

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2024 04:47 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	28
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	70	65
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	76	71

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

## 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: 20

#### 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 extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies is excellent.

The applicant proposes to apply a multi-level job-embedded professional development system with a focus on improving principal and teacher effectiveness (p. e14). This approach includes three learning components: (1) professional development for principals to strengthen supports for teacher learning; (2) professional development for teacher leaders to develop and facilitate teacher team meetings; and (3) group coaching sessions for both principals and teacher leaders to strengthen distributed leadership practices (p. e14).

The applicant has a record of success with a similar project that involved the training of 622 K-8 teachers serving 8,264 K-8 students in high-needs settings. These districts improved math proficiency scores by as much as 20 percentile points for white students, but less than 10 percent for students who are Black, Indigenous and people of color (BIPOC). The intent of this project is to address this discrepancy and bolster outcomes (p. e17). This new project will focus on strengthening the school-based teacher learning system, improving culture and spaces to support teachers in learning and implementing instruction to meet the needs of students served by the project (p. e17). This new approach will focus on developing school-level capacities and group coaching to support principals and teacher leaders in cultivating distributed leadership (p. e18).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

### 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)**

**Strengths:**

The extent to which the applicant has established a conceptual framework underlying the proposal is excellent. A logic model is provided, outlining the key inputs, interventions, outputs, short-term outcomes (for principals, math teacher leaders, math teachers, and students), and long-term outcomes (math teacher self-efficacy, retention, and instructional quality as well as student learning outcome improvement in math) (p. e20).

The applicant cites multiple research studies supporting the impact of principal leadership on student outcomes (p. e21).

The approach includes enacting key facilitation practices to foster the analysis of classroom-based evidence by teachers in evidence-based to inform instruction to responsively address the needs of their own high-needs students (p. e22).

**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 goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable is good.

The applicant's goals, objectives, outcomes, and measures are clearly specified (e23-24). The objectives, outcomes, and measures are grouped by the four established goals: (1) Develop, test, and refine the intervention in pilot school district, (2) Implement the intervention and evaluate its impact in two treatment school districts, (3) Examine sustainability of the intervention under normal conditions and offer delayed treatment to control districts, and (4) Disseminate findings (pp. e23-24).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's outcomes and measures do not include metrics by which outcome attainment may be measured (pp. e24-25). For example, the outcome, "Math documents coverage of planned activities and teacher leader participation; teacher leader surveys/logs" does not include information about frequency and duration of participation (p. e10).

**Reader's Score: 3**

- 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 has an excellent plan to meet the needs of the target population. Evidence of support for this plan is provided in letters of support from three participating districts (pp. e144-147). The support indicated by participating

**Sub**

districts is essential for project success.

The applicant cites the importance of principals and teacher leaders in educational improvement efforts. This project focuses on these key roles in changing the culture around professional learning and collaboration in the educational environment (p. e14). Given that this project is building upon a prior project which has been successful and is adding in this leadership component to boost outcomes, it is highly likely that this project will be successful in meeting the needs of the target population in mathematics (p. e17).

The applicant's professional development plan is comprehensive and well-structured (p. e196).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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: 9**

**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.

A three-tiered effective partnership management structure has been established to support effective collaboration in support of the project (p. e28). The key leadership team has expertise that is relevant to support the instructional change, math education, educational leadership, professional development, research methods, and grant implementation efforts involved in the project (pp. e26, e41-143). For example, the Co-Principal Investigator will lead continuous improvement and dissemination efforts. He teaches courses for principals and superintendents and has expertise in research to improve instruction (p. e27).

The team members represent groups that have been traditionally underrepresented and have extensive experience working with individuals from various races, gender, age, disability, and socioeconomic levels, which reflect the target student population e26-27).

The applicant will intentionally recruit diverse participants that reflect the predominantly minority and low-income student populations served by the partnering school districts. The recruitment model includes analyzing position descriptions for biased language, placing nondiscrimination statements in job advertisements, and disseminating jobs on listservs to reach diverse audiences (p. e27).

**Weaknesses:**

Resumes or biographical sketches are not provided for some key project staff, including an Advisory Board Member and project evaluators (pp. e26, e41-143).

