrated approach aimed to improve student achievement and develop organizational capacity. Through that review, the outcomes showed that network leaders determined that it was essential to clarify and define the strategy for organizational development moving forward in this initiative. This action may seem overly simplistic, but the process of realizing this vision, its composition, and aligning it with the organizational values and a series of observable behaviors was both painful and growth-evoking.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score:

3. (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

General:

Strengths: The applicants provide strong evidence that the proposed project is part of a significant comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. For example, the initiative will involve hearing from all stakeholders, ensuring that they have a voice in determining the needs and design of this project, teachers' professional development, and best practices for retention. For example, the goal of improved student achievement fits into this framework and one LPS initiative for improved teacher development such as: Focus on the wildly import - clearly defined coaching rations and protocols, Act on leading measures - observe and respond to teachers' mastery of the five core behavior management techniques, Keep a compelling scorecard - use a shared tracker with consistent language, Accountability - leadership discussions daily and weekly within school teams, biweekly meetings with principals and heads of school, monthly network data review. As this process provides a clear plan for leaders to execute, while also creating value for teachers. Teachers want to become more effective; they want to be coached. This initiative differentiates LPS in the marketplace by providing an instructional coach for every eight teachers to ensure all teachers have the support they need to become effective.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score:

4. (iv) 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.

General:

Strengths: The applicant provides substantial assessment/evidence, measurable performance activities such as increase Math/ELA proficiency score by 4% and more students earn an ACT score of 21 or higher, all LPS schools earn a TVAAS rating of 4 or 5 and 75% of teachers at who have been at LPS for at least two years score 3.75 or higher on TEAM observations. The proposed approaches to identify the objectives for each activity in realistic and quantifiable and to solve the goals. The objectives are specific and quantifiable and well-presented in the proposal. For example, in the winter of 2018, LPS began working in earnest on a performance-based compensation system for teachers. Part of that work included conducting a significant review of past TEAM performance by teachers as related to student outcomes. As there is no correlation (0.07) between TEAM evaluation scores and TVAAS growth outcomes for students. However, LPS breaks this trend with a statistically significant correlation between its highest-performing teachers (0.82) and student growth on TVAAS. From 2016 to 2019, teachers who consistently produced Level 4 and Level 5 TVAAS growth rated as highly effective through their observations at all LPS sites. Teachers who consistently produce Level 4 and Level 5 TVAAS growth were rated as highly effective through their observations at all LPS sites. LPS showed a consistent trend, teachers improve significantly from Year 1 to Year 5.

Sub

LEAD believes this is directly attributable to the consistent leadership and forming practices across its network. The inter-rater reliability and consistency amongst network observers are defining characteristics of LEAD's talent development strategy. Understanding where teachers are and what it takes to help them improve are the foundations of Leading Onward, and consequently, improving student achievement.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the 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:**

Reader's Score: 23

Sub

- 1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project Demonstrates a Rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

General:

Strengths: The applicant provides a rationale for the proposed goal, and objectives are well situated in the literature. The objectives are specific and measurable and well-presented in the proposal. The applicant documented the strategies for ensuring a well-developed project. The applicant provides a logic model that describes the resources, activities, outputs, short and long-term outcomes, and the impact that will assist the applicant in addressing unanticipated consequences. Additionally, the consistent review and analysis of data will allow for the project to address challenges as they arise (pg. e56).

Weaknesses: The applicant's response to this criteria is broad and requires more information. It is not clear that the goals are apparent and include a detailed discussion of the measurable activities, approaches, timetable, and responsibilities indicated for the proposed project activities and are highly likely to yield reliable information to guide possible replication of this project.

Reader's Score:

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

General:

Strengths: The applicant provides evidence of evaluation plan that outlines the timeline for collection, methods, and instruments to be used. The proposed design includes the use of qualitative and quantitative data measures that will yield formative and summative results. The applicant has designed an evaluation component that takes into consideration the inputs, activities, outputs, and short and long-term goals highlighted in the Logic Model, ensuring that a robust and detailed evaluation process is conducted.

Weaknesses: The applicant does not address the detailed on formative evaluation process will be ongoing throughout the academic year, qualitative (surveys) and quantitative measures will be analyzed to determine project effectiveness, including how the applicant has planned to make programmatic changes based on the results of the project evaluation.

