

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:22 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Voorhees College (S411C200080)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	36
<b>Sub Total</b>	45	36
<b>Resources and Quality of Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources and Quality of Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources and Management	30	23
<b>Sub Total</b>	30	23
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	24
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	24
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. SEA Partnership	5	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	2
<b>Total</b>	105	85

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY19 EIR Early-phase AP 3- PD - 1: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Voorhees College (S411C200080)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 36

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which professional learning funded through the stipend will replace existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers at the following levels:

Less than 20%- 0 points	20%- 5 points
40%- 10 points	60%- 15 points
80%- 20 points	100%-25 points

#### Strengths:

The proposal provides \$10,000 for participants to use towards their self-selected professional learning opportunities. Participant must use these funds for a minimum of two professional learning activities.

#### Weaknesses:

It is not clear if mandated requirements consist of just two professional learning activities. The proposal also does not provide an estimate of the average annual professional learning costs per teacher. Consequently, it is not clear that the \$10,000 to be provided per teacher will be sufficient. In addition, these funds can be applied to professional learning in literacy only. The proposal doesn't indicate if there are any professional learning requirements on content/topic not related to literacy that wouldn't be covered by these funds.

Reader's Score: 20

2. (2) The adequacy of plans to ensure that stipends are appropriately used for high-quality professional learning.

#### Strengths:

The proposal indicates that an objective set of quality control parameters will be used to determine appropriate professional learning activities. (page e28)

#### Weaknesses:

The proposal does not identify any of the quality control parameters to be used to determine appropriate professional learning activities. The proposal would be stronger with the inclusion of these parameters and a selection of professional learning activities that have been identified to meet these parameters.

Sub

Reader's Score: 3

3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project will offer teachers flexibility and autonomy regarding the extent of the choice teachers have in selecting their professional learning.

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides sufficient details regarding how teachers will be provided with options for their professional learning activities. They may choose from a menu of pre-approved options and they can submit a request for approval for a professional learning opportunity that is not on the menu. (page e30)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. (4) The likelihood that the procedures and resources for teachers result in a simple process to select or request professional learning based on their professional learning needs and those identified needs of high-need students.

**Strengths:**

The proposal indicates that participating teachers will submit a request to the Voorhees College business office for payments/reimbursements for their selected professional learning activities.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal would be strengthened with the inclusion of an identified time-period prior to a selected professional learning activity that participants must make their requests. This is especially important for professional learning activities that are not on the pre-selected menu of approved activities.

Reader's Score: 4

5. (5) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

**Strengths:**

The proposal includes specific goals for outcome indicators (e.g. 10% increase on state ELA proficiency assessments for students of participants) and measurement instruments (e.g. SC assessments) for most of the project's goals (page e43). Allowing some participants to continue involvement in the Virtual Community of Practice as Co-Facilitators has the potential to increase their ability to effectively implement Information Science in their classes.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal would be improved if evidence of effectiveness was defined for teachers' self-reporting of program impacts. More detail about the Virtual Community of Practice is needed. Although the budget includes funds for each Mentor to conduct sessions, it is not clear what topics will be conducted in those sessions. It is also not clear how participants will be trained to use the SIBME technology and Digital Promise platforms.

Reader's Score: 4

**Resources and Quality of Management Plan - Resources and Quality of Management Plan**

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project based on the following factors:

**Reader's Score: 23**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The sufficiency of the stipend amount to enable professional learning funded through the stipend to replace a significant portion of existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal indicates that participating teachers will receive up to \$10,000 of professional learning support during their one-year participation in the program. The proposed program will allow for carry-over funds if a participant is unable to use the entire \$10,000 during that year. The budget also includes funds for technology for participants to participate in the Virtual Community of Practice and to record and share their required video reports.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal does not provide an estimate of the average cost per teacher for mandatory professional learning

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

Approximately 40% of the proposed yearly budget goes directly to support participating teachers. This includes the stipend for participating in the summer Professional Learning Intensive, funds for technology to participate in the virtual community of practice, and funds for serving as a Co-Facilitator for sessions lead by the Virtual Teacher Mentor Coaches.

