

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2024 01:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	13
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	27
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	60
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	3
Total	76	63

Technical Review Form

Panel #19 - Early Tier 1 - 19: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

1. (1) 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. (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant's development or demonstration of new strategies is very good. The project involves helpful strategies for improving mathematics instruction and student outcomes, including professional development observation, planning and reflection with virtual coaching feedback (pp. e8-9). The combination of existing strategies into a unified approach is somewhat innovative.

The acronym HOPE is applied to showcase the key components of the strategy (Hear, Observe, Plan, and Enact) (p. e14). Hear involves learning about strategies in professional learning. Observe involves the opportunity to see the strategy live in action with a real classroom as part of a quarterly workshop plan. Plan involves the designing of lessons with the observed strategy. Enact involves enacting and recording lessons for reflection and virtual coaching.

The plan includes professional learning for assistant principals and teacher leaders to support the professional growth of teachers (p. e12).

Weaknesses:

The strategies applied in this proposal are not new to education. Opportunities for teachers to observe other teachers in action has been a strategy in teacher education for many years both via in-person observation and video recordings of lessons.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

1. **(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)**

Strengths:

The applicant's proposal includes excellent evidence of a conceptual framework. The proposed activities are based on a comprehensive plan for professional development focused on seven characteristics of effective professional development that were obtained from a rigorous review of 35 studies on effective professional learning (p. e15). These features, which are applied in the applicant's plan, include the following: focused on content, involve active learning, supports collaboration, uses models of effective practice, provides coaching and expert support, offers feedback and reflection, and is of sustained duration (pp. e15-16). Additional evidence-based strategies applied include instructional coaching, virtual/video coaching, model lessons/peer observations, and teacher collaboration/PLCs (p. e16). The applicant provides citation and relevance to provide research-based evidence in support of project activities (pp. e160-163).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The extent to which the applicant's proposed goals are clearly specified and measurable is excellent. A central goal to "Increase math achievement for students in grades 7-8 in high-needs middle schools by improving teachers' instructional practices and skills" is supported by three sub-goals, objectives, and associated performance measures, most of which are measurable with counts or percentages of participants or frequencies of occurrence (pp. e22-24). For example, "At least 80% of teachers and assistant principals attend the Summer Institute and four quarterly workshops" and "Evaluators collect implementation and perception data from various sources, meet with project team at least once per quarter to provide feedback" (p9. e 22-23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. **(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)**

Strengths:

The applicant's proposal is very good regarding its appropriateness and capacity to successfully address the needs of the target population. The most important factor in school outcomes for students is teachers. This project invests in improving teacher knowledge and skills through professional learning that is sustained, active and interactive, bringing in coaching, reflection, observation, and more to build the capacity of teachers in their teaching in turn

Sub

yield improved student achievement in mathematics (p. e23).
The inclusion of Assistant Principals in this project is important in harnessing the support of leadership at the school level. This support may prove very helpful in overcoming challenges that arise throughout project implementation (p. e92).

Weaknesses:

The coordination required for a project involving 62 middle schools and 248 teachers of grades 7-8 mathematics across the state, including quarterly professional learning involving observation of live lessons modeled for teachers may be difficult to achieve given the complexities of school schedules and challenges with substitute teacher availability. Also, this approach may cause significant disruption to classrooms as the attention of students can be easily drawn away when visitors are present in classrooms.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. 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 following factor:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

1. (1) 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)

Strengths:

The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented is excellent. The applicant is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization with 132 employees led by a board that includes governors and appointees from 15 states (p. e26). The applicant has “extensive experience in providing high-quality PD for middle grades teachers that focuses on practices linked to the improvement of student achievement, as well as coaching, planning and supporting the districtwide implementation of new instructional practices and PLCs’ (p. e26).

