

**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: Region 18 Education Service Center (S411C200125)

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	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	89

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (S411C200125)

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 proposal provides funds to constitute at least 80% of participants' state-mandated professional development time. (page e23) The applicant will work with districts to determine the best ways to maximize the amount of professional learning time that can be released so that more than 80% release from mandatory professional learning time may be achieved. (page e27). The approach for each district to release professional learning time for participants to engage in their chosen activities will be agreed upon and confirmed at the start of the project. (page e32) Participants must engage in at least two learning cycles (selecting a professional learning activity that meets their needs, participating in the professional learning activity, submitting a reflection on the activity on the usefulness of the activity and the extent to which it met their needs) to meet the requirement of 24 continuing professional education credits. (pages e26 and e31)

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not indicate that 100% of teachers' required professional development time

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 plans to develop and test a rubric for assessing the quality of professional development activities. Research-based criteria for developing this rubric are provided in the proposal. (pages e27-28) The proposal indicates the inclusion of an Advisory Committee to assist in the identification of professional learning activities. (page e28)

Sub

Weaknesses:

It is not clear if the two mathematics contents specialists have the background needed to develop and test the professional development quality rubric. The proposal would be improved with examples of professional learning activities that have the potential to be approved using the quality rubric. It would also be improved with a discussion on how a minimum quality score will be established. In regards to the quality rubric, the proposal indicates that the performance measure for the rubric is that at least 90% of the Advisory Committee agree that it can be used. This conflicts with the need to test and validate the quality rubric. Similarly, in regards to the list of pre-approved courses, the proposal indicates that the performance measure is that at least 90% of the Advisory Committee agree that the list will meet participants' professional learning needs. This performance measure conflicts with the need to assess professional development activities with the quality rubric.

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 only fixed requirement for participants' selection of professional development activities, other than that it must be approved, is that it focuses on improving student math achievement. (page e29). Teachers will be prepared to assess their professional learning needs and the needs of their students. They will be supported in their selection of professional learning activities with an orientation workshop. (page e30) Descriptions of approved professional learning opportunities (including the quality rubric score) will be made available to participants in a platform they already use. Participants may also use this platform to request approval for professional learning opportunities that are not already identified and approved. (page e25) In addition, participation in a professional learning activity may take place during designated professional learning time, during non-instructional hours, or during instructional hours. (page e31)

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:

Because selecting, requesting, and reflecting on professional learning activities will be functions that are incorporated into a platform that participants already use, it is very likely that the process will be simple for participants to use. The process is outlined in a table. (page e31)

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not provide any detail about the annual professional learning plans that participants complete or on how they will use these plans to identify the best professional learning activities to improve their students' performance in mathematics. The proposal would be improved with an indication of how much time prior to participating a self-directed professional learning activity participants would be needed to obtain approval.

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.**

Sub

Strengths:

The proposal includes a series of strategies with associated outcomes and measures for each of the four performance objectives. (pages e32-33)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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 project will provide \$8,000 per teacher to cover at least 80% of a teacher's professional learning time. These funds can be used for four days or 24 hours of professional learning. The proposal indicates that the state's expenditures per teacher for professional learning activities was \$4,600 per teacher. (page e36) Up to \$500 of the \$2000 per day of professional learning can be used for travel reimbursement. (page e35)

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:

In addition to the \$8000 per participating teacher for professional learning, the budget includes \$500 for both participating teachers and the control group teachers as an incentive to contribute to the data collection needed for the evaluation study. The budget includes funds during the first year of the grant for the development of the platform features needed to support participants' selection and reflection on their professional learning activities. It also includes funds for the maintenance of these platform features after the first year of the grant.

Weaknesses:

The proposal indicates that 45% of the project budget will go directly for teacher selected professional learning and incentive stipends. The incentive funds are only expended during years 2 and 3 of the grant and professional learning stipends are expended during years 2 through 4. During the first year of the grant, approximately 25% will go towards salaries for key personnel. It is not clear if these funds are in addition to their regular salaries or if they replace a portion of their salaries. Approximately 20% of the grant budget of the five years of the grant goes

Sub

towards the external evaluator. Although the budget justification indicates how the amount for the external evaluator was arrived at, the amount seems excessive.

