

**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: School Board of Miami-Dade County, FL (S411C200111)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	37
Sub Total	45	37
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources and Management	30	28
Sub Total	30	28
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	24
Sub Total	25	24
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. SEA Partnership	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	94

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, FL (S411C200111)

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: 37

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 proposed activities provide four different pathways of participation that will replace 100% of the mandatory professional development for participating teachers. Funds provide a \$1500 professional learning allowance that includes stipends to participate in professional learning sessions, travel, and registration fees. Participants will be allowed to carry over funds from one year to the next to put towards more expensive programs. (page e34) Funds from the professional learning allowance may also be used towards the cost of NBPTS certification or renewal. (page e27) Participants are expected to complete a minimum of 50% of their 24 required Master Plan Points through the grant funded stipend system. The remaining 50% of required training (on teaching students with disabilities and approaches to reading instruction) may be satisfied by either participating in the Teachers CHOICE program or through their district's professional learning options. (pages e23-24)

Weaknesses:

Although participants can replace up to 100% of their professional development requirements, they are only required to complete 50%. (page e52)

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 includes a table that outlines the Stipend System Management that includes review and approval of professional development credits. (page e28) Professional development activities are vetted by the Office of Professional Development and Evaluation or the Professional Learning Support Team at participating schools (page e30). The stipend structure is comprised of six elements and incorporates measures to detect, prevent, and correct

Sub

fraud, waste, and abuse. (page e25) The six elements include establishing a compliance committee, advisory board, and compliance training.

Weaknesses:

None 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:

Participating teachers will choose from one of four participation pathways based on their annual Deliberate Practice Growth Target. (page e27) Participants may choose to participate in existing district-approved options. (pages e26 and e33)

Weaknesses:

The proposal would be strengthened if a contingency plan was identified for the situation where a teacher wishes to change pathways. It is not clear how this might be handled or if it is even possible. This might be considered a minor issue since participants are not locked into a single pathway across all years of participating in the grant program. The proposal would be improved with details about the annual Deliberate Practice Growth Target (DPGT) that teachers complete and with details about how activities within Pathway 4 will meet or address the components of participants' DPGTs.

Reader's Score: 3

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 Stipend System Management table provides a series of steps participants will follow to request participation in each pathway. (page e28)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

Table 3: Objectives, Performance Measures and Proximal Outcomes (pages e52-53) provides sufficient detail about the data to be collected for the activities associated with each of the five main objectives. It also includes sufficient details about the measures for determining project success.

Weaknesses:

The proposal would be improved with more specific goals, such as increasing student achievement scores or improving teacher effectiveness by a specific percentage. It would also be improved with an indication how many participants achieve the Teacher Leadership Endorsement.

Sub

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: 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 budget provides \$1500 each year for each participating teacher to participate in professional learning activities. The proposal indicates that the average cost to support teacher professional learning was \$1540.42. (page e33)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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:

Approximately 70% of total costs per year goes directly to participants in the form of their stipend (plus FICA), registration fees and travel expenses.

Weaknesses:

None 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 proposal indicates how the stipend process is initiated for each of the four pathways, including when participants can request stipends/reimbursements. (pages e35-36)

Weaknesses:

Information about where professional learning allowance funds are distributed from is not included in the proposal. The proposal does not indicate a specific district or state budget office that will control these funds. It does mention that the Executive Director of the Office of Professional Development and Evaluation will have fiscal oversight (page 36) and that the program will be housed in the Office of Human Capital Management of the Miami Dade County Public Schools, but not the person or office directly responsible for dispensing funds to participants or to professional learning providers. The proposal also does not indicate the time-frame that teachers must follow to

Sub

request stipend funds prior to participating in professional learning activities.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

Table 4 (page e55) indicates specific roles to be conducted by key personnel. The CVs of key personnel provide sufficient evidence of the qualifications of these individuals to conduct their assigned project activities.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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:

Table 5 (pages e 56-57) provides sufficient detail concerning project activities for each of the project objectives and the individuals responsible for those activities.