**Weaknesses:**

The budget includes funds (about 6% of the total budget) for consulting from the Institute for Organizational Coherence, but it is not clear what this organization will contribute to program activities

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the proposed payment structure will enable teachers to have an opportunity to apply for and use the stipend with minimal burden.**

**Strengths:**

Participants will make a request to the Voorhees College Business Office for funds to participate in professional learning opportunities

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal would be improved with a timeline to line to let participants know how long before an activity they need to submit a request.

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 4. (4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The proposal has provided a list of appropriate qualifications required for the Program Director. The proposal has identified an interim Project Director with sufficient qualifications to establish program activities until the Program Director is hired. The external evaluator has the appropriate background and experience to conduct the evaluation plan.

**Weaknesses:**

Although the Co-PIs/Faculty Advisors had some of the leadership, management, and education experiences to conduct some of the program activities assigned to them, only two have a background in literacy and/or teacher professional development. None of them have the necessary background and experience needed to provide instruction in Information Science, which is a key component in developing participating teachers' ability to identify and select professional learning activities to improve the literacy achievement of their students. Also, the proposal would be improved with the inclusion of the number of National Board Certified Teachers who can be identified as experts in improvement science. It is not clear that teachers who have the highest effectiveness level per state teacher effectiveness rating protocols will necessarily be experts in Information Science.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**5. (5) 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.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal includes an implementation timeline for the phases of program development and implementation that includes individuals responsible. (pages e37-38)

**Weaknesses:**

The timeline does not include development of the Impact menu of approved professional learning activities. It also does not include the development of the Professional Learning Intensive.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**6. (6) The adequacy of procedures for leveraging the stipend program to inform continuous improvement and systematic changes to professional learning.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides sufficient evidence of plans for data collection and sharing across the levels of program management to support continuous improvement. (page e39)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project based on the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan includes a randomized controlled trial that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. The treatment and control groups for each year of the grant will consist of matched pairs of classrooms of the 75 participating teachers and 75 non-participating teachers. Criteria for creating and evaluating the quality of the matching are provided in the evaluation plan.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan indicates the planned use of ANOVA to compare treatment and control groups. This is an appropriate method for comparing group averages. It also indicates the potential use of ANCOVA if confounding variables are identified. Appropriate effect size information is provided.

**Weaknesses:**

It is not clear how or if data from each year of the grant will be combined to conduct the ANOVA. It is also not clear that the "business as usual" professional learning activities of the non-participating teachers will be reviewed to compare with the options selected by the participating teachers. The evaluation plan would be improved with the collection of data from participating teachers after the year of their participation to determine what, if any, long term impacts of the Information Science instruction on teachers' ability to improve their instruction strategies to meet their students' needs.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan includes a detailed table of feedback mechanisms. (page e45)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

## Priority Questions

### CPP - Competitive Preference Priority 2

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: SEA Partnership

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate it has established a partnership between an eligible entity and an SEA (with either member of the partnership serving as the applicant) to support the proposed project.

#### Strengths:

The proposal includes letters of support from three school districts.

#### Weaknesses:

The three letters of support are all nearly identical and don't identify how the school districts will be involved with the grant. In addition, there is no letter from the South Carolina Department of Education.

**Reader's Score:**     **2**

---

**Status:**           Submitted  
**Last Updated:**   10/28/2020 03:22 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:12 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Voorhees College (S411C200080)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	43
<b>Sub Total</b>	45	43
<b>Resources and Quality of Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources and Quality of Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources and Management	30	28
<b>Sub Total</b>	30	28
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	25
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	25
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. SEA Partnership	5	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	1
<b>Total</b>	105	97

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY19 EIR Early-phase AP 3- PD - 1: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Voorhees College (S411C200080)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 43

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which professional learning funded through the stipend will replace existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers at the following levels:

Less than 20%- 0 points	20%- 5 points
40%- 10 points	60%- 15 points
80%- 20 points	100%-25 points

#### Strengths:

The application states that the project will replace 100% of the required professional learning. Participating teachers will attend a one-week professional learning intensive to start the program. They will then have access to \$10,000 for professional learning for the year, which is the national average for PL/teacher/year. (pp. e25, e30)

#### Weaknesses:

The application does not provide the list of district-required professional learning hours or topics. This information would provide stronger evidence that the proposed project is, in fact, replacing 100% of the required professional learning. (page not found)

Reader's Score: 24

2. (2) The adequacy of plans to ensure that stipends are appropriately used for high-quality professional learning.