Sub

Reader's Score:

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 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.**

General:

Strengths:

The management plan is well documented and clearly shows time commitments with the qualifications, experience, and education required of the program to carry out the tasks by project leads, project directors, and project managers (p.51, 59-61, and attached cv). For example, the management structure will facilitate day-to-day operational effectiveness and provide a means for the partner's schools to give input and guidance into operations and management. This structure ensures that the project will achieve its objectives on time and within budget. For example, the applicant provided evidence that they plans to achieve its objectives on time and within budget, because it will be supported by current leadership, will be led by an effective, experienced Project Director, and will be supported by an Advisory Board. It has clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. Also, School's Head of Academics and Innovation will be integral to the project's success and CEO will guide the project, ensuring it continues to adhere to the LEAD ethos and provide needed supports for teachers and school leaders in improving performance and recognizing this through compensation. He will allocate 25% of his time toward this initiative. The applicant plans to hire a Project Director (1.0 FTE) with experience in compensation analysis and familiarity with talent development within an educational setting to lead and manage grant implementation for this initiative. The Project Director will direct, coordinate, and ensure the project's integrity by adhering to Federal requirements, funding guidelines, and the LEAD onward proposal. The Project Director will monitor, track, and assess project goals and outcomes on an ongoing basis and manage the grant budget, ensuring the expenditures are allowable and that the match is fully attained.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

- 1. (i) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**

General:

Strengths: The applicant presented a comprehensive description that the proposed project will result in district school community improvement. For example, this initiative is expected to result in systems change because it is grounded in research on education, performance compensation, and business leadership. As public schools have successful experience implementing major grants and new initiatives, it is in good financial health, and the proposed

Sub

project will be guided by current LPS Network Leaders and a well-qualified, experienced Project Director.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score:

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand serves that address the needs of the target population.**

General:

Strengths: The applicant provided evidence of full commitment and input from schools, parents, and community stakeholders, included in application letters of support from Advance Financial, Ajax Turner, Broad, Capstar Bank, Charter School Growth Fund, Clarcor, Deloitte, Frist, Lee, Nashville Rotary, Parks Family, Pinnacle, Scarlett, and the US Department of Education. LPS It anticipates total philanthropic dollars of \$1M per year. For example, it is likely to improve the education of students attending high need schools because it includes a comprehensive program not only to evaluate and compensate educators on effective teaching, but also because it provides the necessary supports through individual training and coaching that will guide them in implementing best practices based on individual needs.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score:

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model, and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

General:

(iii) The project shows great potential for the support of the project after federal funding ends. For example, the real measure of sustainability will be teacher performance leading to improved student achievement and retention of highly effective educators after the TSL Federal grant concludes. To help ensure adequate funding is available for future years, data and outcomes from the project's impact will be shared with philanthropic organizations and individual contributors. Individual donors and family foundations working to create impact in the Nashville area continue to express interest in LEAD Public School's vision to the best place to work in the city, especially for teachers. AS the Vice President of Development will work with the CEO and Board of Directors, the Project Director and current philanthropic partners to seek additional philanthropy. LEAD will also continue efficient stewardship of the budget and other resources in order to make as much available for the performance compensation program.

(iii) No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

- 1. Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.**

An applicant must--

- a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it**

proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and

b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence in the proposed project to (CPP 1, P.1) the Human Capital Management System as many of the proposed project activities uses established multi-metric teacher evaluation system to focus instructional supports towards the teachers most in need. Applicant provided evidence that only two of its schools are in Opportunity Zones. The other three are open-zoned and serve students in nearby Opportunity Zones. The applicant has provided strong evidence to provide the services on supplements based on teacher performance and professional growth as a teacher. The teachers will be rewarded financially for taking on increasing levels of responsibility and supporting their peers.

Weaknesses: Applicant reported that there are only two of the five schools are located directly in opportunity zones.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0, 2, or 5 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate

a) The applicant has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds (0 or 5 points); or

b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the program from which it seeks funds, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, in the five years before the deadline date for submission of applications under the program. (0 or 2 points)

General:

Strengths:

a) The applicant has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted (pg.5).

b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the TSL program, including through membership in a group in the last five years.

Weaknesses: No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/09/2020 01:59 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/10/2020 02:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools (S374A200020)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Sub Total	30	25
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	25	25
Sub Total	45	45
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones		
1. CPP 1	10	8
Sub Total	10	8
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	108

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - TSL - 3: 84.374A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools (S374A200020)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining evidence of the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

The applicant has devised a plan that will address the concern with the qualified teacher shortage, close student achievement gaps, and update the antiquated compensation system currently in place (pg. 19). The applicant's plan will serve the most at-risk students by monitoring the results of such assessments as the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) to measure program effectiveness (pg. 22). This data will provide the applicant with useful insight into the performance of the incoming 5th grade students (pg. 23). The applicant's plan also contains components that will provide students with "irreplaceable" teachers through the LEADing Onward approach which has been designed to attract, develop, and retain highly- effective teachers (pg. 23).

