

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2020 11:03 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** South Bend Community School Corporation (S374A200039)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	25	24
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	24
<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	24
<b>Sub Total</b>	45	44
<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	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	113

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - TSL - 5: 84.374A

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

Applicant: South Bend Community School Corporation (S374A200039)

## 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: 24

#### 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:

- There is an extensive gap analysis organized under 3 categories: students, educators, district (e18-e27).
- Multiple measures are included in the gap analysis including demographic, student learning, and educator evaluation data (e19, e20, e22, e23).
- Improvement strategies have been identified based on gap analysis. For example, there is a gap in alignment of professional learning to educator needs and an improvement strategy of using Educator Support Plans as been identified (e27).
- Gaps in local capacity are identified (e.g., lacks resources to implement meaningful PBC) and will be addressed by the proposed project (e21).

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:

None

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:

- Supporting rigorous academic standards for students is not discussed which may impede the outcome of improved student achievement (e28).

**Sub**

**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:**

- The needs of the target population are clearly identified (e.g., lacks strategies and resources to meet district and state equity plans) and the LEAP strategies align to these needs (e.g., Relocation/Retention PBCS bonuses) which focus on the target population (e29).

**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)).**

**General:**

- Evidence of effectiveness aligned to program components is included and informs a well thought out logic model (e32-e33).
- The project will begin with an external audit of HR and professional learning protocols which will identify priorities and not waste resources on unaligned activities (e35).
- Educator evaluation data will be used in workforce decision-making (e35).
- Multiple measures will inform annual effectiveness ratings (i.e., observations, student growth data, student learning objectives) (e40).
- Differential pay via PBC aligned to educator effectiveness is thoroughly explained (e41-e42).

**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 model is extremely thorough, differentiated for each year of the project, aligned to the logic model and implementation timeline, and includes process and outcome evaluation (e49-e50).
- The GPRA measures have been incorporated into the evaluation plan and are aligned to Goal 1 (e52).
- Multiple data sources/instruments will be used that will help gauge progress (e53).
- Evaluation methods are designed to provide feedback so grant staff will know if the project will yield outcomes (e49).

**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:**

- An appropriate size grant team, led by a 1.0FTE, has been identified, and primary responsibilities have been outlined for each role which will support achieving activities on time (e56-e57).
- Key activities are identified (by year and quarter) and tied to the grant personnel responsible for completion which will support keeping the project on track (e42).
- Benchmarks and Milestones are aligned to objectives and identified for each year of the project which increases ability to monitor project progress (e58).
- Stakeholder engagement is addressed as a way to “broaden support for reform efforts” which will enhance the ability to meet project objectives (e59).
- A formal process for collecting ongoing feedback from multiple groups has been identified (e58-59).

Weaknesses:

None

**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: 24**

**Sub**

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

**General:**

- Two systems of support (HCMS/Professional Learning) are identified as the means to promote system change and improvement (e60).
- Attention is paid to short-, mid-, and long-term systemic improvements and these align to the project objectives (e60).

**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:**

- Needs have been identified in order to target capacity building efforts. For example, South Bend CSC acknowledges lack of expertise to objectively evaluate educators and partners have been identified to assist the district with training and establishing inter-rater reliability (e61).

**Sub**

**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:**

- A complete list of partners (e.g., Learning Forward; Institute for Organizational Coherence) and their implementation role is included (e64).
- Post-grant implementation is addressed with specific sustainability strategies that support the operation of the project beyond the length of the grant (e65).
- The multi-year financial and operating model is not thoroughly addressed (Note: a plan for developing this in the future is included) (e63-e64).
- Although support from stakeholders is built into the plan moving forward, there is minimal direct evidence of educator support for the LEAP project (e65).
- Evidence of Educator Support (in Appendix) does not address the principal stakeholder group (e105).

**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:**

- Census tract numbers are listed for 8 schools and they are either directly in – or overlapping with Qualified Opportunity Zones.
- A prioritization of services has been established to ensure support for the neediest schools. Qualified Opportunity Zone schools are categorized as a Level 1 Priority to be served to the “maximum extent possible” (e34).
- LEAP strategies are aligned directly to identified strategies in the Indiana Equity Plan (e24-e25). The focus on retention and prioritized services at QOZ schools will contribute to closing Indiana’s biggest gap – the retention rate of effective educators.