Sub

Reader's Score: 9

### 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: 8

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's 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 is very good. The applicant's institution is working in partnership with a regional service center providing support to multiple districts in the implementation of this proposal (p. e14). Letters of support verify this relationship, which is important in the management of project activities (pp. e143-147).

The budget overall is appropriate to accomplish the project tasks on time and within budget (pp. e176-179, e185). A timeline of tasks identified by objective is provided, which is appropriate for the project. It includes goals, objectives, and trimesters over a five-year period

In years 2-3, teachers are to be paid \$50 per log to log teacher leadership practices (p. e176). Teachers are also to be given \$50 per survey for survey completion.

#### Weaknesses:

The stipend to be provided to teachers for maintaining monthly logs may not be an adequate incentive for the related work (p. e176).

The timeline does not include individuals responsible for listed objectives/tasks (p. e30). The listing of responsible parties is important in providing clarity in responsibilities for project activities.

Reader's Score: 8

### 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:**

The applicant has an excellent plan for a project that will be implemented by or in partnership with a minority-serving institution (p. e14). The applicant is listed among the institutions identified as a minority-serving institution.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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 capacity of the proposal to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic within the community to be served by the project is excellent. The applicant sites data from the 2023 administration of the NAEP administration assessment which revealed that on 36% of 4th graders were proficient in math, with 15% of Black and 22% of Hispanic students reaching proficiency (p. e15). The applicant provides local, county level data reflecting this same pattern, with state level assessment of readiness scores decreasing by as much as 50% and only one in ten students on average passing the exam (p. e15). Teacher turnover rates are also cited as high in Title I schools, a condition that is likely to continue (p. e15). The proposed professional development and coaching will help to strengthen the organizational and instructional conditions and structures within schools that will support and sustain effective math teaching and improve student math outcomes (p. e15). Leadership development and inclusion of distributed forms of leadership are effective in fostering conditions in which principals, teacher leaders foster necessary learning conditions in schools, strengthen instruction, and produce positive math learning outcomes (p. e16).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/02/2024 04:47 PM



Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	18
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	28
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	9
<b>Sub Total</b>	70	64
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	76	70

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

## 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 using a new strategy. The applicant makes a strong case for the use of an innovative multi-level job-embedded professional development system with three components: professional development (PD) for principals, PD for teacher leaders, and group coaching for principals and teacher leaders (e14). The goal of this innovation is to employ a distributed leadership approach to improve K-8 students' math learning (e14). The school-level capacity focus is innovative and building on previous work that pointed to a gap that resulted in lower achievement gains for high needs students (e17-18).

#### Weaknesses:

Some aspects of the strategy are not new or innovative. For example, doing PD with leaders and teachers at the same time is not new.

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 conceptual framework underlying the research is excellent (e19-23). The applicant proposes to build on high-quality research on professional development (PD) with teachers and leaders in math (e20-23). A strong logic model is provided (e20) that includes clear inputs, activities, and outcomes.

**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 a good job of clearly articulating goals, objectives, and outcomes that it will seek to achieve through the project design (e23-25). The project articulated measures that would be used to assess the outcomes (e17-19, e32-33). The outcomes appear to be measurable.

**Weaknesses:**

Some of the outcomes are not specific. For example, it is unclear what the specific impact the project hopes to have on students. It is also not clear what some of the measures will be. For example, what specific surveys are going to be administered, how often, and the levels that are hoped to be achieved via that measure are not specified (e17-19).

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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 is likely that the Learning To Lead (LTL)-Math program will support teacher leaders and principals in ways that will result in impacting the needs of K-8 students in math (e26). There is a clear plan for the components of the professional development (e196-200) that suggest this plan will be successful addressing the needs of the target population.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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: 9**

**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 key project personnel are highly qualified to support the project goals (e27-28). The applicant indicates that team members represent groups that are traditionally underrepresented and have experience working with individuals from various races, gender, age, disability and socioeconomic levels (e27). The application also indicates it will follow a model for hiring that encourages applications and a recruitment plan that does not discriminate on the basis of gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age (e27).