Weaknesses: N/A

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve Relevant Outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

General:

The applicant will use the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) Rubric to measure the educator's performance using rating scales that range from scores derived from planning, instruction, environment, and professionalism objectives (pg. 25). The applicant identifies other evaluative assessment systems that will be used to measure student growth and teacher effectiveness. Based on the results of these measures, teachers will be compensated through initiatives such as the Employee Value Proposition initiative (pg. 32).

Weaknesses: N/A

Reader's Score:

3. (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve

Sub

teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

General:

The applicant's plan proposes a performance-based compensation system for teachers that is intended to attract and retain highly effective teachers (pg. 40). This initiative will be based on the inter-rater reliability and consistency as defined in the applicant talent development strategy based on student growth outcomes on the TVAAS and TEAM scores (pg. 40). The applicant will use these indicators to focus on the development of short-term goals for teachers as advised by their mentor.

Weaknesses: N/A

Reader's Score:

- 4. (iv) 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.**

General:

LEAD has provided a management plan with clearly defined roles and responsibilities (pg. 56), and the proposed project is likely to lead to some level of system change.

Weaknesses: N/A

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the 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:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

- 1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project Demonstrates a Rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

General:

The applicant uses a culmination of comprehensive research and collaborative planning to improve teaching strategies (pg. 41). The applicant will be deliberate in consulting sound reviews on the best practices in effort to take an innovative approach to the implementation of this plan (pg. 41). The applicant's logic model highlights the organization's action plan to achieve the defined goal. The applicant will use the TEAM model as the evaluation rubric to measure the teacher efficacy and provide them with the feedback to help them to expand capacity (pg. 45). The TEAM approach, along with feedback from post-observation conferences, will aid the applicant in outlining clear expectations of a high-quality educator (pg. 45).

Reader's Score:

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

Sub

General:

The applicant's plan is embedded with ongoing formative performance feedback and support for educators (pg. 50). The data gathered will drive the decision-making for project modifications and will be used to ensure that the project goals are being met in a timely manner outlined in the scope of the plan (pg. 50). The applicant will also contract an outside evaluator to ensure that each objective in the plan is design to determine project impact, objective attainment, and the GPRA outcomes are achieved (pg. 50).

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant's plan will be based on ongoing formative performance feedback and support for the educators after each observation, the details for the evaluation plan, in terms of data collection and analysis, is lacking. For example, bi-weekly leadership team meetings and ongoing fidelity checks will take place at the school, but it is unclear who will implement these initiatives beyond the initial training which will take place through the Tennessee Department of Education (pg. 50). This plan will also be data-driven but the dissemination of this data is unclear. For example, the applicant does not identify who or what entity will be responsible for gathering the data to provide feedback to ensure that project modifications are simultaneously implemented throughout the grant term.

Reader's Score:

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 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.**

General:

The applicant has devised a management plan that will be supported by current leadership, an experienced Project Director, and an Advisory Board (pg. 53). The Project Director will monitor, track, and assess project goals (pg. 53). The complete job description is in Appendix (pg. 323). The Vice President of Development will support the initiative by seeking additional philanthropic support necessary to sustain the project after the completion of the grant (pg. 54). The team will work together to determine the modifications needed to enhance the plan and further accomplish project tasks.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

- 1. (i) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**

Sub

General:

The application uses data from comprehensive research on education, performance compensation, and business leadership as evidence of need for grant (pg. 56). The plan builds on local capacity as it includes an extensive program to not only evaluate and compensate educators, but to also to provide the necessary support through coaching efforts and professional development to guide them in using the best proven practices (pg.56).

Reader's Score:

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand serves that address the needs of the target population.**

General:

Feedback, coaching, and best practices are tools to help the applicant produce more highly effective teachers. The applicant's true measure of sustainability will be based upon teacher performance (pg. 56). The applicant will thoroughly explore methods to continue to compensate, retain, and recruit high effective educators.

Reader's Score:

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model, and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

General:

To ensure adequate funding beyond the grant term the applicant will seek funding from individual donors, family foundations, and other philanthropic organizations (pg. 56). A trend of "clean" annual audits provides the assurance that the applicant will be able to sustain beyond the life of the grant (pg. 57).