The applicant is “committed to providing all employees a safe, supportive, and inclusive environment and employees individuals from across the country with varied cultural backgrounds and experience in the education sector (p. e26). strategic/deliberate approach to our recruiting and employ a process that is inclusive and inviting. The applicant’s commitment to a diverse workforce is evident in a variety of steps taken to ensure the attraction of diverse employees and to provide fair consideration to all, including underrepresented populations. The applicant lists job openings on a variety of platforms, including Diversity.com (p. e27). Key personnel are adequate and highly qualified to lead project activities. The applicant organization’s President will serve as the Principal Investigator (pp. e27, e134-135). This individual has extensive experience in policy, practice, and leadership in science and math education. The Project Director, who will oversee all project activities, has experience leading researchers and coaches in providing support to teachers as well as school and district leaders

Sub

Coaches to serve the project have extensive experience coaching middle grades math teachers (p. e135).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

1. (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths:

The applicant has an excellent management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. A management plan with key milestones, timeframes, and responsible parties included in the proposal are aligned with project goals and objectives (p.e30). The plan is sufficiently detailed to provide a clear indication of the nature of activities to be completed, when, and by whom. These activities begin with convening the leadership team, proceed through project activities, and conclude with the dissemination of results (pp. e29-33).

The budget is adequate and appropriate for meeting the needs associated with the project, providing essential support for salaries, supplies and resources, and incentives (pp. e134-140). An external evaluator will support the project and will serve on the advisory board for the project (p. e27).

The applicant has plans to provide stipends to support participation (p. e25). Teachers “will receive a stipend of \$1,200 for events outside of their normal contract hours/days. Teacher leaders will participate in additional training (i.e., virtual PLCs with APs) each month and earn an additional \$800 each year for a total of \$2,000. Similarly, Assistant Principals will receive a total stipend of \$1,400 for participation in a Summer Institute and monthly virtual PLCs (p. e25). The applicant’s budget narrative breaks down the stipends to show stipend amounts provided per event or activity (p. e137). This is helpful in holding participants accountable in regard to project activities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners

(up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The applicant provides an excellent plan to address the impacts of COVID-19 on math instruction, with a focus on grades 7 and 8 (p. e92). State and national level research focused on student outcomes in mathematics is cited as evidence supporting the need for the proposed interventions and target populations (p. e92). The applicant has provided pre- and post-pandemic state assessment data by school in two districts named in the proposal, providing evidence of localized need (p. e123). Recent (2023) data shows that 47% of the state's students are not proficient in math (p. e12). The applicant sites that the school closures due to COVID-19 had varying effects based on the capacities of schools to support students, leaving some districts within the state with even higher levels of non-proficiency (p. e12). Two of these districts are partners in the applicant's proposal (p. e12). Letters of support for this proposal are provided by both districts (pp. e87-90). The applicant proposes to apply effective, evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, including professional development, virtual coaching, observation, feedback, and a system of ongoing support for educators (p. e12).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2024 01:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/03/2024 09:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	18
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	66
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	3
Total	76	69

Technical Review Form

Panel #19 - Early Tier 1 - 19: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 18

Sub

1. (1) 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. (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant makes an excellent case for building on an existing professional development (PD) workshop model that incorporates observations, professional learning communities (PLCs), virtual coaching, and virtual follow-up (e13-14). Part of the innovation of this approach lies in the enactment of lessons by the facilitator in teachers' classrooms as they observe (e14, e16). In addition, the synchronous follow-up sessions allow teachers the option of selecting opportunities that best meet their individual needs (e14) and is an innovative component of the PD. Furthermore, the project proposes to do virtual video coaching and plans to incorporate training for assistant principals which adds to the innovative aspects of the project (e16).

Weaknesses:

The components of the project are not innovative alone. There is nothing new related to the individual components that are planned to be implemented.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

1. (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)

Sub

Strengths:

The proposal presents an excellent conceptual framework that underlies the proposed research (e19-21). The project describes high quality research that is undergirding all components of the proposed plan (e21). A strong logic model incorporating the research is provided (e92).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The application does an excellent job of articulating specific and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes that would be achieved by the project (e22-e24). The project clearly articulated measures that would be used to assess the outcomes (e22-24). The outcomes are specific and measurable. For example, it is likely the project will be able to measure whether 80% of teachers and assistant principals report the professional learning opportunities are high quality (e23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (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)

Strengths:

The proposal does an excellent job describing how the project will address the needs of the targeted population. It clearly identifies the needs of the student target population (e24-25), the targeted teacher population (e25), and the targeted schools and districts (e26). The project has a strong recruitment plan and is offering appropriate incentives to recruit teachers and assistant principals (e25) to the project. The team already has recruited some schools and districts to the project which is further evidence of these facts (e25). The design of the project will likely address the needs of the targeted populations.