#### Strengths:

The application details a plan to ensure that stipends are used for high-quality professional learning. The proposed project begins with training teachers in the method of improvement science, which will help individual teachers better understand their professional needs and identify the appropriate professional learning opportunities. Teachers will also work with National Board Certified mentor teachers and an Advisory Board composed of high-performing teachers to help with the selection of quality professional learning. The Chief Finance Officer of the applicant organization will provide counsel and direction. This will help protect against fraud and waste. (pp. e8, e190)

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score: 5**

3. **(3) The extent to which the proposed project will offer teachers flexibility and autonomy regarding the extent of the choice teachers have in selecting their professional learning.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project will offer teachers a great deal of flexibility and autonomy in selecting professional learning opportunities. Once participating teachers have completed improvement science training, they will, with the help of a Clinical Advisor and Virtual Coach, create a unique professional learning plan with professional learning options best suited to their needs. The Advisory Board will begin a list of vetted professional learning opportunities and review/approve requests that are not on the list based on an objective set of quality control standards. (p. e26)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score: 5**

4. **(4) The likelihood that the procedures and resources for teachers result in a simple process to select or request professional learning based on their professional learning needs and those identified needs of high-need students.**

**Strengths:**

The application outlines a simple process for teachers to select or request professional learning based on their needs. Teachers will either make a selection from a pre-approved list of professional learning options or submit a summary with rationale for the selection of an alternate professional learning option to the advisory board for approval. Approved professional learning options that were not on the list could be added based on a review following completion. The applicant notes that an information session will be held for interested teachers prior to the start of the program with ongoing marketing and recruitment for the duration of the program. (pp. e21, e28-29, e38)

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not provide a detailed outreach strategy for notifying teachers of the stipend opportunity. There is no information on how teachers will be made aware of the program. (page not found)

**Reader's Score: 4**

5. **(5) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

The application clearly provides specific and measurable goals, objectives and outcomes. Specifically, these include, but are not limited to; a minimum 10% increase in ELA and reading proficiency of students measured by state and district assessments, a minimum of 90% of teachers who self-select and attend professional learning in literacy measured by completion rates, and increased program impact measured by publications and an operational platform for the dissemination of program tools. (pp. e30-31, e43)

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Resources and Quality of Management Plan - Resources and Quality of Management Plan**

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project based on the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 28**

Sub

- 1. (1) The sufficiency of the stipend amount to enable professional learning funded through the stipend to replace a significant portion of existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed stipend amount is sufficient to replace a significant portion of mandatory professional development. The project provides \$10,000 for teacher-selected professional learning to cover registration, materials and travel, which is in line with the national average allotted per teacher, per year. Additionally, the project provides funding for 5 substitute days per teacher. (p. e31, e187)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The costs budgeted for the proposed project are reasonable in relation to the stated objectives and design of the project. The Professional Learning Intensive is key to the success of the program as it provides the basis for teachers' understanding of how to assess their professional needs and evaluate PL. The compensation for mentor teachers and other experts who will spend significant time guiding cohort teachers is appropriate. Finally, the amount budgeted directly for teacher-selected PL is appropriate for the stated goal of 10% increase in literacy achievement in students each year. (pp. e186-190)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the proposed payment structure will enable teachers to have an opportunity to apply for and use the stipend with minimal burden.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The proposed payment structure of the project allows teachers to use their stipend with minimal burden. Once teachers have selected from the pre-approved menu or had their request approved, the Program Director or Administrative Assistant will pay for the registration and make any necessary travel/hotel arrangements for the teacher directly from the applicant organization's Business Office. (p. e33)

**Weaknesses:**

Providing a timeline for the requests and approval process would strengthen this proposal. Understanding the lead time teachers would need to submit requests would be helpful. (Page not found.)