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

- 1. Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.**

An applicant must--

- a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and**
- b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant proposed a plan to provide a Performance-Based Compensation System for educators which will have the capacity to ensure a higher quality of education to schools located within the opportunity zones (pg. 18). The applicant is composed of a network of charter schools and operates as a local education agency (pg. 18). One of the schools in the network is a LEA and was established as an intervention for turning around schools identified in the bottom 5% for school performance (pg. 18). The need for an effective evaluation is needed to grow school performance in this LEA.

Weaknesses:

Although the schools in the network serve, to some capacity, students who live within QOZs, only two of the five schools are located directly in opportunity zones.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0, 2, or 5 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate

a) The applicant has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds (0 or 5 points); or

b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the program from which it seeks funds, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, in the five years before the deadline date for submission of applications under the program. (0 or 2 points)

General:

Strengths: The applicant has never had a TIF or TSL grant

Weaknesses: No weakness identified

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/10/2020 02:48 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/10/2020 02:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools (S374A200020)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	23
Sub Total	30	23
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	25	25
Sub Total	45	45
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones		
1. CPP 1	10	8
Sub Total	10	8
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - TSL - 3: 84.374A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: LEAD Public Schools (S374A200020)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining evidence of the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

This project will serve the five public charter schools in the LEAD Public Schools (LPS) network (p. 17). Across the network, 76% of students are Economically Disadvantaged. Of the five schools served by this project, two are located in Opportunity Zones, while the other three are open-zoned and serve students from nearby Opportunity Zones (p. 18). These schools serve students in the fifth through twelfth grades, who are some of the most vulnerable in the city. These students typically enter LPS with a history of extreme academic, social, and emotional deficits. Furthermore, three of the schools to be included in this project had student achievement ranked in the bottom 5% of all schools in the state (p. 22). Of their students, 33% begin fifth grade with a reading level below the 20th percentile, demonstrating a sizeable deficit in reading skills for this population (p.24).

Based on ratings from the district's evaluation system their highest needs schools are disproportionately staffed with lesser effective educators (p. 25). Compared to Tennessee schools, with 36.4% of its students performing on grade level, LPS showed a lower rate of achievement, with only 10.5% to 28.3 of their students performing on grad level (p. 26). LPS has averaged a 33% educator turnover rate over the last five year, and fewer teachers are now applying for their teaching vacancies. In 2019, the number of teacher applications at LPS was half what it was in 2015, dropping from 360 to 180 (p.19). Teacher shortages are most prevalent in high school math, science, ELL, and special education (p. 20).

Although teacher development has been decentralized (i.e. at the discretion of the leader), it has always been a focus across schools, but has been provided differentially (p. 28). As an example, some schools have employed more instructional coaches, while others have required teachers to participate in more coaching sessions.

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve Relevant Outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

Sub

General:

This project builds upon other initiatives aimed at improving teacher development. Some examples include a performance-based compensation strategy for teachers and leaders; an incentivized approach to keep the best teachers in the classroom; and an established ratio of one instructional leader for every eight teachers (p. 34). One year ago, LPS also secured funding to establish a new three-year program focused on developing high-performing School Leaders (p. 37). LPS has also invested in strongly-aligning the English/Language Arts and math curricula to ensure students have access to rigorous, grade-appropriate content (p. 39).

Reader's Score:

- 3. (iii) **The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**

General:

This project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve student education and develop effective educators in the district. In its recently-developed Strategic Plan, LPS has identified talent recruitment, talent and leadership development, and teacher shortages as the most critical weaknesses of the district (p. 39).

Reader's Score:

- 4. (iv) **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.**

General:

This plan is likely to demonstrate success in that it links teacher development and student achievement through a consistent shared coaching experience grounded in the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) rubric, which assesses teachers' instruction, planning, environment, and professionalism using frequent observations, constructive feedback, student data, and professional development that correlates with improvements in student achievement (p. 14). This is a comprehensive approach to ensuring teaches individual needs are met, in order to provide students with the most effective instruction.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the 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:**

Reader's Score: 23

Sub

- 1. (i) **The extent to which the proposed project Demonstrates a Rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

General:

LPS has cited a number of studies to support its rationale for the proposed project (examples on page 42). One TNTP study cited asserted each year, highly-effective teachers generate five to six more months of student learning than a poor performing teacher (p. P.21). Another study posited that a lack of sufficient, qualified teachers threatens students' ability to learn, and that instability in a school's teacher workforce negatively affects student achievement and diminishes (p.22). Overall student achievement declines significantly when a highly-effective educator, capable

Sub

of producing 1.6 years of growth is replaced with a novice teacher producing 0.8 years of growth (p. 24). As such, the rationale for this project, which focuses on reducing teacher attrition, improving the district’s ability to attract talent, providing more effective coaching and building teacher capacity to improve student achievement, is clearly supported by research.