Weaknesses:

The plan is ambitious and may have issues when being implemented. For example, the availability of substitutes teachers may be an issue as the project tries to implement the professional learning. It may also be difficult to find classrooms that are appropriate for that number of adults and students to do the push-in learning.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. 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 following factor:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) 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)**

Strengths:

The quality of the project personnel is excellent. The applicant encourages applications for employment from traditionally underrepresented groups based on gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age (e27). The project describes steps it takes to encourage applications from these underrepresented populations (e27). The key project personnel are highly qualified to support the project goals (e39-41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The application provides an excellent management plan for how the project will be administered (e29-34) on time and within budget. The management plan aligns goals and objectives with clearly defined timelines, responsibilities, and milestones for accomplishing the project tasks (e29-34). The thoroughness of the plan makes it likely that it could be carried out on time and within budget. The budget seems to have taken into account all potential costs (e134-140).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

CPP1 is not addressed.

Weaknesses:

CPP1 is not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The proposal makes an excellent case for addressing CPP2. The project is designed to address the impacts of COVID-19 on seventh and eighth grade students' math scores (e12-13) by providing professional development using evidence-based instructional approaches (e12-13). The project provides evidence regarding the specific needs for students in North Carolina and within specific partner districts they will be working with (e14, e25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/03/2024 09:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/09/2024 01:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	27
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Sub Total	70	62
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	3
Total	76	65

Technical Review Form

Panel #19 - Early Tier 1 - 19: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. (1) 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. (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant presents a very good demonstration of how their project is innovative. They propose "a promising new strategy built upon the existing practices of effective professional development (PD) and other components of effective teacher support (e13)." The practices include instructional coaching, observing other teachers, Professional Learning Community (PLCs), and content aligned workshops. Including assistant principals in the professional learning to improve their ability to coach math teachers by strengthening their own understanding of math content and instructional strategies is novel.

Weaknesses:

One weakness of the proposal is that all of the strategies are already commonly used in teacher professional learning. There are no new strategies proposed in this project.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

1. (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)

Sub

Strengths:

The conceptual framework on e18-21 is excellent. The applicant addresses the major components of this work including high quality professional learning, model lessons, instructional coaching, virtual coaching and PLCs. There is a clear logic model on e92 that includes inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes (both short and long term) and the outcomes address both teacher and student growth.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The project goals, objectives, outcomes and specific measures are clearly articulated in the table on pages e22-24. For example, an overarching goal is "Design, implement, and refine the HOPE Model of professional development with a pilot cohort." This is then broken down into 6 clearly stated objectives. Each objective has one or more specific performance measures with goals for satisfactory completion. For example, one objective in this goal is "Provide high-quality professional learning to teachers and assistant principals in the pilot study." The measures include, for example, "At least 80% of teachers and assistant principals attend the Summer Institute and four quarterly workshops."

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (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)

Strengths:

The applicant does a very good job of addressing the needs of the teachers who will participate in this project. It is notable that the applicant has considered the timing of all interventions so the need for substitutes is minimal. The focus on math content alongside pedagogy is an important strategy that will improve teacher success (e25). Providing professional development for an assistant principal and teacher leader in the school builds capacity in the district for instructional coaching in mathematics means that they will be able to support the mathematics teachers beyond the project timeline (e26).

Weaknesses:

The needs of the students in these particular districts beyond test scores are not clearly identified in this application. There is no mention of how the culture and context of these students will be addressed as part of the professional learning for teachers or administrators.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. 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 following factor:

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) 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)**

Strengths:

The applicant comprehensively addressed the quality of the project personnel. The applicant presents an excellent team to carry out the proposed work. The leadership team has extensive experience in managing and implementing large grants (e27). The Southern Regional Education Board has a track record of success for projects of this type (e26). The applicant also addresses their process for encouraging applicants from underrepresented groups and their efforts to recruit a diverse staff (e27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

- 1. (1) 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 management plan on e29-e34 is very detailed and includes clearly defined tasks with personnel responsible for the task. The key milestones are noted in bold such as "Select 2 math teachers at each grade level 7-8, an AP, and 1 teacher leader at each school for the pilot study (e30)." The timeline is organized by the date of completion of the task or milestone. The budget includes adequate stipends for teacher and assistant principal participation. The budget is adequate to complete the tasks within the given timeline.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The applicant provided excellent information about addressing the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. The applicant has already gathered some information on the needs of each middle school in the two counties to analyze their decline in math achievement since the Covid pandemic (e12). The project uses evidence based instructional approaches including extensive coaching, instructional modeling, PLCs and supporting administration to become more effective instructional

coaches.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/09/2024 01:20 PM

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/02/2024 08:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Sub Total	30	27
Total	30	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Early Tier 2 - 18: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 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:

Reader's Score: 27

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 this notice). (20 points)

Strengths:

- 1) The evaluation is designed to meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations (e35). It uses a blocked cluster randomized control trial (RCT) design, in which schools are randomly assigned to treatment or control groups. Schools are blocked by student demographics within districts before randomization, so that the treatment and control groups are balanced on key characteristics. This process ensures high internal validity and reduces selection bias.
- 2) The use of attrition analyses and plans to address any differential attrition, strengthen the evaluation's ability to meet WWC standards (e36). The plan includes strategies to minimize both teacher- and student-level attrition, such as offering incentives for participation and relying on secondary data like test scores.
- 3) With 60 schools and approximately 24,000 students and 240 teachers, the study is powered to detect a minimum detectable effect size (MDES) of 0.15 SD for student achievement and 0.31 for teacher self-efficacy (e37). This ensures that the findings will be robust and generalizable.
- 4) The plan to exclude late-joining teachers but include late-joining students (e36) follows WWC guidelines, mitigating potential bias from new participants who were not part of the original randomization.

Weaknesses:

- 1) The evaluation does not specify the exact criteria for determining equivalence (e.g., standardized mean differences).
- 2) There is limited discussion of the generalizability of findings beyond the specific context of North Carolina middle schools.

Reader's Score: 19

2. (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)

Sub

Strengths:

- 1) The pilot allows for early identification of issues, improving the effectiveness of the later impact study by refining program elements (e39).
- 2) Monthly meetings and quarterly reports (e40) ensure that actionable feedback is provided in a timely manner to address obstacles.
- 3) The use of both deductive and inductive coding (e39) for qualitative data strengthens the ability to assess emergent issues and themes that may arise during program implementation.

Weaknesses:

- 1) The evaluation plan proposes primarily post-activity or end-of-year data collection (e39). The applicant did not include sufficient in-program feedback (logs, feedback forms, surveys, focus groups, etc.) in the design to allow for mid-course corrections.

Reader's Score: 4

3. (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)

Strengths:

- 1) The evaluation plan provides a well-defined framework, clearly identifying key program components, mediators, and outcomes.
- 2) The evaluation uses various data sources, including logs, program data, and teacher leader records, to monitor fidelity, offering a comprehensive picture of implementation.
- 3) The plan recognizes the importance of both teacher professional learning and school leader development, emphasizing the need for leadership engagement to sustain the PD model.

Weaknesses:

- 1) The 80% attendance target across different components does not capture varying degrees of engagement or the quality of participation. For example, participants might meet attendance thresholds without being fully engaging with the content.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/02/2024 08:57 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2024 12:28 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
Sub Total	30	29
Total	30	29

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Early Tier 2 - 18: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Board of Control for the Southern Region (S411C240164)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. 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:

Reader's Score: 29

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 this notice). (20 points)

Strengths:

The application proposes a blocked cluster randomized control trial to evaluate the proposed Hear-Observe-Plan-Enact - Professional Development (HOPE-PD) intervention. Schools within districts, blocked by demographics, will be randomly assigned to condition, over two cohorts, for a total of 60 schools and an estimated 24,000 students and 240 teachers (e35). The proposed methods are designed to avoid potential confounding factors and threats to internal validity, including contamination, joiners, attrition, and sample size. The methods of evaluation will produce evidence that meets the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

2. (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)

Strengths:

The applicant's proposed methods of evaluation include a pilot study prior to the impact study which will allow for early assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. During the impact evaluation perspective, surveys will be collected in the spring of the intervention year, and implementation data will be regularly reviewed. Preliminary analyses will also be conducted at the end of the first year for cohort 1 (e40). The performance measures are laid out and described in the form (e141-e150), and the frequencies of the various data collections are provided in the timeline in Appendix J.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

3. (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)

Strengths:

The applicant's proposal clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, outcomes, and measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation. These are described in the narrative (e40-e41) as well as in the logic model in Appendix G (e92). A detailed description of the proposed mediation analyses is also provided (e106).

Weaknesses:

The application does not provide a justification for the choice of thresholds for acceptable implementation. The mediators were not clearly articulated within the logic model.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/07/2024 12:28 PM