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 system for participants to select their professional learning and initiating stipend payments will be contained in a platform teachers already use. As participants make their requests, funds will go directly to the professional learning vendor. The applicant will then reimburse districts. (page e37) The applicant is identified in the logic model as managing the voucher payments. (page e25)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

Key project personnel have the background and experience to conduct program activities. The Project Director, the Director of Partnerships, and the Director of Research, Evaluation and Data Systems all have previous grant experience. Key personnel include mathematics specialists to assist in developing the quality rubric and identifying quality professional learning activities. The external evaluator has the appropriate background and experience to conduct the evaluation plan.

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:

Appendix Exhibit I.3 provides sufficient detail concerning strategies and performance measures for each of the four project objectives. It also includes individuals responsible for each strategy and a timeline for the five years of the grant. (pages e119-121)

Weaknesses:

None 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.**

Sub

Strengths:

The proposal includes a pilot phase to prepare for the implementation study. The external evaluator will contribute data for continuous improvement. Data collected will allow for project modifications. An Advisory Committee will be established to review implementation and evaluation findings. (pages e39-40)

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 multisite randomized controlled trial that will involve randomly dividing 54 schools into two cohorts. The timing of randomization is well-explained. Teachers in cohort 1 schools will participate in self-directed professional learning activities during the 2nd year of the grant. Teachers in cohort 2 schools will serve as the control group for the 2nd year of the grant and will participate in self-directed professional learning activities during the 3rd year of the grant. The evaluation plan addresses contamination and attrition, two issues that can impact the implementation study. Baseline equivalence of cohort schools, teachers, and students will be evaluated. A power analysis was conducted to determine minimum detectable effect sizes. Specific and appropriate methods of analysis are identified for each of the impact research questions. How missing data will be handled is addressed. (pages e43-44, pages e126-129)

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 logic model (page e25) provides sufficient detail on key project components, mediators and outcomes. Specific measurement tools and surveys are indicated. (pages e24-25)

Sub

Weaknesses:

None 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 evaluation plan indicates that the external evaluator will collect and use data to address the implementation research questions. Usage data from the enrollment platform and attendance records will be used to document and monitor participants' selections and attendance. Additional data will be collected from participating teachers and program staff using surveys and interviews. (pages e47-48)

Weaknesses:

Participation in self-directed professional learning activities will take place for the pilot study and participation of teachers in cohort 1 schools. Because the pilot study coincides with the first cohort of participating schools, it is not clear how the pilot student will inform the implementation study.

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:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does indicate plans to address this competitive Preference Priority.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (S411C200125)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	39
Sub Total	45	39
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources and Management	30	27
Sub Total	30	27
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. SEA Partnership	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	91

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (S411C200125)

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: 39

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:

This project proposes to replace at least four full days (24 hours) of mandatory professional development, which represents 80% of professional learning required for the year. The applicant organization will leverage existing partnerships to determine, across districts, the maximum time that can be released as some may be able to exceed 80%. Professional learning options may take place outside of school hours, during non-instructional time, or during instructional time with substitute coverage. (pp. e26, e31)

Weaknesses:

No weakness

Reader's Score: 20

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

Strengths:

The project proposes a detailed plan to ensure that stipends are used for high-quality professional learning. All requests are made through the TEEMS platform and, upon approval, payments are made directly to the vendor which will reduce fraud and waste. For requests not on the pre-approved list of choices, teachers will submit a request on the TEEMS platform which will be reviewed using the rubric created during the design phase by content experts. (pp. 37, e27)

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 application will use the existing TEEMS platform to inform teachers about the new professional learning options. Using student data and a list of PL options based on their needs, teachers will be able to request PL options not on the pre-approved list through the TEEM platform. During orientation teachers will be trained to use the rubric to assess the quality of professional learning options. (pp. e29-30)

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:

A detailed outreach plan is identified in the proposed project which includes the creation of recruitment materials, outreach to district leaders, schools, and principals - specifically those serving grades 3-8. A state network of education service centers will notify LEAs about the teacher-directed professional learning opportunity. The process for teachers to request or select professional learning is simple. Teachers will utilize the TEEMS platform to make their selection or request an option not already in the system. Once approved, the applicant organization will make payment to the school as reimbursement for direct payment made to the vendor. (pp. e116-117, e37)