Reader's Score:

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

General:

The evaluation plan includes bi-weekly Leadership Team meetings at the school and network levels, to include data discussions on educators and student performance. Data gathered will inform decision-making for project modifications and be used to help ensure annual objectives are accomplished and final project goals are attained. Fidelity checks will also be conducted with those administering educator evaluations to ensure fidelity and inter-rate reliability across all evaluators in the state. LPS has also built additional training protocols and fidelity checks within its framework (p.50).

Weakness: The applicant does not yet have a fully developed evaluation plan to include identification of the data to be collected or methods of analysis. As such, the frequency of these activities have also not been identified. Without providing a fully developed evaluation plan, to include the aforementioned components, it is difficult to fully ascertain the extent to which the evaluation methods will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessments of progress towards achieving the program’s intended outcomes.

Reader's Score:

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 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.**

General:

: LEAD has provided a management plan with clearly defined roles and responsibilities (pg. 56). The project will be led by a Project Director (1.0 FTE) with experience in compensation analysis and familiarity with talent development in an educational setting (p. 53). The Project Director will be supported by an Advisory Board (p. 53), which will meet quarterly to discuss the project’s status and determine if modifications are needed. The Advisory Board will include the Project Director, the evaluator, network leadership, a principal, Instructional Coach, teacher and Director of Talent Resources (p. 55). The Head of Academics and Innovation and the Chief Executive Officer, will guide this project. The Director of Talent will also work with the Project Director to implement the TEAM Evaluation Rubric and ensure it is implemented with fidelity. He will also serve as a member of the project’s Advisory Board (p. 53)

The applicant also includes a management plan (pgs. 55-56) with clearly outlined milestones, due dates and persons responsible.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

- 1. (i) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**

General:

The proposed project is likely to lead to some level of system change, in that it builds upon previous efforts, and presents a comprehensive model for improvement, facilitated by the district's strategic plan (p.39).

Reader's Score:

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand serves that address the needs of the target population.**

General:

The program is also likely to build capacity, in that it provides an instructional coach for every eight teachers, to ensure all teachers have the support need to become more effective (p. 33), and it has established a consistent protocol of formally evaluating all teachers for at least 45 minutes. These evaluations are then coupled with biweekly coaching and feedback to help ensure improvement (p. 45). History within the district has demonstrated that generally, after two years at LEAD, teachers score effective on the evaluation system, and by third year, score highly-effective (p.46). Therefore, it is highly likely this project will result in system changes, as teachers are consistently and frequently evaluated, then coached towards performance goals. This will likely lead to improved capacity throughout the district.

Reader's Score:

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model, and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

General:

All LPS schools are in good financial health, rated as "Excelling" in the Financial Framework. The district has obtained clean audits every year it has been in operations and has built a healthy cash balance of over 60 days cash on hand. Its board, and particularly its Finance Committee, has significant financial and accounting experience from the private sector.

LPS has experience successfully implementing large Federal and State grants. One example, is the \$4,000,000 Charter Schools Program grant. LPS has also implemented a Federal School Improvement Grant to support its turnaround schools, and a Priority Schools State Grant for \$350,000, to name a few. LPS also generally augments its budget to ensure sufficient support for students and faculty through funding from private foundations, corporate giving programs, special events and individual donations. It is supported by a number of foundations and corporations, and anticipates its total philanthropic donations will be at least \$1M each year (p. 57). The Vice President of Development will work with the CEO, Board of Directors, Project Director and current philanthropic partners to seek additional philanthropy (p. 57). 100% Of the LPS Board members have a history of making monetary and in-kind contributions (p. 57). The program will also provide matching gifts in support of this program,

Sub

by way of private gifts and grants, in-kind contributions, and public grant funds that align with the grant deliverables and outcomes (p. 58).

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

- 1. Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.**

An applicant must--

- a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and**
- b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).**

General:

LPS provides services in Qualified Opportunity Zones. Two of its schools are in Opportunity Zones. The other three are open-zoned and serve students in nearby Opportunity Zones.

Weakness: Although all of the schools serve some measure of students from opportunity zones, only two of the five schools are located directly in opportunity zones.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

- 1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0, 2, or 5 points).**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate

- a) The applicant has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds (0 or 5 points); or**
- b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the program from which it seeks funds, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, in the five years before the deadline date for submission of applications under the program. (0 or 2 points)**

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/10/2020 02:53 PM