**Weaknesses:**

Biosketches for the evaluators and an advisory board member (e196-197) are not provided so it is difficult to assess their ability to support the project.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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: 9**

**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 (e29-30) on time and within budget. It clearly provides a timeline for accomplishing project objectives (e30-31). Responsibilities are clearly detailed for key personnel (e196-197).

**Weaknesses:**

Milestones are not explicitly included in the management plan. Tasks are not clearly linked to the individuals responsible (e30-31).

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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:**

The proposal addresses the CPP1 excellently. The applicant identifies a minority serving institution as defined in the NIA (e161).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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 K-8 students' math scores by providing in-school and after-school tutoring (e14-15). The project provides evidence regarding the needs for the nation (e15) and for the community they serve (e15). There is evidence of community asset-mapping and needs assessments (e15).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	28
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	9
<b>Sub Total</b>	70	66
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	76	72

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

## 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: 20

#### 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 proposed project demonstrates an excellent strategy to develop a promising new strategy based on combining several evidence based existing strategies. This applicant provides an excellent description of a multi-level professional development intervention (e14). They clearly describe how this grant will build on prior successful work in multi-level professional learning by more explicitly focusing on the school level rather than the district or system level (e17-18). The multi-level approach will also focus on improving outcomes for high needs students (e17).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

### 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)

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides an excellent conceptual framework that underlies the proposed research project. There is a clear logic model presented on page e20 with inputs, outputs, and short and long term outcomes as well as on page



**Sub**

e147. The conceptual framework supports their program design that will impact principals (e20-21), teacher leaders (e21-22), and job embedded group coaching (e22).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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 applicant provides a good list of goals, objectives and outcomes with goals and objectives being specific and measurable. On pages e23-25 the applicant provides a good explanation of the goals of the program. Each goal has objectives that will lead to attainment of the overarching goal.

**Weaknesses:**

The outcomes listed on e23-25 are not all specific and measurable. Many of the measures in the table have no metrics to determine if the objective was achieved. There are also no metrics to measure change in mathematics achievement.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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 an excellent job addressing the needs of the target population. The needs of the target population are presented using national and county data (e25-26), and clearly demonstrates a need for improved mathematics instruction. The applicant is building on models that have had success in addressing the needs of this population (e26). Key members of the grant team know the needs of the population well from their work within these schools (e26). This project also addresses the needs of the teachers for students in this population by bolstering their math teaching practice (e26). There is also a clear plan for professional development for the teachers on e199-e201.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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: 9**

**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 grant team includes individuals who have “expertise in large-scale instructional change, math education, educational leadership, professional development, and research methods (e27). They state that they will intentionally recruit diverse participants and have a clear strategy in place to ensure the applicant pool is representative of people from members of traditionally underrepresented groups (e27).

**Weaknesses:**

The biosketch of one advisory board member is not included. There are no biosketches from the team of external evaluators.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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: 9**

**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 presents an excellent management plan. “The LTL-Math management plan is three-tiered for effective partnership management and to ensure those closest to the work have a voice (e29).” The team has a history of successfully completing large grants on time and within budget. Table 3 on e30 provides a specific timeline for project activities that includes goals and objectives over the 5 year grant period. The overall roles and responsibilities are defined on page e29 for the three tiers of partners and with more details on (e196-e197). The milestones are tied to specific dates and align to the project goals and objectives (e30).

**Weaknesses:**

The objectives do not include the responsible personnel to accomplish these tasks.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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:**

The applicant provided excellent evidence because they are a qualified minority serving institution as indicated in the NIA, as a Hispanic Serving Institution and an Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution. (e161).

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

## 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 does an excellent job of addressing the needs of students from the COVID 19 pandemic. The project will use evidence-based instructional approaches like embedded job coaching and professional development for administrators and teachers (e15). There is a plan for a needs assessment and asset mapping (e15). The applicant provides data related to the problem for the specific counties in which they propose their work (e15). This highlights the

needs for the community they will address.

**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: 10/10/2024 08:50 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	23
<b>Sub Total</b>	30	23
<b>Total</b>	30	23

# Technical Review Form

Panel #24 - Early Tier 2 - 25: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

## 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: 23

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant provided a well described and robust discussion of its impact study utilizing principals, teachers and students in 4 school districts (2 treatment and 2 control) with a clearly detailed propensity score matching to reduce selection bias which would meet the WWC Handbook standards and provide for meaningful findings about the project's effectiveness (pages e33, e35).