**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:**

The applicant has never had a TIF or TSL grant.  
No weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/14/2020 11:03 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/07/2020 04:28 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** South Bend Community School Corporation (S374A200039)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	25	23
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	23
<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	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	111

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - TSL - 5: 84.374A

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

Applicant: South Bend Community School Corporation (S374A200039)

## 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: 23

#### 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 clearly describes specific gaps, weaknesses and magnitudes of each in services, infrastructure, and opportunities. For example, students live in at-risk communities in poverty where the average per capita income is \$19,818, there's a high free and reduced lunch percentage of 71.3% and many students experience academic failure. 80% of K-5 students are not proficient in math or English language, 81% of 6-8th graders are not proficient in math and 79% of high school students. (e20) Teachers have few resources and limited capacity to serve students where 20% qualify for special education which increases educational challenges. The applicant explains fully why the District needs to create equity and fill gaps in all schools, including high need ones in Opportunity Zones because the graduation rate is 74.2%. (e18-20)

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:

The proposed project will build on and support integration with the State mandated new strategies for educator effectiveness and human capital management. This project will build on similar or related efforts to improve educator improvements through incentive and professional growth. The project will give the District the opportunity to implement the performance-based compensation that they piloted with the support of the Union. Professional Development will implement the Late State Wednesdays every month and the University will provide the training through a Teacher Quality Partnership Grant. (e21)

Weaknesses: The application would be strengthened if more information or foundational funding streams from other programs were included. For example, information and details about how the project is supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

Sub

**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:**

The applicant makes a clear case that the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning for 1,273 teachers and 71 administrators. (e14) For example, the applicant explains how retention rates of highly effective and effective teachers is lower in high needs schools and how they plan to introduce equity of service through this project. (e24) The applicant provides an extensive list of logical strategies they have evolved to support the State equity standards. For example, the State wants schools to work with the Teacher Leadership Group and the project will collaborate with the Institute for Organizational Coherence with the State's goal in mind to improve communication. (e25)

Weaknesses: The applicant would be strengthened if they included how the project will address implementation of academic rigor. This strategy should be mentioned and detailed so as to be assured that academic rigor is part of the overall plan.

**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:**

(iv) The design framework of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population as well as other identified needs.(e28-29) For example, the project plans to attract, support and retain diverse teachers and principals and the applicant details the steps necessary to accomplish this in a realistic manner that includes sufficient detail. (e25) In addition, the applicant provides a complete list of gaps and weaknesses with the accompanying project improvement strategy. For instance, the District does not use a system of supports for effectiveness but through the proposed project them with use Professional Growth Pathways and Educator Support Plans to improve practice. (e27)

Weaknesses: None 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)).**

**General:**

The proposed project demonstrates a rationale and strong theory. For example, the project will prioritize services and develop systems of supports based upon collaborative planning with state reform strategies and equity initiatives. The applicant outlines their research base, including their study outcomes. The applicant did a thorough

**Sub**

job of reviewing the literature and choosing citations that support and guide their planning for change. (e29-32) Their solid research base has a natural flow to their Logic Model which further supports program development. (e33)

Weaknesses: None 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:**

(ii) The applicant provides cohesive objectives and methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress towards achieving intended program outcomes. The external evaluation team will be a strong partner for change. For instance, they will audit and review job descriptions, pay scales, hiring and onboarding, placement and retention. This will assist the District in sustainable evaluation efforts toward improvement. (e34-37) In addition, the applicant will invest in talent and data management systems to track educator data and their support plans in order to optimize effectiveness through real-time support, feedback, self-reflection and observations. (e37)

Weaknesses: None 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:**

The applicant provides a high-quality management plan for the proposed project. For example, the staff is well thought out with Professional Learning Coordinator who will manage the effectiveness improvement strategies for the project and a Capital Management Coordinator who will organize District-wide improvement efforts. (e42, e35) There are job descriptions and qualifications provided for positions. (e56-57) The management plan is focused on equity for all and clearly states that all teachers, parents, administrators and stakeholders are welcome to participate in activities. (e54) The management plan promotes sustainability, provides a feasible timeline that provides the duties and responsibilities for the tasks involved and milestones for project implementation. (e55-60) There is a high likelihood of the project achieving the listed objectives. For instance, the project plans smaller equity gaps, valid educator assessment tools, improved effectiveness and increased student attainment through the proposed project. (e14)

Weaknesses:None 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:**

There is a strong likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. For instance, the project has two fronts for change-one is the support system for professional learning and the other is for prioritization of improvement efforts. As part of these systems, instructional coaching will be implemented and decision-making will be based upon educator effectiveness for both teachers and principals. Moreover, the applicant lays out a cohesive mid-term systematic improvement plan that will result in continuous improvement. (e60)