Weaknesses:

Although the proposal indicates that teacher participation will begin in 2021/22 (page e23) and that teachers' information about the Teachers CHOICE program will be made available to teachers as part of the summer at a learning showcase, it doesn't indicate when participants can make their requests for stipends or reimbursements.

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 describes a five-step continuous improvement model and mechanisms for participants to review and share their professional learning experiences. (pages e37-39) Continuous improvement is further supported by the Professional Learning Support Teams at participating schools. (page e37)

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 quasi-experimental design that meets the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations. (page e41). The process of selecting the 83 "business as usual" control schools and matching teachers in these schools to participating teachers is well-defined. (page e 59) The proposal includes plans to evaluate impacts on student achievement, attendance, and disciplinary referrals after two, three, and four years. (page e41) The evaluation plan includes one or more appropriate research questions for each component of the evaluation (fidelity, confirmatory impact, exploratory impact, and subgroup impact) (page e41) along with the data to be collected and planned methods of data analysis. (page e25) The methods of data analysis are appropriate for addressing the research questions and the types of data to be collected.

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 includes sufficient detail regarding evaluating key project components and outcomes in Appendix J. (pages e55 – 63). It is noteworthy that the evaluation plan includes plans to establish the reliability and validity of the school checklist to be used for the fidelity study and that school fidelity will be assessed twice each year. (page e44).

Weaknesses:

The proposal would be improved with specific goals for the long-term outcomes, such as a specific percentage increase in enhanced instructional practice and increased diverse retention for teachers and a specific percentage increase in student achievement.

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 indicates that the project and evaluation teams will meet at least monthly to review progress and discuss feedback to guide continuous improvement. (page e45) In addition, the evaluation includes case studies on six participating schools each year to collect implementation data and provide vignettes of classroom practice of participating teachers. (page e42)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Sub

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 is the Miami-Dade County Public Schools, in partnership with the Florida Department of Education.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:13 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, FL (S411C200111)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	37
Sub Total	45	37
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources and Management	30	23
Sub Total	30	23
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	24
Sub Total	25	24
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. SEA Partnership	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	89

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, FL (S411C200111)

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: 37

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 proposed project provides the opportunity for participating teachers to replace 100% of mandatory professional development. Teachers will be provided \$1500 each year for professional learning, which is approximately the same as what the district currently spends on annual teacher professional development. (p. e34)

Weaknesses:

While the application states that teachers participating in the program can replace up to 100% of their mandatory professional learning with teacher-directed options, they are only required to replace 50% (60 of the 120) required hours. (p. e22)

Reader's Score: 18

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

Strengths:

The application provides a thorough plan to protect stipends from fraud, waste and abuse, including the designation of a compliance committee and an advisory board, compliance with all local, state and federal standard, compliance training, and internal monitoring. Staff in the Office of Professional Development and Evaluation (OPDE) will manage the stipend system in order to ensure that the professional learning options selected meet the definition of professional learning. The Office of Professional Development and Evaluation will use the district's Framework of Effective Professional Learning rubric to confirm that selections not on the list of approved choices meet the criteria for high-quality professional learning. The OPDE team will process registration fees and make any necessary travel arrangements for teachers upon selection and approval of professional learning. (pp. e25-26, e28)

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 program offers teachers significant flexibility and autonomy in selecting professional learning. It outlines four pathways for teachers to follow, including one that provides teachers with the ability to independently select high-quality professional learning, based on their Deliberate Practice Growth Target and with the help/guidance of their school's Professional Learning Support Team (PLST). Teachers will be informed of the new professional learning options through onboarding and informational sessions, as well as an annual learning showcase hosted at one of the participating schools. (pp. e28-29)

Weaknesses:

The requirement that all professional learning funded through this program must take place outside of the regular school day or year may limit the choices teachers have regarding professional learning options. (p. e23)