Weaknesses:

The application does not provide any detail regarding the turnaround time for the selection and approval process for teachers. (p. 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 objectives, outcomes and measures for the proposed project are clearly specified. The objectives include collaboratively developing the program, piloting and refining the program, testing the impact of the program on teacher and student outcomes, and disseminating learnings. The proposed strategies align with the desired outcomes and measures. (pp.32,33)

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: 27

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 application proposes to provide participating teachers with \$8,000 for professional learning, plus \$500 for travel costs and a \$500 stipend. While the average amount spent on professional development for teachers in Texas in 2018-2019 was roughly \$4600, the proposed amount was derived based on 80% of recent estimates which put the cost between \$7,000 and \$18,000 per teacher. At a total of nearly double that of the average Texas teacher, the proposed amount is sufficient to replace at least 80% of the existing mandatory PD. (p. e36)

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how substitutes will be covered. There is no line item for them in the budget. Does that cost come out of the \$8,000? (Page not found)

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:

Overall, the costs provided in the proposed budget are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design and potential significance of the project. Approximately 45% of the budget goes directly to professional learning activities, with the next largest portions going to evaluation and personnel. Given that the project is designed to evaluate the impact of teacher-directed professional learning on student math achievement, this is reasonable. (pp. e144, e17)

Weaknesses:

The amount budgeted for the Content-Area Instructional Specialist to conduct on-site coaching is unclear. Is this not a local position? Does travel to these locations require an overnight stay? Clarification on this item would help in assessing its reasonableness. (p. e146)

Reader's Score: 4

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 process for teachers to use the stipend for local professional learning is simple and creates minimal burden for teachers. After an approved selection or request in TEEMS, the vendor is paid by the school and the school is reimbursed by the applicant organization through monthly payments. Teachers do not pay for registration out of pocket. (p. e37)

Weaknesses:

The application does not outline how travel or hotel is covered in the case of professional learning that occurs out of town. If the teacher has to pay upfront and wait to be reimbursed, it could create a burden/barrier to access. It is also unclear how or when teachers receive their \$500 stipend. (Page not found)

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The qualifications of key personnel including the Project Director, Director of Partnerships, Math Content Leads and Director of Research, Evaluation and Data Science all have the appropriate education and experience for their positions. Most of them hold at least a graduate degree in the education field and show career progression in the field. The evaluation team also brings highly qualified staff to the project. Nearly all hold a Master's degree or higher (most have a doctorate) and show progressive experience in their field. (pp. e38, e59-93)

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 proposed management plan is clear and outlines specific strategies, along with responsible parties, to meet proposed milestones such as updating the TEEMS platform, finalizing the rubric for choosing high-quality professional learning, obtaining signed agreements from teachers and principals, and publicly reporting findings on impacts that meet What Works Clearinghouse standards. Successfully meeting these, and additional milestones, will lead to achievement of the objectives of the proposed project. (pp. e119-121)

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.

Sub

Strengths:

The application outlines a plan for continuous improvement that includes regular feedback from key stakeholders including teachers, district and school leaders, and the evaluation team. This feedback will be used to guide project improvement, including implementation at the district and school levels. An Advisory Committee composed of district administrators, principals, and teachers will meet twice a year to review findings around implementation and evaluation to determine the need for any changes and the possibility of expanding the program to more teachers. (pp. e39-40)

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: 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 evaluation team proposes an implementation study and an impact study designed to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. This will be a randomized controlled trial involving 54 schools and two cohorts. Baseline data will be assessed at the school, teacher and student levels, and schools will be randomly assigned into control and treatment groups. All control and treatment teachers will be given the same beginning and end of year surveys to measure attitudes and beliefs. Video-based math lessons will be coded by MSCAN (an observation rubric) to measure improved classroom practice and the STAAR assessment will be used to measure student achievement in math, grades 3-8. (pp. e41-46)

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 evaluation clearly identifies four key components designed to improve teacher's attitudes and beliefs, and classroom practices in their math class. These outcomes will then mediate the impact of teacher-directed

Sub

professional learning on student achievement. The mediation analysis will then examine the relationship between teacher outcomes and student math achievement. The implementation thresholds for low, medium and high fidelity are clearly articulated. (pp. e45-46)

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 evaluation team will utilize the data collected to address the identified research questions. Information on teacher completion of the initial workshop, data from the TEEMS platform on PD selection, completion and reflection will all be used to determine not only fidelity, but the feasibility of implementation of the program as designed. (pp. e46-48)

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:

No strength.

