

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/16/2020 03:47 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** District of Columbia Public Schools (S374A200031)

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

|   | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>  |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                                 |                 |               |
| <b>Need for Project</b>                                   |                 |               |
| 1. Need for Project                                       | 25              | 25            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 25              | 25            |
| <b>Selection Criterion</b>                                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Project Design</b>                      |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design   | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                                 |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>                     |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan  | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Adequacy of Resources</b>                              |                 |               |
| 1. Adequacy of Resources                                  | 25              | 25            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 45              | 45            |
| <b>Priority Questions</b>                                 |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority #1</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 1  | 10              | 10            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 10              | 10            |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority #2</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Diverse and Effective Workforce</b>                    |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 2  | 5               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 5               | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>  | 115             | 110           |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - TSL - 4: 84.374A

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

Applicant: District of Columbia Public Schools (S374A200031)

## 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:

Strengths:

The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) is requesting grant funding to support the Rigorous Instruction Supports Equity (R.I.S.E) project. The applicant has provided extensive evidence of current gaps and weaknesses in services that can potentially be addressed with grant funding. These weaknesses include: at-risk communities; consistently low performing schools; inequity in learning; learning access gaps; and outdated systems(e18-19). From the detailed descriptions of variance in the racial and financial composition of the district, there is clear evidence that new innovative services are needed to support and improve student achievement by increasing access to effective educators in high-needs schools. The applicant has justified the need for enhanced Human Capital Management Systems (HCMS) and Performance-Based Compensation Systems (PBCS) to support the learning environment. Also, personalized professional development and equity with identifying and placing Highly Effective and Effective teachers in high-need schools are not customary practices and in-turn, impact students in high-need schools (e18-23).

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses 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 Federal resources.

#### General:

Strengths:

DCPS has implemented four projects (LEAP, Equity, 2012 Teacher Incentive Fund and Performance-based compensation) with state and federal funding within the last ten years (e23). The desire to build upon the work completed with past funding is aligned with the principles of the grant notice. The district's plan to improve the

**Sub**

current IMPACT system by enhancing teacher evaluations, redefining highly effective teachers and realigning the effectiveness ratings within the performance-based compensation is logical are provides insight on rationale thinking that good systems can always be improved(e23-24).

Weaknesses:  
There are no weaknesses 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:

It is apparent that the district desires to increase student achievement and provide opportunities for students to have access to highly effective and effective teachers. Throughout the application there is emphasis on equitable practices that are free from bias. Expanding the LEarning together to Advance our Practice (LEAP) teams will lead to quality professional development. The district has done an excellent job allowing teachers to be owners of learning and the career advancement opportunities, micro-credentials and badging allows for access and self-paces knowledge building (e25-26).

Weaknesses:  
  
There are no weaknesses 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 current proposal will impact 43 schools in the district. 16 of the schools are located in 12 federal Qualified Opportunity Zones (e12). It is commendable that the district is purposefully seeking to support DCPS schools rated with one 1 and 2 two stars (16 one-star schools and 27 two-star schools) (e22). RISE will serve 15,793 students enrolled in high-need schools. The applicant has done a good job explaining within the Design Framework that these high-need schools lack resources the increase student achievement and educator effectiveness (e27-28).

Weaknesses:  
There are no weaknesses 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: 30**

**Sub**

**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 has been intentional with providing six research studies aligned with the goals of the project to implement systems that support improved teaching and learning. The studies cited address the following overarching themes: teacher induction; National Board Certification, transfer incentives, professional development and coaching, professional development and principal coaching (e29-31). The logic model provided on e70 also demonstrates desires to increase student achievement, align teacher ratings and enhance data management.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

**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:

Plans to contract with EduShift, Inc., to implement an objective evaluation of RISE are aligned with the grant notice. DCPS' experience with working with the entity with previous federal and state grant awards is well justified. Plans to collect both qualitative and quantitative data to support the project's evaluation are described in detail. Utilization of the research-based FORECAST model (FORMative Evaluation, Consultation, And System Techniques) to guide an objective evaluation structure is reasonable (e48). The applicant's plans to collect baseline data year one supported within the proposal and will ensure that project implementation is carried out using a systematic approach. Also, plans to collect data and host focus groups on implementation progress biannually are reasonable and demonstrate that input from stakeholders is valued (e52).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

**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 for the school district is robust. The school district has made strategic efforts to be inclusive with selecting the team to oversee the project by creating an advisory board, budget committee, equity committee and sustainability committee (e54). The applicant has appropriately noted that the Project Director and DCPS Finance Office will manage expenditures. The comprehensive RISE Personnel plan provides specific qualifications and responsibilities for the following stakeholders that will ensure tasks are implemented with fidelity.