The applicant also provided a detailed estimated minimum detectable effect size which indicated that the study's minimum sample sizes for principals and teachers were underpowered and thus students would be the confirmatory sample for producing meaningful findings which would meet the WWC Handbook standards (page e35).

The applicant included a detailed procedure for addressing missing data, which would meet the WWC Handbook standards and would produce meaningful data about the project's effectiveness (page e36).

The evaluation will utilize state standardized tests for student performance outcomes and teacher surveys that have validity and reliability coefficients that will facilitate the accuracy of the survey findings to assist in determining the project's effectiveness, which would meet the standards for surveys in the WWC Handbook (page e36).

#### Weaknesses:

The evaluation indicated that the novelty of this study would be the inclusion of principal professional training and teacher group coaching to improve classroom pedagogy and student academic performance in mathematics (pages e20 to e23). It was unclear why the applicant only utilized five principals in the Year 1 pilot study. Any survey or interview data from the principals would not meet minimum sample size for statistical analysis and thus, would only provide anecdotal findings in the development of the implementation study. This would make it unclear if the applicant's study design and its findings would meet WWC Handbook standards.

Sub

**Reader's Score:** 13

**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, in Table 1 (pages e23 and e24), provided a clear and comprehensive listing of measurement tools that would provide performance feedback. For example, the implementation study will collect performance feedback from surveys and logs from principals and teachers. This information is further clarified in Table 4 (pages e32 and e33) which identified surveys that have documented validity and reliability coefficients which improve the accuracy of the feedback data.

The evaluation, in Table 3 (page e30), provided a detailed timeline for the collection of data. For example, group coaching findings will be collected after each group meeting to permit periodic assessment of the effectiveness and utility of group coaching in achieving the program's outcomes

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses identified.

**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 clearly identified the project's key components in several sections of the application. These included (1) principal professional development, (2) teacher professional development, and (3) teacher group coaching (pages e20 to e23).

The applicant clearly identified key mediators, including school and student characteristics/demographics, which will be incorporated into the regression analysis (page e38).

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/10/2024 08:50 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/10/2024 10:21 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	30	20
<b>Total</b>	30	20

# Technical Review Form

Panel #24 - Early Tier 2 - 25: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois (S411C240186)

## 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: 20

#### 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 project proposes to use propensity score matching (PSM) to evaluate the impact of a structured professional development program for school leaders and teachers (page e34). The use of propensity score matching has the potential to meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) design standards with reservations. The applicants conducted a power analysis and discussed WWC-approved methods to determine effects (page e35). Student outcomes were discussed as a distal measure (page e35). The handling of missing data was discussed and aligned with WWC-recommended methods (page e36).

#### Weaknesses:

There were numerous measures that were going to be developed as part of the project. It is unclear what the reliability and validity of these measures would be and the estimates for reliability and validity were not provided for the measures that were previously developed. The application did not discuss how the cross-level variables would be handled in the analyses or in the propensity score matching procedure.

Reader's Score: 12

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 application describes both short-term and long-term outcomes and outlines how the short-term objectives will inform later work on the project (page e20). A timeline provides details on how the project objectives relate and when specific evaluations will occur. The process for identifying avenues for improvement during the project is also outlined (page e18). The applicant explains that they will meet regularly with the project team.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

Though meetings are said to occur regularly, it is unclear what data will be discussed during these meetings and how these discussions will inform future evaluations related to the project objectives.

**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:**

At numerous points throughout the application, the constructs of interest are identified and tied to specific measures that will be conducted during the project (see Table 4 on pages e32 – e33 and Table 5 on pages e35 – e36). The threshold for acceptable implementation is described. The applicant also describes how implementation thresholds may vary based on the needs of the project and the specific project objectives targeted during that time (pages e37 – e38).

**Weaknesses:**

Since some of the measures still need to be developed, it is not clear how these measures may or may not include indicators of the related constructs. At some points in the application, it is unclear which level (i.e., school leader, teacher, student) is associated with specific constructs of interest.

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/10/2024 10:21 AM