Weaknesses:

No SEA partnership addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:15 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (S411C200125)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	38
Sub Total	45	38
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources and Management	30	29
Sub Total	30	29
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	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	91

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (S411C200125)

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 clearly and fully describes the rationale for proposing that 80% of mandatory professional learning will be replaced by teacher self-directed PL choices (page e26). The proposal allows for a majority of PL while still adhering to school-specific PL that requires full staff participation.

The applicant also presents a strong focus on math for teachers in grades 3-8 (page e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 presents an appropriate approach to conduct a national scan of PL opportunities as well as allowing teachers to identify additional opportunities through the development of a research-based rubric (page e27).

Weaknesses:

Details outlining how the applicant will protect against fraud, waste, and abuse are needed.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

- 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 outlines the process for informing teachers about the PL opportunities through a yearly orientation workshop (page e30).

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 adequately describes the process teacher will use; it is paired with a current system and procedure they already know and use greatly reducing the learning curve (page e31).

The applicant details the process of teachers using annual PL plans and evidence of student learning needs to guide teachers PL focus (page e31). In addition, the requirement of a written reflection three weeks after PL allows teachers time to implement and test the learning in their classroom before providing feedback (page e31).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The applicant provides clearly specified goals, objectives, and measures (page e32-e33).

Weaknesses:

Many of the measures presented are process measures. Additional information on student outcome measures is 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: 29

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 funds for PL as well as other associated expenses including travel (page e35).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe what other non-participants receive for PL in terms of cost to determine if the allocated amount is equitable.

Additional details on the cost analysis conducted to come up with the stipend amount are needed. Details on district PL costs over the past three years as an average are needed.

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 applicant includes reasonable overall costs for this scope of work (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 will use an already existing online platform to ease the burden for teachers. Teachers already use and are familiar with this platform (page e37).

The applicant proposes a system in which teachers do not have to submit reimbursement forms because everything is initiated through the platform, then coordinated by the applicant who submits reimbursements to the district (page e37).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant provides appropriate qualifications of the key project personnel, including math specialists (page e38).

The applicant also describes an Advisory Committee, made up of district level staff, who will help guide the ongoing development of this work (page e40).

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:

Appendix I3 (pages e119-e121) adequately outlines the management plan including timelines, clear responsibilities, and milestones for accomplishing tasks.

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 project is design to first test the process with a small group, then modified to accommodate a larger number of teachers for the next two years (page e32 – e33).

The applicant clearly describes the Advisory Committee’s role in implementation review to determine any needed changes to the stipend process or quality rubric (page e40).

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: 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 applicant provides information on the impact study design proposed that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations (page e41). The applicant proposes a randomized control group, randomly assigned at the school level to mitigate the risks of attrition (page e42).

The evaluator proposes a blocked approach to random assignment to control for threats to internal validity; internal controls will ensure similar types of school within each site are equally represented in the treatment and control groups (page e42).

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 provides sufficient information on key project components, mediators, and a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation (page e45-e46).

Weaknesses:

Additional information on incentives available to control group teachers and schools is needed. The evaluation plan requests a lot of contact with the control group including surveys and recorded lessons, without a formal incentive structure it may become difficult to gain access to control participants.

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 evaluator will provide monthly updates and feedback to the applicant providing meaningful performance feedback. Information will be provided on fidelity and the feasibility of ongoing implementation (page e47)

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:

Not addressed.

Weaknesses:

Not addressed.

Reader's Score: **0**

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

Status: Blank

Last Updated: 10/16/2020 07:24 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Region 18 Education Service Center (S411C200125)

Reader #4: *****

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