Also included is the RISE IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE organized yearly by quarter with key personnel and Primary Benchmarks / Milestones Aligned to Objectives. It is apparent that the applicant is equipped to have each objective addressed before completion of funding. Required communication from stakeholders is consistent and in designated in times where adjustments and improvement can be made in a timely manner. Plans to have quarterly advisory board meetings and monthly evaluator progress monitoring calls are realistic and can be achieved with grant funding (e55-58).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

Plans to provide two tiers of support (Comprehensive HCMS and Educator Quality) while implementing the project are evident throughout the application. This proposal includes short-term, mid-term and long-term strategies to promote systems change that are aligned with the overarching these to improves outcomes for schools, educators and students. Plans to prioritize improvement strategies provides a clear focus on reaching targets. Also, the concept of provided tiered professional growth plans demonstrates an understanding that stakeholders will need a varied level of support (e59-60).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses 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:

For each of the five DCPS needs there is tiered evidence on how the district will build capacity. Implementing streamlined HCMS software and updating biased free evaluation tools with the support of partnering organizations (Learning Forward) can lead to identifying highly effective and effective teachers that can in turn, increase student achievement. The applicant has provided a descriptive dissemination plan to share RISE products, lessons learned, best practices, implementation guides, outcomes, research and effective strategies (e61-62).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses 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:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has provided solid evidence that it can successfully implement and sustain projects with federal funding. The school district has provided evidence that it will meet the required 50% non-federal match requirement (e126). Within the narrative are descriptions of seven partnering organizations that will assist with sustaining the program (e64-65). Also included with the proposal is collaborative letter of support from Georgetown University (e100). Plans to eliminate the Project Director, Career Ladder Coordinator and Educator Quality Coordinator at the end of the grant cycle and after project goals are implemented and supported at all schools are understood and realistic (e66). Commitments to realign Title I, II, III and IV funds to support evaluation data-driven professional development to sustain grant-funded strategies and Professional Growth Plans are aligned with the grant notice (e66).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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:**

On page e17 of the grant application are the census tract numbers for 16 schools located in Qualified Opportunity Zones. The applicant has also provided the student total enrollment at each school.

The applicant has done a good job explaining that the identified schools will be supported with funding to address a need to increase student achievement and provide highly effective and effective teachers in schools. Plans to provide instructional coaches, tiered professional development, equity in teaching and learning and a principal network to support schools are realistic and can be achieved with grant funding. It is commendable that the district is purposefully seeking to support DCPS schools rated with one 1 and 2 two stars (16 one-star schools and 27 two-star schools) (e22). RISE will serve 15,793 students enrolled in high-need schools.

**Reader's Score:** 10

**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:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/16/2020 03:47 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2020 02:43 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** District of Columbia Public Schools (S374A200031)

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

|   | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>  |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                                 |                 |               |
| <b>Need for Project</b>                                   |                 |               |
| 1. Need for Project                                       | 25              | 25            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 25              | 25            |
| <b>Selection Criterion</b>                                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Project Design</b>                      |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design   | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                                 |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>                     |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan  | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Adequacy of Resources</b>                              |                 |               |
| 1. Adequacy of Resources                                  | 25              | 23            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 45              | 43            |
| <b>Priority Questions</b>                                 |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority #1</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 1  | 10              | 10            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 10              | 10            |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority #2</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Diverse and Effective Workforce</b>                    |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 2  | 5               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 5               | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>  | 115             | 108           |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - TSL - 4: 84.374A

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

Applicant: District of Columbia Public Schools (S374A200031)

## 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:

##### Strengths:

The applicant documents the equity issues for students in the targeted district as it relates to a quality education program. Collaborative planning sessions with district administrators, Human Capital Management System (HCMS) professionals and school staff (i.e., teachers, principals, non-instructional professionals, union leaders, curriculum specialists) were held regarding the barriers (i.e., low-performing schools, inequity in learning, at-risk communities, and 48.5% of children in the targeted area living below the poverty level) to academic success (pg. 3-4).