Reader's Score: 4

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 an outreach plan that includes building a landing page on the district's HR website, hosting information sessions, presenting at onboarding and informational meetings, and holding meetings to specifically address the needs of teachers. Teachers are able to select one of four pathways by submitting a request to either their school's Professional Learning Support Team or the Office of Professional Development and Evaluation, depending on the choice. (p. e32, e30)

Weaknesses:

No weakness

Reader's Score: 5

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 objectives and outcomes for the proposed project are clear and measurable. Stated objectives include the development of a teacher-directed professional learning system, increased educator capacity to support professional growth, improved teacher agency in professional learning, effectiveness and retention, improved achievement and behavior for high-need students, and increased district capacity to scale and sustain the program. Some of the measures for desired outcomes include 80% of implementation fidelity is met, 80% of school leaders report improvement in capacity to support teacher agency, 80% of teachers receive monthly support, and higher student achievement on ELA and math scores in intervention schools relative to matched comparison schools. (pp. e52-53)

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: 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 proposed stipend amount for this project of \$1500 will be equivalent to the district's current professional learning allowance which will enable teachers to replace 100% of the existing mandatory professional learning. The 2019-2020 average spent on stipends in the district was \$1540.42. This amount will cover registration, travel and a stipend for participation. (p. e34)

Weaknesses:

The proposal states that the professional learning allowance can be spent through any combination of stipend for participation, travel, and registration. It is unclear if the stipend amount should cover the hotel and per diem costs. It is also unclear what incentive a teacher has to use the full or majority of the allowance towards professional learning as opposed to keeping a larger portion as a stipend for participation. Will there be any oversight on this? (p. e35)

Reader's Score: 3

- 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 proposed cost for the Instructional Supervisor is reasonable in relation to the objectives of the program. (p. e156)

Weaknesses:

An explanation as to why the stipend amount increases after the first year from \$400 to \$600, while travel and registration costs remain the same would be helpful in determining the reasonableness of the proposed costs. The proposed budget lists \$10,000 per year for computers and equipment for staff. Typically, the cost for equipment purchase is frontloaded in the first year of a program, with the budget in this category decreasing in subsequent years. The specific number of computers and a detailed list of equipment would provide more clarity for the requested amount. A detailed description of the services to be provided by the Learning Policy Institute would help justify the budgeted \$10,000 per year. Given that the proposed project seeks to engage 1120 teachers annually, it

Sub

does not seem that only two Curriculum Support Specialists will be sufficient to meet the proposed objectives of the project. (pp. e156-157)

Reader's Score: 3

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 proposed payment structure for teachers selecting pathways 2 & 4 simply require teachers to complete a stipend request form and evaluate and reflect on the learning after completing approved professional learning. The OPDE team will process registration fees and make travel arrangements as needed. (pp. e28)

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how stipends for teachers who select pathway 1 will be paid. It is noted that the process for pathway 1 is initiated by the Office of Professional Development and Evaluation, but there is no further information about the process or turnaround time. It is also unclear if there will be out-of-pocket costs for teachers who select pathway 3. It is designated as a school-based professional learning option, but the process notes that teachers will register for and complete course requirements prior to submitting a stipend request form. (p. e28-29)

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

While several of the staff in the Office of Professional Development and Evaluation are new in their positions, they possess the education and experience for successful implementation of the proposed project. With more than 25 years in the district in positions ranging from principal to superintendent, the Chief Human Capital Officer - a key member of the leadership team - possesses more than adequate education and experience to provide oversight and guidance. Key personnel for the evaluation team also possess the appropriate experience and training including doctorate degrees and What Works Clearinghouse Certification. (pp. e72-e148)

Weaknesses:

Separate clear and detailed job descriptions for the Instructional Supervisor and Curriculum Support Specialist would provide clearer expectations for these positions. (p. Page not found)

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 proposed timeline provides a detailed description of the activities and responsible parties for the project. These activities include development and support of the stipend system, teacher engagement, SEA engagement, and a regular cycle of evaluation and improvement. (pp. e56-57)

Weaknesses:

No weakness.

