Education Innovation and Research (EIR) FY 2023 Grant Competition Overview

These slides are for informational purposes only. Please refer to the official Notices as they are published in the Federal Register.
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• **Yvonne Crockett**, EIR Grant Competition Manager

• **Debora Southwell**, EIR Program Officer

• **Ashley Brizzo**, EIR Group Leader
What is the EIR Grant Program?
**EXPLORE** new ways of addressing persistent challenges that other educators can build upon.

**SUSTAIN, REPLICATE AND SCALE** successful evidence-based practices in new schools, districts, and States, while addressing the barriers to scale, like cost-effectiveness and implementation fidelity.

**BUILD THE EVIDENCE** based on effective educational practices to improve achievement for high-needs students.

**USING AND BUILDING EVIDENCE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Innovation/Scale</th>
<th>Early-phase</th>
<th>Mid-phase</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>refines innovative education practices</td>
<td>develops and tests innovative education practices</td>
<td>refines innovative education practices at a regional or national scale</td>
<td>scales innovative education practices nationally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Demonstrates a Rationale (high quality research findings of evaluation)</th>
<th>Moderate Evidence</th>
<th>Strong Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Early-phase</th>
<th>Mid-phase</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to $4 Million</td>
<td>up to $8 Million</td>
<td>up to $15 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Award</th>
<th>Early-phase</th>
<th>Mid-phase</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-38 awards</td>
<td>8-15 awards</td>
<td>4-8 awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who is an eligible applicant?
ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

*An LEA includes a public charter school that operates as an LEA, Bureau of Indian Education schools, and education service agencies (refer to every student succeeds act section 8101(30)).

**A public institute of higher education (IHE) that has 501(c)(3) status would also qualify as a nonprofit organization.
APPLICANTS THAT ARE **NOT** ELIGIBLE

**INDIVIDUALS**

**FOR PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS**
(LLCs, S and Corps)

An IHE without 501(c)(3) status (even if that entity is tax exempt under Section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code or any other State or Federal provision) OR that could not provide any other documentation described in 34 CFR 75.51(b).
FY 2023 Absolute Priorities
### Early-phase Absolute Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Priority 1:</th>
<th>Demonstrates a Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Priority 2:</td>
<td>Field-Initiated Innovations-- General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Priority 3:</td>
<td>Field-Initiated Innovations-- Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Priority 4:</td>
<td>Field-Initiated Innovations-- Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Priority 5:</td>
<td>Field-Initiated Innovations-- Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Educator Recruitment and Retention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All Early-phase applicants must address this evidence priority**

**Applicants must address one of the additional absolute priorities**
## Mid-phase Absolute Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Priority 1: Moderate Evidence</th>
<th>Absolute Priority 2: Field-Initiated Innovations-- General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Priority 5: Field-Initiated Innovations-- Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Educator Recruitment and Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expansion Absolute Priorities

Absolute Priority 1: Strong Evidence

Absolute Priority 2: Field-Initiated Innovations-- General
Competitive Preference Priority 1

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners
• Community Colleges
• Historically Black Colleges and Universities
• Tribal Colleges and Universities
• Minority-serving Institutions
Competitive Preference Priority 2

FOR EARLY-PHASE COMPETITION ONLY

Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce and Professional Growth to Strengthen Student Learning
FY 2023
Select Criteria
# Early-phase Selection Criteria and Competitive Preference Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Significance</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Quality of Project Design</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Quality of Project Personnel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Quality of the Management Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Quality of the Project Evaluation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points without CPP** 100

Competitive Preference Priority 1 5

Competitive Preference Priority 2 2

**Total Points Including CPP** 107
A. **Significance (up to 20 points)**

The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
B. Quality of the Project Design (up to 30 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

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

3. The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)
C. Quality of Project Personnel (up to 10 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)
D. Quality of the Management Plan (up to 10 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (10 points)
E. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 30 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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 this notice). (20 points)

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

(3) 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. (5 points)
# Mid-phase and Expansion

Selection Criteria and Competitive Preference Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Significance</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Strategy to Scale</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Quality of the Project Design</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Quality of the Project Evaluation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Points without CPP**                    | **100** |
| Competitive Preference Priority 1               | 5       |

| **Total Points Including CPP**                  | **105** |
A. **Significance (up to 15 points)**

The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
B. Strategy to Scale (up to 40 points)

The Secretary considers the applicant’s strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the applicant’s capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

1. The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application. (10 points)

2. 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. (5 points)

3. The applicant’s capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period. (10 points)

4. The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication. (10 points)

5. The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings. (5 points)
C. Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (5 points)

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

(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (5 points)

Mid-phase and Expansion Selection Criteria
D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 30 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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 without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)). (15 points)

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings. (5 points)

(3) 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. (5 points)

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)
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Important Webpages
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More Information and Resources

- What Works Clearinghouse
- National Center for Education Research (NCER) Home Page, a part of the U.S. Department of Education
- Education Innovation and Research - Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
- Search for Public School Districts (ed.gov)
Logic Model Resources

- **REL Pacific** - Logic models: A tool for effective program planning, collaboration, and monitoring

- **REL NEI** - Logic models for program design, implementation, and evaluation: Workshop toolkit
  https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northeast/Publication/3670

- **REL SW** - Developing logic models for school improvement systems

- **OSEP IDEAs that Work** - Logic models for evaluation: Four-part video training series
  https://osepideasthatwork.org/evaluation?tab=eval-logic