The specific infrastructure gaps as it relates to inequity in learning identified that the lowest-performing schools are also impacted by segregation, and a lack of highly-effective educators. To address these gaps, the applicant will provide training and professional development that is designed to improve practice, increase the fidelity of tools, assess educator effectiveness, and increase equity in access to quality educators and programs (pg. 6-8).

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 Federal resources.

#### General:

##### Strength:

The applicant proposes to build upon lessons learned in previous projects that focused on equitable access to high-quality learning. The applicant cites a number of projects (i.e., LEAP, IMPACT System, Teacher Incentive Fund) that were implemented to improve educator quality and performance and student access to high-quality educators. The applicant documents previous experience implementing and sustaining a performance-based compensation system that continues today as a result of the district providing matching funds (pg. 6 -7, 9-10).

**Sub**

Weaknesses:  
No weaknesses 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 proposed project will focus on improving the alignment of educator evaluations and expand the current performance-based compensation system to include providing additional career advancement opportunities. For example, the Lift Career Ladder program provides a strategy that focuses on elevating and rewarding successful educators with additional career advancement opportunities that are linked to micro-credentials that promote continuous educator improvement. (pg. 9-10).

Weaknesses:  
No weaknesses 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 will refine an existing project that appears to meet the needs of the targeted population. For example, the applicant identifies two tiers of service that will align the needs to specific gaps and weaknesses. For example, the Tier 1 service will focus on the needs associated with the HCMS, and implementation strategies such as training administrators on analysis and interpretation of data and the impact of data-driven decision making on the human capital management system (pg. 11).

Weaknesses:  
No weaknesses 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: 30**

**Sub**

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

**Sub**

**General:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates a rationale as evidenced by the Logic Model (pg. 2 appendices) that aligns with the overall project design of optimizing student achievement, building the capacity of educators at all levels, and establishing collective teacher efficacy by increasing the percentage of effective educators (i.e., teachers and school leaders), which will ultimately lead to short and long-term outcomes of increased student achievement levels.

The applicant cites a rational and the supporting evidence (i.e., Teacher Induction – Schmidt, Young, Cassidy, Wang, and Laguada documents the need for reducing the equity gaps through the provision of evidence-based coaches and leaders that can mentor teachers in high-need schools, where more intense skill sets are needed. The applicant has documented that the high-need schools are not always provided the most effective teachers; as such, the primary goal is to improve student success by improving the quality of teachers through a high-quality project design (pg. 17-18).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**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 will provide for an evaluation model that could produce promising evidence of the project's effectiveness and areas in need of support. The applicant is proposing a mixed-method model that will track progress towards the achievement of the stated goals. The evaluation will include a formative and summative evaluation report that will be based on how the project is implemented, operating, services delivered, and the decisions made in carrying out the project. The provision of a formative process, and the ongoing collection and review of data, will allow for feedback that can be used to ensure that the project is moving towards its intended outcomes (pg. 32-35).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**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 applicant provides a timeline that outlines the activities for each quarter of the fiscal year in the first of the program. There are clearly defined responsibilities to include initiating professional growth plans, developing evaluation tools, recruiting coaches and mentor teachers, and providing leadership and instructional coaching. The milestones for accomplishing tasks are outlined (i.e., measuring redistribution of diverse educators in high-need schools) along with the tasks needed to accomplish the stated goal and objectives.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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: 23**

#### **Sub**

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

##### **General:**

##### **Strengths:**

The applicant documents strategies that focus on systems change and improvement highlighting a strategy that will focus on launching and sustaining a project that promotes systems change in their Human Capital Management System (HCMS) and Educator Quality Supports. The strategies include auditing the HCMS to prioritize those areas of strength, revising, and expanding their current Performance-Based Compensation Structure (PBCS), and providing a long-term data-driven HCMS that ensures access to effective educators (pg. 43-44).

##### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 provides evidence of a systematic and ongoing process to address building capacity. For example, the applicant documents their dissemination plan to include the launching of a program website that will share progress, events, and research. The plan will provide opportunities for sharing and receiving of information, which has the potential to broaden the impact the project will have on the district and other organizations in the surrounding area (pg.45-46).

##### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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.**

**Sub**

**General:**

**Strength:**

The applicant states that the proposed project was designed to facilitate sustainability and documents some of the strategies they believe will sustain the project (i.e., institutionalizing of an HCMS, investment in technology hardware and software). Pg. 49-50

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide sufficient details on sustainability once federal funding ends. While the applicant indicates that a model will be created, the details or evidence of what a multi-year financial model will contain as it relates to the sustainability of the practices is not provided (pg. 47-50).

**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:**

**Strength:**

a) The applicant proposes to serve 16 schools within a Qualified Opportunity Zone (QOZ) and provides the tract numbers and the enrollment numbers for each tract. The applicant states that the communities they are proposing to serve have been impacted by extreme poverty and a lack of education opportunities (pg. 1-2).

b) The applicant proposes to increase Pre-K -12th grade learning by expanding access to high-quality educators, and identifies the type of supports (i.e., instructional coaching, professional development, New Teacher Network, and performance-based compensation). Pg. 2-3

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**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:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/14/2020 02:43 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2020 01:32 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** District of Columbia Public Schools (S374A200031)

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

|   | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>  |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                                 |                 |               |
| <b>Need for Project</b>                                   |                 |               |
| 1. Need for Project                                       | 25              | 25            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 25              | 25            |
| <b>Selection Criterion</b>                                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Project Design</b>                      |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design   | 30              | 28            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 30              | 28            |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                                 |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>                     |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan  | 20              | 18            |
| <b>Adequacy of Resources</b>                              |                 |               |
| 1. Adequacy of Resources                                  | 25              | 23            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 45              | 41            |
| <b>Priority Questions</b>                                 |                 |               |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority #1</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones</b> |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 1  | 10              | 10            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 10              | 10            |
| <b>Competitive Preference Priority #2</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Diverse and Effective Workforce</b>                    |                 |               |
| 1. CPP 2  | 5               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>  | 5               | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>  | 115             | 104           |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - TSL - 4: 84.374A

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

Applicant: District of Columbia Public Schools (S374A200031)

## 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:

##### Strengths:

The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) proposed RISE (Rigorous Instruction Supports Equity) to inform and address educator effectiveness pertaining to placement, retention, performance-based compensation, professional development, and promotion for educators working in High-Need Schools (pg. 17). According to the applicant, multiple barriers impede the success of students and diminish district efforts to promote ongoing improvement of education, including: (1) At-Risk Communities; (2) Low-Performing Schools; (3) Inequity in Learning; (4) District Capacity and (5) Gaps and Weaknesses (pgs. 18-19). Thus, DCPS faces significant challenges and TSL funding will provide resources to implement positive reforms that build local capacity to raise educator and student achievement (pg. 23). The entity noted that RISE will provide two Tiers of Service aligned to needs, gaps and weaknesses identified by the Planning Team (pg. 27). Furthermore, the entity effectively highlighted that the utilization of TSL funds combined with the multiple project efforts of RISE, will yield positive and lasting results that increase equity and achievement in high-need schools. (pg. 26)

##### Weaknesses:

None 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 Federal resources.

#### General:

##### Strengths:

The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) proposed RISE (Rigorous Instruction Supports Equity) to inform and address educator effectiveness pertaining to placement, retention, performance-based compensation, professional development, and promotion for educators working in High-Need Schools (pg. 17). According to the applicant, multiple barriers impede the success of students and diminish district efforts to promote ongoing

**Sub**

improvement of education, including: (1) At-Risk Communities; (2) Low-Performing Schools; (3) Inequity in Learning; (4) District Capacity and (5) Gaps and Weaknesses (pgs. 18-19). Thus, DCPS faces significant challenges and TSL funding will provide resources to implement positive reforms that build local capacity to raise educator and student achievement (pg. 23). The entity noted that RISE will provide two Tiers of Service aligned to needs, gaps and weaknesses identified by the Planning Team (pg. 27). Furthermore, the entity effectively highlighted that the utilization of TSL funds combined with the multiple project efforts of RISE, will yield positive and lasting results that increase equity and achievement in high-need schools. (pg. 26)