Weaknesses: None 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:**

The proposed project is highly likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population. For example, the applicant will ensure through Unified Talent that professional growth impacts compensation decisions. The project is highly likely to support educators to move along career ladders and gain skills that will create high-quality programs for high needs school students. (e61) In addition, the applicant has provided a thorough dissemination plan to share their findings with others. (e62)

Weaknesses: None 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:**

The applicant indicates numerous and appropriate working partnerships. For example, The University leadership program, Waggoner, National Board of Teaching Standards, Power School Unified Talent Data Management System, and others. (e14) The applicant provides a clearly detailed multi-year financial and operating model, and an accompanying plan of operation which is feasible for sustainability. (e63) There is a clear and demonstrated commitment of partners through inclusion in planning, roles and contributions shown throughout the application and evidence of broad support from stakeholders listed in the project narrative. (e64-65) For example, Harvard University Strategic Data Project will provide support and share best practices. (e64)

Weaknesses: While there are specifics which indicate that partners were part of the project planning, they did not provide their evidence of support in written form. For example, there are no evidence of support in terms of letters of support from SEAs, teachers' unions or other partners critical to the project's long-term success.

Sub

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:

- a) 27 of the 29 schools meet the High Need Criterion of free and reduced lunch rate of 71.3%. Four of the schools are inside Opportunity Zones. Four schools are on the border of Opportunity Zones and attendance borders overlap. The census tract number are provided by the applicant of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s)-For example, 18141011100 and 18141001000 where two of the eight schools are in Opportunity Zones. (e17-18)
- b) The applicant will provide services and increase equity in K-12 learning in the Qualified Opportunity Zones. The applicant addresses the State equity plan. (e18)

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:

- a) The applicant has never had a TIF or TSL grant.
- b) No weaknesses identified

Reader's Score: 5

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/07/2020 04:28 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/08/2020 05:31 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** South Bend Community School Corporation (S374A200039)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	25	24
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	24
<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	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	112

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - TSL - 5: 84.374A

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

Applicant: South Bend Community School Corporation (S374A200039)

## 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: 24

#### 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 application clearly shows gaps and weaknesses in services which will be addressed by the application. For example, to show the magnitude of their gaps the application discussed that South Bend Community School Corporation struggles to overcome educator and student challenges that impact the quality of teaching and learning in high-need schools. The narrative discussed barriers to the success of students and educators, that includes degraded district efforts to promote ongoing improvement. There are also several areas of weakness discussed in the application showing challenges due to At-Risk Communities, Poverty, and Academic Failure. Other gaps and weaknesses are presented by the application discussing that educators are challenged by a lack of resource and local capacity. Other areas of weakness provided in the application are related to a lack of equity and other gaps in student access to, and distribution of, Effective Educators in High-Need Schools. (pp. e19)

#### 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 application clearly articulated plans for the proposed project to integrate with similar programs by using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources. For example, the application clearly showed that collaborative partnerships currently exist with A Teacher Quality Partnership grant project is improving educator quality and performance by providing Master of Education candidates with a one-year Teaching Residency in a participating South Bend school that will culminate in a full-time teaching position, upon graduation. Another grant initiative involves a Project Prevent grant project to improve equitable access to high quality learning for all students without regard to race, economic status, community location or other socio-economic factors by addressing the root cause of violence in five participating schools and providing supports to vulnerable students / families. The narrative shows performance-based compensation strategies to accelerate positive educator and student outcomes, and continuing investment in improvement initiatives, SBCSC seeks to expand reforms to further raise instructional practice and school leadership and greatly

**Sub**

elevate equity in education for all students. (pp. e27, e28 )

**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:**

The proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. There are two strands addressed by the applicant to show plans to improve educator effectiveness by addressing a comprehensive Human Capital Management System that includes raise to base, rewards, stipends, and bonuses. The second strand involves a comprehensive professional learning system to develop educator support plans, mentoring, Peer Observations, high quality observations, feedback, aspiring leaders, micro-credentials and badging. The narrative shows that professional learning will also include professional growth pathways, new teacher induction and career ladder opportunities. (pp. e28)