- **Kellogg Foundation** - Logic Model Development Guide

- **Univ of Wisconsin** - Enhancing program performance with logic models
  https://fyi.extension.wisc.edu/programdevelopment/files/2016/03/Lmcourseall.pdf

- **CDC** - Program Performance and Evaluation Office materials
  https://www.cdc.gov/eval/logicmodels/index.htm

- **Community Toolbox** - Developing a Logic Model or Theory of Change

- **Pell Institute** - Evaluation Toolkit
Management Plan: Components to Consider

1. **Goal(s):** An ambitious statement(s) of what the project intends to accomplish. *What do you hope to accomplish by implementing your project?*

2. **Objective(s) and Performance Measures:** Objectives that illustrate concrete attainment to be achieved by following specific steps in support of the project goals. *Are your objectives SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound)? Are objectives supported by performance measures that are observable indicators to assess how well objectives are being met. How will you measure the success of your project?*

3. **Activities:** Day to day pieces that must be completed to signal that the grant is on track for being on time and within budget.

4. **Responsible Personnel:** Explicit detail about who will carry out what activities

5. **Timeline (Start/End Dates):** Provide some timeline that will allow task monitoring. *Is the timeline realistic? Does it include milestones?*
## Sample Management Plan Excerpt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Responsible Personnel</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong> Increase involvement of Smith Elementary School families in their students’ education.</td>
<td><strong>Objective 1.1:</strong> Logins on the Smith Elementary School Online Parent Training System will increase 25% from baseline to the end of the grant.</td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure 1.1a:</strong> Parents reporting in an annual survey knowing about the Online Parent Training System.</td>
<td><strong>Activity 1.1.1:</strong> Administer parent survey to get baseline data.</td>
<td>1/1/2024</td>
<td>1/15/2024</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong> Increase involvement of Smith Elementary School families in their students’ education.</td>
<td><strong>Objective 1.1:</strong> Logins on the Smith Elementary School Online Parent Training System will increase 25% from baseline to the end of the grant.</td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure 1.1b:</strong> Number of logins per year.</td>
<td><strong>Activity 1.1.2:</strong> Create a pamphlet for parents that describes how to access and use the Parent Portal.</td>
<td>3/1/2024</td>
<td>3/15/2024</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong> Increase involvement of Smith Elementary School families in their students’ education.</td>
<td><strong>Objective 1.1:</strong> Logins on the Smith Elementary School Online Parent Training System will increase 25% from baseline to the end of the grant.</td>
<td><strong>Performance Measure 1.1b:</strong> Number of logins per year.</td>
<td><strong>Activity 1.1.3:</strong> Distribute pamphlet during school-wide events and parent-teacher conferences.</td>
<td>4/15/2024</td>
<td>12/1/2024</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Expectations

• Must be an independent evaluation.
• Design must have potential to meet What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations (Mid-phase/Expansion) or at least with reservations (Early-phase).
• Encouraged to examine cost-effectiveness of practices.
• Encouraged to include focus on the grant’s scaling strategy.
• Encouraged to identify potential obstacles and success factors to scaling.
Suggestions for Selecting Evaluators

• Is the evaluator closely familiar with What Works Clearinghouse standards?
• Has the evaluator conducted evaluations using a variety of designs and methodologies? Has the evaluator published?
• Does the evaluator have a team of qualified individuals?
• Is the evaluator independent?
• Does the evaluator have strategies for recruiting control sites and experience working with districts to gain appropriate consents and to share data?
• Does the evaluator have experience managing data records and protecting student privacy?
• Is your evaluator familiar with the literature in the area in which you’re working?
• Do you see eye to eye on the goals of the evaluation, and would you have a good working relationship?
• Have you talked about what might happen to the design and/or the budget if things do not go as planned?
  • Problems with recruitment
  • Problems with attrition
  • Delays or changes to the program
• Are your expected deliverables clearly defined?
• Have you clearly defined responsibilities of program staff vs. evaluators, or internal vs. independent evaluators?
Considerations for Application Organization

• We recommend that you organize and sequence your application narrative using the selection criteria.

• Within each criterion, make sure that you include a direct response to each of the factors under that criterion.

• Reviewers will be instructed that they may use material from anywhere in the application (including the appendices), but they will have an easier job if each section of your narrative is clear, well-organized, and complete.
Review Process

• Applications are sorted and placed in panels by Absolute Priority 2, Absolute Priority 3, Absolute Priority 4, and Absolute Priority 5

• Using the selection criteria, applications are scored by peer reviewers who:
  • Are independent, external experts (content and evaluation)
  • Undergo intensive vetting and rigorous training
  • Receive ongoing support during the review

• There will be separate rankings for each absolute priority based on average peer review score.
FY 2023 EIR Grant Competition Timeline

Notice Inviting Applicants (NIA) Released May 23, 2023

NIAs Released
OFFICE HOURS
APPLICATION DEADLINE
Panel Reviews
Applicants will be notified

Mid-phase and Expansion Grant application deadline
July 12, 2023, 11:59:59 PM (EST)
Early-phase grant application deadline
August 1, 2023, 11:59:59 PM (EST)

December 2023 (anticipated) all applicants will receive notice about the status of their grant application

The EIR Team will host virtual 30-minute Q&A sessions covering topics:
- Organizing & Submitting an Application
- Preparing a Budget Narrative
- Evidence
- Program Requirements

Eligible applications will be panels by Peer Reviewers
August 2023 - November 2023
Thank you

The EIR Grants Competition Team

EIR@ED.GOV

FY 2023 Competition - Office of Elementary and Secondary Education