Sub

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 notes that the project and evaluation teams will meet monthly to evaluate findings for continuous improvement. Teacher feedback and data will be used to identify highly effective professional learning partners. Teachers and school leaders will share information on the success of the program and the Florida Department of Education is committed to expanding the teacher-directed model (if shown successful) throughout the state in order to offer more teachers the opportunity to engage. (pp. e38-40)

Weaknesses:

No weakness.

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 proposed evaluation, if well implemented, will produce evidence of effectiveness that meets the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations. The evaluation team, led by two What Works Clearinghouse certified reviewers, proposes a quasi-experimental design study to evaluate the impact of the program on participating teachers and students. A comparison group of matched teachers and students in non-participating schools will be identified in the fall of 2020, after baseline measures have been administered. (pp. e40-e42)

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 provides a detailed description of the key project components, mediators and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. Key components include: professional support teams in each school, 1400 participating teachers across 18 schools, curriculum support specialists, an advisory board that

Sub

includes the Florida Department of Education, support for teachers and administrators, and a professional development management system. Long-term outcomes include enhanced instructional practice, improved achievement for high-needs students, and increased district capacity to scale and sustain teacher-directed professional learning. The proposal identifies the threshold for acceptable implementation as 80%. (pp. e54, e44)

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 proposed project outlines a plan to regularly review the progress of the program. Monthly meetings between the project and evaluation teams will provide an opportunity to review progress, consult with the EIR technical assistance providers and discuss interim feedback to inform improvement. The evaluation team will also produce annual evaluation reports focused on student outcome, implementation fidelity and adherence to minimum thresholds, challenges, and areas of improvement. This level of review and openness to allowing feedback to guide improvement will contribute to successfully meeting the stated goals. (p27)

Weaknesses:

Including teacher feedback in the regular review of the program would strengthen this proposal. (p. Page not found.)

Reader's Score: 4

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 organization is an LEA (Miami-Dade County Public Schools) partnering with the SEA. The application contains a letter of support and draft MOU from the Florida Department of Education for the proposed project. (p. Appendix - no page number indicated)

Weaknesses:

No weakness.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:13 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, FL (S411C200111)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	37
Sub Total	45	37
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources and Management	30	24
Sub Total	30	24
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	23
Sub Total	25	23
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. SEA Partnership	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	89

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, FL (S411C200111)

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: 37

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 plans to achieve the 100% threshold through the program by not placing a limit on the number of Master Plan Points of professional learning a participant can accrue per year (page e22).

Weaknesses:

It is unclear if teachers participating in this program are exempted from specific professional learning sessions during the district's mandatory professional learning days (page e23). If teacher are required to attend, that does not meet the 100% of teacher selected professional learning threshold.

In addition, the applicant notes on page e29 that only pathway 3 is an option in which teachers qualify for a stipend. Clarification is needed on which teachers are eligible to select 100% of their PD through the stipend system.

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 outlines a number of compliance mechanisms, such as compliance training, development of a compliance committee, and identifying effective communication systems (page e25). These systems are designed to protect against fraud, waste, and abuse.

The applicant also provides adequate details on teacher selected opportunity approvals outside of the approved list of providers (pages e26 – e27). Specifically, the applicant identifies the Framework for Effective Professional

Sub

Learning as a pre-existing research-based tool to verify opportunities (page e28).

The applicant provides appropriate information on connecting the CHOICE Initiative to annual reflection processes and procedures for all teachers to help guide the professional growth of teachers (page e28).

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 identifies a couple of appropriate outreach mechanisms to inform teachers in participating schools about the opportunity (page e29).

Weaknesses:

Additional details on how the professional learning will be connected to student needs are needed.

Reader's Score: 4

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 provides appropriate details on how the opportunity will be communicated with eligible teachers, including a landing page on the HR website, presentations and information sessions, and teacher meetings (page e32).