Weaknesses:  
None 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 District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) proposed RISE (Rigorous Instruction Supports Equity) to inform and address educator effectiveness pertaining to placement, retention, performance-based compensation, professional development, and promotion for educators working in High-Need Schools (pg. 17). According to the applicant, multiple barriers impede the success of students and diminish district efforts to promote ongoing improvement of education, including: (1) At-Risk Communities; (2) Low-Performing Schools; (3) Inequity in Learning; (4) District Capacity and (5) Gaps and Weaknesses (pgs. 18-19). Thus, DCPS faces significant challenges and TSL funding will provide resources to implement positive reforms that build local capacity to raise educator and student achievement (pg. 23). The entity noted that RISE will provide two Tiers of Service aligned to needs, gaps and weaknesses identified by the Planning Team (pg. 27). Furthermore, the entity effectively highlighted that the utilization of TSL funds combined with the multiple project efforts of RISE, will yield positive and lasting results that increase equity and achievement in high-need schools. (pg. 26)

Weaknesses:  
None 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 District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) proposed RISE (Rigorous Instruction Supports Equity) to inform and address educator effectiveness pertaining to placement, retention, performance-based compensation, professional development, and promotion for educators working in High-Need Schools (pg. 17). According to the applicant, multiple barriers impede the success of students and diminish district efforts to promote ongoing improvement of education, including: (1) At-Risk Communities; (2) Low-Performing Schools; (3) Inequity in Learning; (4) District Capacity and (5) Gaps and Weaknesses (pgs. 18-19). Thus, DCPS faces significant challenges and TSL funding will provide resources to implement positive reforms that build local capacity to raise educator and student achievement (pg. 23). The entity noted that RISE will provide two Tiers of Service aligned to needs, gaps and weaknesses identified by the Planning Team (pg. 27). Furthermore, the entity effectively highlighted that the utilization of TSL funds combined with the multiple project efforts of RISE, will yield positive and lasting results that increase equity and achievement in high-need schools. (pg. 26)

Weaknesses:  
None noted

Sub

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: 28

Sub

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

**General:**

Strengths:

The RISE Planning Team completed extensive research and review of human capital management systems, performance-based compensation strategies, educator evaluation protocols and educator improvement plans (pg. 28). Thus, by utilizing programs supported by Evidence of Effectiveness, and an extensive needs assessment (pg. 33) the Planning Team is confident that RISE will yield positive outcomes for educators and their students during the grant period and beyond (pg. 28). To meet school-wide, educator and student needs and address the project's goal and objectives, the Planning Team designed a project composed of two interconnected TIERS OF SUPPORT: Tier1-Comprehensive Human Capital Management System and Tier 2 - Educator Quality Supports. (pg. 34). Thus, RISE and its Tiers of Support will provide District of Columbia Public Schools with a mechanism to make effectiveness-based HCMS decisions, improve instructional leadership, enhance classroom education, improve equitable access to quality teaching for all students and raise achievement in high-need schools. Evaluators will utilize the research-based FORECAST model (FORmative Evaluation, Consultation, And System Techniques) to guide an objective evaluation structure (pg.48). Evaluators will collect data for Treatment and Control groups to facilitate evaluation that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards (pg. 49). Additionally, evaluators will utilize multiple instruments to collect qualitative and quantitative data: Assessment Scores and Grades; Educator Effectiveness Data; Participant Surveys; Focus Groups; and, Formative Assessment Data (pgs. 52-53). Data analysis will be ongoing to ensure a constant flow of feedback to facilitate improvement and sustainability of effective strategies. Evaluators will monitor all components of RISE through continuous assessment of process and outcome measures to examine the effectiveness of the program as it evolves (pg. 53). RISE will release a coordinated Dissemination Plan to facilitate replication of effective strategies in internal district schools and in external learning environments across the region, state and nation (pg. 53).

Weaknesses:

The RISE Professional Development strategy will provide weekly professional learning in all schools during 90-minute RISE Seminars that address diverse content areas, leadership skills and instructional competencies (pg. 45). The applicant did not indicate if these weekly meetings would occur during or outside of the instructional day.

