

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/16/2020 03:47 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Providence Public Schools (S374A200032)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	25	20
Sub Total	45	40
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - TSL - 4: 84.374A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Providence Public Schools (S374A200032)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining evidence of the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

Strengths:

The Providence Public School District (PPSD) is requesting TSL funding to support its Leadership Development Academy (PLDA) & Residency programs. The applicant desires to support 42 high-need schools with \$10,379,475.94 million in federal funding. PPSD has done a good job in explaining the need to provide services. There is a strong desire to recruit and retain talented leaders and connect high-quality school leadership with improved student outcomes (e16). The school district serves a diverse student body where over 80% of the students enrolled are students of color (e18). The applicant has done a good job explaining that all schools servicing students are high-need and that more than 50% of students qualify for free and reduced priced lunch subsidies. Current weaknesses noted include consistently low student achievement and college preparedness in math and English which has led to a state takeover (e19). It is commendable that the district has identified the major weaknesses and has created a Turnaround Action Plan (TAP) to address education disparities (e23). This provides a clear picture of the needed supports and services in the school system.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve Relevant Outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

General:

Strengths:

Efforts to support student learning are aligned with state and district initiatives. With the commission of the Turnaround Action Plan (TAP) to address education disparities, the school district is working with the Rhode Island Department of Education and John Hopkins Institute of Education Policy to address the needs of stakeholders

Sub

within the community (e23-28). The three TAP pillars (Engaged Communities, Excellence in Learning and World Class Talent are aligned with the goals that will be addressed with grant funding (e27).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**

General:

Strengths:
Mentioned throughout the proposal is an apparent desire to reform the current school system. The applicant aspires to value community input, align and provide access to high quality standards and recruit and retain high quality leaders that can improve student outcomes (e29-31).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

- 4. (iv) 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.**

General:

Strengths:
Providence has described in detail efforts to ensure inclusivity and diversity in initiatives. This ensures that all voices can provide input. The applicant has provided correlations that broken systems can lead to future community concerns including poverty and crime. There is a clear desire to enhance professional development and elevate instructional practices that in turn, will assist with increasing student achievement (e29-32).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the 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: 30

Sub

- 1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project Demonstrates a Rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Sub

General:

Strengths:

The district's desire to increase student achievement is justified and aligned with project goals. The applicant efforts to be objective and to ensure equity are understood. The goal to revamp and enhance leadership development and current evaluation tools to ensure student achievement are specific. There is a clear focus on measuring leadership critically while also focusing on student learning and aligned measures of teacher effectiveness. These items are evident throughout the application and within the logic model (e35, e56). Providence desires to phase in the new evaluation tool. Not rolling out the new evaluative tool at one time demonstrates a desire ensure that implementation is fair, free from bias and allows room for all to provide input while working to address ineffective components.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress towards achieving intended outcomes.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant has expressed a solid commitment to gather feedback from stakeholders. Efforts to streamline data and continuously provide oversight are appropriately expressed (e41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, 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.**

General:

Strengths:

Plans for the Providence superintendent, chief operating officer and deputy superintendent of schools to be the projects key sponsors are outlined within the grant application (e45). Providence has created a systemic approach to overseeing project goals. The logic model presented on e56 is specific and provides expectations of activities created with grant funding. Included within the timeline are the three proposal priorities, resources, activities, outputs, along with the short-term, mid-term and long-term outcomes. Utilizing key leaders and key departments as resources ensures that project implementation's success is due to a collective effort of reform. The logic model and Providence Leadership Development Academy (PLDA) & Residency Goals, Objectives and Metrics (table 2.2) both provide a management plan that could feasibly be implemented with grant funding (e43-44). Plans to identify an outside evaluator will ensure objectivity.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

1. (i) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant has presented a proposal to address major weaknesses within the school system. It is apparent that there is a commitment to enhance the development of leaders and increase student achievement by providing diverse learning outcomes. There are clear plans expressed within the logic model and table 2.1 can result in system change (e45, e56).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand serves that address the needs of the target population.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant has presented a well developed workplan that addressed the milestones, participating parties and dates of implementation (e47-50). For example, within the first year of funding the applicant will pilot the evaluation method and design and launch the Providence Leadership Development Academy (PLDA) Residency, offering high performing teachers a pathway to principalship. These plans are ambitious and will build the capacity of leaders that will ensure that goals are completed, and stakeholders have the needed knowledge to be successful.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

3. (iii) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model, and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

General:

Strengths:

A statement was provided by the school district that the Rhode Island Commissioner of Education took control of Providence Public School's programming, budget and personnel decisions. Also mentioned is a statement of

Sub

obligation that the city of Providence is to increase its contribution to PPSD at the same percentage the state increases funding statewide (e53). The plan to use grant funding to create evaluative tools that will be utilized beyond the years of funding is understood.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has provided limited information that the district can lower costs of incentive programs. More information is needed on sustainability within the district to manage federal funding. This will ensure that the goals are supported and continued long after the grant cycle.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

1. Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.