**Reader's Score: 4**

**4. (4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

The key personnel for the proposed project are highly qualified. The interim Project Director (who will be the primary grant administrator) holds a Doctor of Education and has more than 30 years in the field of education. Faculty Advisors from Voorhees College will facilitate the year-long experience for the cohorts. Mentor teacher coaches to be selected will be National Board Certified. (p. e34)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**5. (5) 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.**

**Strengths:**

The application presents a clear and thorough timeline for the project that includes the activities to be completed and the responsible parties. Adherence to the proposed timeline will ensure the objectives are met on time and within budget. (pp. e37-38)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**6. (6) The adequacy of procedures for leveraging the stipend program to inform continuous improvement and systematic changes to professional learning.**

**Strengths:**

The application outlines a plan of continuous improvement for the stipend program. This includes regular collection and review of feedback from teachers, as well as data to inform any needed changes to the implementation of the program. The Advisory Board will form both a Replication Support Team and a Sustainability Committee to help sustain the program beyond the grant period. (p. e39)

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not specifically identify a plan to increase the number of teachers who have the opportunity to participate in teacher-directed learning. (p. Page not found)

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project based on the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**Strengths:**

The proposed evaluation plan meets the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. It will consist of a randomized control group of 75 teachers annually. The evaluation team will create a matched sample of comparison classrooms taught by teachers who have been through the IMPACT program and those who have not. The evaluation team will refine matching as needed to ensure that it is within the standard 0.25 deviation. Analyses of variance and covariance will be conducted to ensure that no confounding factors exist between the control and treatment groups. (pp. e41-42)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

**Strengths:**

The application clearly articulates the project's key components, mediators, and outcomes, along with measurable thresholds for implementation. Key components include student achievement, the professional learning intensive/micro credential, teacher-driven professional learning in literacy, and replication strategies. Program outcomes include improved student achievement in literacy, a reduction in the number of schools designated as unsatisfactory and below average, an increase in the number of mid-career teachers and teachers from underrepresented groups that attain a micro-credential in improvement science, and an increase in the impact of the program through effective replication and scaled impact strategies. (pp. e43-44)

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score:** 5

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

**Strengths:**

The application details a plan of regular evaluation and feedback from each of the program's stakeholders. Teachers will provide feedback through satisfaction surveys and the data generated, the Advisory Board, Program Director and Evaluation team will meet monthly to review data and determine the need for any program improvements. The South Carolina Board of Education will also monitor the program and provide feedback to increase the number and kinds of professional learning that qualify for Continuing Education Credits. This plan for regular monitoring and feedback along with an openness to make adjustments and improvements as needed will increase the likelihood of the program's success in meeting its goals. (p. e45)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Priority Questions**

**CPP - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: SEA Partnership**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate it has established a partnership between an eligible entity and an SEA (with either member of the partnership serving as the applicant) to support the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The application states that it will partner with the South Carolina Department of Education. (pp. e15)

**Weaknesses:**

An MOU or letter of support directly from the South Carolina Department of Education would strengthen this proposal. (Page not found)

**Reader's Score:** 1

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 10/28/2020 03:12 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Voorhees College (S411C200080)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	38
<b>Sub Total</b>	45	38
<b>Resources and Quality of Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources and Quality of Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources and Management	30	24
<b>Sub Total</b>	30	24
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	25
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	25
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. SEA Partnership	5	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	1
<b>Total</b>	105	88



# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY19 EIR Early-phase AP 3- PD - 1: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Voorhees College (S411C200080)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 38

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which professional learning funded through the stipend will replace existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers at the following levels:

Less than 20%- 0 points	20%- 5 points
40%- 10 points	60%- 15 points
80%- 20 points	100%-25 points

#### Strengths:

The applicant outlines a thorough process for eligible teachers to complete as a professional learning experience, including intensive Improvement Science training for all participants to help them identify and solve around a problem of practice (page e25).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant provides minimum details on the level of professional learning that is being replaced. Additional details on the number of hours of days of professional learning this program is intended to replace are needed. Also details on mandatory non-content related professional development are needed.

While there are a couple of letters of support included with the application (page e127-e129); additional details from the district perspective on the number of teachers they anticipate participating each year and the district role in supporting this participation are needed.

Reader's Score: 20

2. (2) The adequacy of plans to ensure that stipends are appropriately used for high-quality professional learning.