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 RISE Planning Team completed extensive research and review of human capital management systems, performance-based compensation strategies, educator evaluation protocols and educator improvement plans (pg. 28). Thus, by utilizing programs supported by Evidence of Effectiveness, and an extensive needs assessment

## Sub

(pg. 33) the Planning Team is confident that RISE will yield positive outcomes for educators and their students during the grant period and beyond (pg. 28). To meet school-wide, educator and student needs and address the project's goal and objectives, the Planning Team designed a project composed of two interconnected TIERS OF SUPPORT: Tier1-Comprehensive Human Capital Management System and Tier 2 - Educator Quality Supports. (pg. 34). Thus, RISE and its Tiers of Support will provide District of Columbia Public Schools with a mechanism to make effectiveness-based HCMS decisions, improve instructional leadership, enhance classroom education, improve equitable access to quality teaching for all students and raise achievement in high-need schools. Evaluators will utilize the research-based FORECAST model (FORmative Evaluation, Consultation, And System Techniques) to guide an objective evaluation structure (pg.48). Evaluators will collect data for Treatment and Control groups to facilitate evaluation that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards (pg. 49). Additionally, evaluators will utilize multiple instruments to collect qualitative and quantitative data: Assessment Scores and Grades; Educator Effectiveness Data; Participant Surveys; Focus Groups; and, Formative Assessment Data (pgs. 52-53). Data analysis will be ongoing to ensure a constant flow of feedback to facilitate improvement and sustainability of effective strategies. Evaluators will monitor all components of RISE through continuous assessment of process and outcome measures to examine the effectiveness of the program as it evolves (pg. 53). RISE will release a coordinated Dissemination Plan to facilitate replication of effective strategies in internal district schools and in external learning environments across the region, state and nation (pg. 53).

### Weaknesses:

The RISE Professional Development strategy will provide weekly professional learning in all schools during 90-minute RISE Seminars that address diverse content areas, leadership skills and instructional competencies (pg. 45). The applicant did not indicate if these weekly meetings would occur during or outside of the instructional day.

### 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:

District of Columbia Public Schools will serve as fiscal agent of RISE. A structured grant management plan will ensure timely completion of grant activities and promote continuous improvement. The structured grant management plan will address – (1) Equal Access; (2) Timely Implementation; (3) Budget Oversight; (4) Procedures; (5) Personnel; (6) Timeline; (7) Feedback and (8) Engaging Under-represented Groups (pg. 53). Project management will be a collaborative effort guided by the following key personnel equipped with the skills, knowledge and expertise to successfully implement RISE. The applicant established that the Coordination of Tiers of Support by grant managers will ensure delivery of high-quality services in accordance with an extensive Timeline and Logic Model. Moreover, Grant managers, Advisory Board, and evaluators will monitor progress, ensure fidelity with project design and assess milestones (pgs. 56-57). The entity articulated RISE is designed to engage multiple partners and solicit feedback from stakeholders to ensure diverse perspectives influence project quality and sufficient data is available to facilitate objective process and outcome evaluation (pg. 58).

#### Weaknesses:

DCPS will engage as many stakeholders as possible in the implementation and decision-making process impacting RISE and participating schools to broaden support for reform efforts and increase engagement in education. The application would have been strengthened, had the applicant shared the plan it will utilize to engage/reach as many stakeholders as possible.

Reader's Score: 18

### 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: 23

#### Sub

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

#### General:

##### Strengths:

The applicant effectively established that implementation of RISE will provide District of Columbia Public Schools with the resources to improve human capital management systems and strengthen educator quality supports. RISE will build district, school and educator capacity to meet the needs of its students and promote systemic change that is sustainable beyond grant funding. Furthermore, the entity will implement a Dissemination Plan to share RISE products, lessons learned, best practices, implementation guides, outcomes, research and effective strategies. Dissemination of results will maximize the impact of federal investment in RISE by promoting scalability of effective practices to additional DCPS schools and replication of strategies to external districts, schools and learning environments (pg. 62). The applicant will implement The K – 12 Insight Survey an externally administered assessment to generate data independent of program staff; survey results will help inform sustainability planning, Advisory Board, Sustainability Committee efforts and influence long-term Financial Plans designed to institutionalize impactful RISE strategies that are worthy of continuation based on feedback. (pg. 65). Thus, the demonstrated ability and alignment of DCPS to sustain educator quality supports and performance-based compensation without federal funds confirms the level of commitment the district has for this vital initiative (pg. 62).