Weaknesses:

Clarity on the process of who teachers submit reviews to is needed. The applicant states that teachers will submit a request to the PLST for Pathway 3, or to OPDE for Pathways 1,2, and 4. Additional information on how teachers will know and understand which pathway they are requesting is needed.

Additional details on the number of teachers to be recruited are needed. It is unclear if all 1,400 teachers across the 18 schools will be participating, making it difficult to ascertain the anticipated level of teacher participation.

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 applicant provides measureable outcomes related to program objectives and outcomes (page e53).

Sub

Weaknesses:

Additional details are needed on projected student growth measures. In addition, details on baseline teacher retention rates and teacher effectiveness for both participating and nonparticipating schools are needed.

The timeframe in which various activities will be carried out is not clear. Additional details on the timeline associated to the activities and objectives 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 provides details on allowing teachers to bank their funds so that they can attend higher cost professional learning opportunities in subsequent years (page e34).

Weaknesses:

Additional details on the cost analysis conducted to come up with the annual stipend amount are needed. Examples of what the district paid per teacher over the past couple of years for professional leaning would be beneficial.

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:

The district provides some details on a 10% match of funds to cover various district personnel over the life of the grant (page e185).

Weaknesses:

On page e35, the applicant indicates this process will result in cost savings across the district. Details on how those cost savings will be met are needed.

The applicant did not provide substantial details in the budget narrative to justify overall costs.

Reader's Score: 3

Sub

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 district will be responsible for all reimbursements and payments for professional learning (page e36).

Weaknesses:

The applicant outlines three different processes for teachers, without clear communication and coordination at the school level these processes may become confusing. While the applicant notes who will initiate each process additional information on how the process will be communicated to ensure minimal burden for teachers is needed.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The applicant identifies the Teacher-Directed Professional Learning Advisory Board to help oversee and coordinate this effort. The applicant appropriately includes various roles, including that of classroom teachers, in this advisory capacity (page e36).

The applicant provides adequate details on the roles of program staff, including instructional supervisor and curriculum support specialist (page e37). Additional details in Appendix B (page e55) clearly outline the expertise of project personnel.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 chart on page e56/e57 adequately outlines key activities and the parties responsible for fulfilling the work.

Weaknesses:

More details about the timeline associated with different activities is needed. As presented on page e57 the applicant indicates all activities are on-going annually for the full five years. More specific timeframes are needed.

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 applicant identifies a number of appropriate processes to ensure continuous improvement is built into the system, including the use of PLST members, a learning showcase, use of a Website, and in-school collaboration and sharing (page e38-39).

Sub

Weaknesses:

Details on how the district will expand the use of professional learning stipends across more teachers over time are needed.

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: 23

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 proposes a quasi-experimental design approach that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations (page e41). The applicant provides adequate power analysis, effect size, and confirmatory and exploratory impacts (page e42). Adequate details are also included about the control and treatment groups.

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:

Substantial details on measures, power analysis, and overall outcome analysis is included in the appendix (pages e60-e63).

The evaluation plan in the appendix (pages e60-e63) also makes appropriate connections to student outcomes and the measures that will be used

Weaknesses:

The proposed schools already have pretty high retention rates (page e49). Details on how this compares across the district and how it will be controlled for are needed.

Reader's Score: 4

Sub

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 a process to share internal findings as well as to disseminate findings beyond the district in order for the work to be replicated and tested in multiple settings (page e45).

Weaknesses:

The timeline proposed to provide evaluation reports annually may not be timely enough to support the system in making necessary iterations to the process over the life of the grant. Additional information on when annual reports will be provided are needed to determine if they will allow for adequate time to make modifications within the proposed project timeline.

Reader's Score: 4

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 SEA will have representation on the applicant's advisory board, allowing for full involvement and knowledge of the work in order to be further replicated across the state (page e40).

Letter of support from the SEA Commissioner is included endorsing the project (page e70-e71).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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