#### Strengths:

The applicant includes an adequate procedure for adding teacher-identified opportunities to the menu of professional learning opportunities as a proxy for high quality, easing the process for new teachers who would like to attend the same training (page e29).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project will offer teachers flexibility and autonomy regarding the extent of the choice teachers have in selecting their professional learning.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's proposal is strongly centered on teacher-identified professional learning needs, through the use of Improvement Science to identify gaps in individual expertise and instructional capacity (page e29).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 4. (4) The likelihood that the procedures and resources for teachers result in a simple process to select or request professional learning based on their professional learning needs and those identified needs of high-need students.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant includes adequate details on the resources to be offered to eligible teachers for teacher-directed professional learning, including a menu of options and the ability to select alternative trainings (page e30).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide adequate information about how participants will be recruited to participate or provide details on how information will be shared initially with teachers to provide information about professional learning options not previously available to teachers. It is unclear if this role will be fulfilled by the districts or the applicant.

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 5. (5) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

Goals, objectives, and outcomes are appropriately included on pages e30-e31.

Applicant provides adequate details on measureable outcomes related to project goals and objectives (page e43).

**Weaknesses:**

Details on of baseline data, along with anticipated student growth measures are needed

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Resources and Quality of Management Plan - Resources and Quality of Management Plan**

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project based on the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The sufficiency of the stipend amount to enable professional learning funded through the stipend to replace a significant portion of existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant includes funding for both professional learning and anticipated registrations costs associated with these opportunities for up to 75 teachers a year (375 teachers over five years) (page e31).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant provided limited information on the full stipend amount. Details on how the pool of funding will be allocated and managed are needed.

Additional details are needed on how the amount for the two stipend figures was determined. Previous costs for professional learning across the districts are needed. In addition, a description of how the cost of the Professional Learning Intensive varies from other professional learning opportunities teachers are expected to complete during the week prior to the opening of school (page e31). This information would provide more details about the reasonableness of the stipend amount.

**Reader's Score: 2**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant includes an appropriate and reasonable budget to meet the goals and objectives of this project (see budget narrative).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the proposed payment structure will enable teachers to have an opportunity to apply for and use the stipend with minimal burden.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant included the appropriate assurances and an adequate process in which the college will manage all direct payments for professional learning opportunities (page e33).

**Weaknesses:**

Additional details on the timeline in which teachers need to submit requests for professional learning to the Project Director are needed. In addition, information about how substitute coverage will be managed throughout this process is needed.

Sub

Reader's Score: 3

**4. (4) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant includes rural teachers as an Advisory Group, which is part of the proposed key personnel structure (page e34). This inclusion of practitioners will be beneficial as the program iterative to meet the needs of teachers.

**Weaknesses:**

Additional details on the working relationship between the college and the targeted districts are needed to understand how connected the entities are, which can impact the teachers' utilization of the college as an option for professional learning.

Reader's Score: 4

**5. (5) 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.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a comprehensive management plan outlining objectives, timelines, and responsibilities (pages e 35-e38).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

**6. (6) The adequacy of procedures for leveraging the stipend program to inform continuous improvement and systematic changes to professional learning.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant includes expanding the use of stipends for teacher directed professional learning over the course of the grant by adding a new cohort every year. In addition, the structure in which the College is proposing to use (Improvement Science) is a model for continuous improvement (page e31).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project based on the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**Strengths:**

The applicant identifies an independent evaluator who has designed an evaluation plan to meet the What Works Clearing House without reservations (page e41). The evaluator has proposed using a randomized control assessment of outcomes through comparison of treatment and control group educators (page e41).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant adequately outlines project components, mediators, outcomes, and the measurable threshold for acceptable implementation (page e43-e45).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant outlines both process and outcome evaluation methodology to measure progress toward outcomes. Process evaluation will focus on the implementation aspects of the project, with the outcome evaluation focused on the effectiveness of the project (page e46). Appropriate feedback mechanisms and the use of assessments are built into both methodologies.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**CPP - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: SEA Partnership**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate it has established a partnership between an eligible entity and an SEA (with either member of the partnership serving as the applicant) to support the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant notes the South Carolina Department will partner with the College in the narrative (page e22).

**Weaknesses:**

There is inadequate evidence to support a true partnership with an SEA. The applicant provides limited information about the nature of the partnership on page e22; however the inclusion of a letter of support outlining responsibilities and expectations of both parties would be beneficial.

**Reader's Score:** 1

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/28/2020 03:21 PM