##### Weaknesses:

Results will be shared with district administrators and will be used in the identification of sustainable services and practices suitable for replication in other settings (pg 65). To strengthen the application, this information should also be shared with other stakeholders, including classroom teachers.

#### 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 effectively established that implementation of RISE will provide District of Columbia Public Schools with the resources to improve human capital management systems and strengthen educator quality supports. RISE will build district, school and educator capacity to meet the needs of its students and promote systemic change that is sustainable beyond grant funding. Furthermore, the entity will implement a Dissemination Plan to share RISE products, lessons learned, best practices, implementation guides, outcomes, research and effective strategies. Dissemination of results will maximize the impact of federal investment in RISE by promoting scalability of effective practices to additional DCPS schools and replication of strategies to external districts, schools and learning environments (pg. 62). The applicant will implement The K – 12 Insight Survey an externally administered assessment to generate data independent of program staff; survey results will help inform sustainability planning,

**Sub**

Advisory Board, Sustainability Committee efforts and influence long-term Financial Plans designed to institutionalize impactful RISE strategies that are worthy of continuation based on feedback. (pg. 65). Thus, the demonstrated ability and alignment of DCPS to sustain educator quality supports and performance-based compensation without federal funds confirms the level of commitment the district has for this vital initiative (pg. 62).

**Weaknesses:**

Results will be shared with district administrators and will be used in the identification of sustainable services and practices suitable for replication in other settings (pg 65). To strengthen the application, this information should also be shared with other stakeholders, including classroom teachers.

**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:**

**Strengths:**

The applicant effectively established that implementation of RISE will provide District of Columbia Public Schools with the resources to improve human capital management systems and strengthen educator quality supports. RISE will build district, school and educator capacity to meet the needs of its students and promote systemic change that is sustainable beyond grant funding. Furthermore, the entity will implement a Dissemination Plan to share RISE products, lessons learned, best practices, implementation guides, outcomes, research and effective strategies. Dissemination of results will maximize the impact of federal investment in RISE by promoting scalability of effective practices to additional DCPS schools and replication of strategies to external districts, schools and learning environments (pg. 62). The applicant will implement The K – 12 Insight Survey an externally administered assessment to generate data independent of program staff; survey results will help inform sustainability planning, Advisory Board, Sustainability Committee efforts and influence long-term Financial Plans designed to institutionalize impactful RISE strategies that are worthy of continuation based on feedback. (pg. 65). Thus, the demonstrated ability and alignment of DCPS to sustain educator quality supports and performance-based compensation without federal funds confirms the level of commitment the district has for this vital initiative (pg. 62).

**Weaknesses:**

Results will be shared with district administrators and will be used in the identification of sustainable services and practices suitable for replication in other settings (pg 65). To strengthen the application, this information should also be shared with other stakeholders, including classroom teachers.

**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 District of Columbia Public Schools, through implementation of RISE, will provide innovative, comprehensive HCMS and Educator Quality Support initiatives – through implementation of a Teacher and School Leader Incentive Fund grant project – at 16 DCPS schools located within Federal Qualified Opportunity Zones. The 16 schools are located in a total of 12 Qualified Opportunity Zones and serve students and families living and learning in communities impacted by extreme poverty and a pervasive lack of social, economic and education opportunities. Furthermore, more than 20 additional schools participating in the RISE project are located within three city blocks of a Federal QOZ and serve attendance boundaries that overlap adjacent Qualified Opportunity Zones. The census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zones for the schools were provided (pgs. 17—18). The entity noted by improving / diversifying education programs in QOZs, DCPS, through implementation of RISE, will catalyze positive change in highest-needs, underserved, economically depressed communities. RISE will increase equity in PreK – 12 learning and expand student access to high quality educators and programs by implementing the following programs serving schools located in Federal Qualified Opportunity Zones:

Weaknesses:

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**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:

No strengths identified.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has had a TIF or TLS grant within the last 5 years.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/14/2020 01:32 PM