**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 proposed project provides details to show they will successfully address, the needs of the target population. For example, the applicant discussed that SBSC lacks resources to consistently implement an effectiveness-based program across all school. As a result, the narrative shows that SBCSC will conduct a Human Capital audit in partnership with Waggoner Irwin Scheels and Associates to identify strengths, weaknesses and gaps in systems capacity and functionality to transition to more data driven decision-making. Another area of weakness to be addressed involves SBCSC lacking the process to connect educators with supports that increase effectiveness. This can be addressed through professional growth and pathways along with support plans that connect to professional learning opportunities. (pp. e29)

Weaknesses

(iv) The application did not provide details to show different funding streams would support educators to increase their effectiveness. These funding streams would allow educators to participate in further professional development and increase their access to more research based materials leading to improving student outcomes. (pp. e28, e29)

**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:**

The application provides a clearly defined rationale by providing a narrative that SBCSC proposes LEAP (Leveraging Equity, Achievement and Performance), a Teacher and School Leader Incentive Fund project. The application discussed that implementation of LEAP will include a strong theory, prioritization of services, and systems of supports. To further show their rationale the application further describes that LEAP is the result of collaborative planning aligned to state reform initiatives, state equity plans and the district need to implement systems that support improved teaching and learning in all schools, particularly high-needs schools. (pp. e30)

**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:**

(ii) The application provides clear details to show the methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback such as annual evaluation of educator effectiveness using the Framework for Effective Teaching and Framework for Effective Leadership Evaluation Models, educator evaluation data to inform all aspects of the improvement strategies. The narrative also shows project plans to connect promotion to an Educator Effectiveness Model that includes use of validated educator effectiveness Rubrics and specified student growth measures. (pp. e 39, e 40, e41)

(ii) Adequate details are also provided in the application to show periodic assessment of progress towards achieving intended outcomes. For example, the applicant wrote that the inclusion of student achievement growth metrics promotes educator accountability for individual and schoolwide student achievement outcomes. The narrative shows that there will be tracking of progress to refine instruction along which will include a review of student scores. (pp. e39, e40)

**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:**

Clear details are provided in the application to show the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress towards achieving outcomes. The narrative shows that project management will be a collaborative effort guided by key personnel equipped with the skills, knowledge and expertise to successfully implement LEAP. The application shows the credentials for the project director who will be expected to work full-time and manage daily implementation of the program, coordinate with the Advisory Board, supervise grant staff and coordinate partnerships, oversee HCMS systemic improvements, and oversee Professional Learning (educator quality) supports. IN addition, periodic assessment will be provided by the Advisory Board conducting quarterly oversight meetings to provide feedback to Project Director, ensuring diversity of perspectives shape project to better meet identified needs, and utilizing evaluation data to strengthen weaknesses and promote improvement. (pp. e56)

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:

(i) The proposed project will result in system change or improvement. This is evidenced by South Bend Community School Corporation implementing a comprehensive Teacher and School Leader Incentive Fund project to increase the quality of teaching and learning in high-needs schools and increase equitable access to education for students enrolled in high-needs schools. LEAP will launch and short-term systemic improvement through a Comprehensive HCMS and Professional Learning Supports. The application provides both mid-term and long term systems to promote positive and lasting systems changes that improve outcomes for schools, educators, and students. (pp. e60)

#### 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 proposed project is likely to build expand serves that address the needs of the target population. For example, the application clearly provides details to show the implementation of LEAP which will provide South Bend Community School Corporation with the resources to improve human capital management systems and strengthen educator quality supports. The narrative shows that LEAP will build district, school and educator capacity to meet the needs of South Bend students enrolled in 27 high needs schools and promote systemic change that is sustainable beyond grant funding. (pp. e 61)

##### Weaknesses

The application did not provide details to show local support from teachers, principals, or the union. Without the local support of teachers there is a strong possibility there would be a lack of buy-in from teachers resulting in instructional programs and initiatives not being implemented. (pp. e 60, e 63)

#### 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:**

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. For example, the application showed that SBCSC will pursue sustainable practices during the grant period and evaluate components to identify practices worthy of replication in additional district schools and prioritize practices to sustain beyond the grant period. The application also provided details to show that the SBCSC multiyear operating and financial plan includes audits in Year 1 and continued adjustments and refine of systems each year. (pp. e63)

**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:**

a) The application provided the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services. The census tract number listed is 18141011100. (pp. e17)

b) The application clearly describes how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). For example, the application describes that LEAP will increase equity in K–12 learning and expand student access to high quality educators and programs by implementing programs such as Evidence-based Human Capital Management, Talent Management, Data Management, Educator Effectiveness Model, and Performance-based Compensation. (pp. e14, e15)

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: The application has never had a TIF or TSL grant.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/08/2020 05:31 PM