An applicant must--

- a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and**
- b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).**

General:

Strengths:

Providence Public Schools has identified three schools in the district within Opportunity Zones: William D'Abate Elementary School (Census Tract Number: 0019.00); Lillian Feinstein at Sackett Street (Census Tract Number: 0002.00); and Mary Fogarty Elementary School (Census Tract Number: 0006.00).

The applicant plans to provide services to all schools and students included the 1,396 students that are in the Qualified Opportunity Zone. The applicant statement to ensure equity with funding, talent and services are aligned with the overarching project goals of enhancing both leadership and student achievement (e22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0, 2, or 5 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate

- a) The applicant has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds (0 or 5 points); or**
- b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the program from which it seeks funds, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance**

with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, in the five years before the deadline date for submission of applications under the program. (0 or 2 points)

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/16/2020 03:47 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2020 02:43 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Providence Public Schools (S374A200032)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	22
Sub Total	25	22
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	25	20
Sub Total	45	40
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	115	102

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - TSL - 4: 84.374A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Providence Public Schools (S374A200032)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining evidence of the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 22

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant documents sufficient evidence of the need for the proposed intervention services highlighting the systemic inequities as it relates to education for students in the targeted district. The applicant cites 2019 data on student performance on mandated tests (i.e., 12% of students performing at or above grade level in math, and 17% in English Language Art). The applicant further proffers that the majority of students are not learning near are on grade level, and that only 25% of students graduated college-ready in English Language Arts, and 16% in math.

The applicant cites data from a 2019 report conducted by John Hopkins on the challenges associated with implementing change at struggling schools and cites the gaps in professional development and evaluation, and the lack of adequate preparation and training of teachers and school leaders in the targeted district (pg. 4, 6-7, 18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve Relevant Outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to build upon, and leverage activities that have been outlined in the Turnaround Action Plan (TAP) that addresses equity and access, transparency, and results through a Students First focus. The TAP identifies three pillars that will be used to guide program success (i.e., Engaged Communities, Excellence in Learning, and World Class Talent) that will focus on establishing efficient district systems, along with an efficient, student-focused central office that is designed to provide schools with the support needed to ensure accountability

Sub

at the school level (pg. 10-11, 23).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not sufficiently describe a plan for leveraging existing funding streams from other programs that would result in improved outcomes (3 points not awarded).

Reader's Score:

3. (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides sufficient detailed evidence that the proposed project is part of a larger comprehensive effort to ensure that all students in the district have access to rigorous and culturally responsible classroom experiences. The proposed project design aligns with recommendations that were provided from the Community Design Teams (parents, students, teachers, principals) that were convened by the Education Commissioner to identify a plan for engaging the communities in being part of the change that would demand excellence in learning. For example, one of the efforts consisted of ensuring that all students have regular access to standards-aligned grade-appropriate instruction. (pg. 4 & 12).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

4. (iv) 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.

General:

Strengths:

The proposed project design has strong potential to address the needs of the targeted students as the applicant provides a Logic Model that outlines the priorities as it relates to Leadership Development, Educator Evaluation, and Career Pathways & Compensation. The activities (i.e., launching of a Leadership Development Academy, updating the school leader evaluation model) are aligned with outputs and outcomes that focus on training and coaching based on research from Branch, Hanushek, and Rivkin, 2013, on the connection between leadership and teacher effectiveness (pg. 17-18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the 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:

Sub

1. (i) **The extent to which the proposed project Demonstrates a Rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a rationale as evidenced by the Logic Model that aligns with the overall project design of optimizing student achievement, building the capacity of educators at all levels, and establishing collective teacher efficacy by increasing the percentage of effective teachers and principals, which will ultimately lead to short and long-term outcomes of increased student achievement levels. Moreover, the applicant is proposing to overhaul their existing performance-based compensation system to align with demonstrated performance to ensure that the model provides greater distribution to top performers (pg. 22).

The applicant documents the need for high performing teachers that will provide consistency in the classroom, and outlines research from Air, 2017 that connects access to ongoing high-quality professional development to student learning. Moreover, the applicant states that survey results from a large urban district in 2011, indicated that high performing teachers stay in classrooms for career opportunities as opposed to just compensation (pg. 17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

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

General:

Strengths:

The applicant will provide for an evaluation model that could produce promising evidence of the project's effectiveness and areas in need of support. The proposed evaluation design will be conducted by an external evaluator that will include a formative and summative design and the collection of qualitative and quantitative data that will allow for midcourse adjustments. (pg. 22-25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, 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.

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a management plan that aligns with the goals and objectives (.e., Leadership Development, Career Pathways & Compensation, Educator Evaluation) of the proposed project. The applicant has identified three individuals who will have overall responsibility for implementation that have a history of working with transformational

projects. The resumes and job descriptions provided of the individuals demonstrate their previous experience designing and implementing similar initiatives (pg. 28 and appendices).

The proposed project design includes a timeline for each activity based on the specific component. For example, one of the milestones for the Career Pathways & Compensation objective is to design and launch an Executive Coach role by Winter 2021, with the list of responsible participants and departments (i.e., Human Resources, Finance Division, Leadership Development Team, and Leadership Development Partner). Pg. 24, 27-28

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

- 1. (i) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant documents a commitment to system change, as evidenced by the proposed Leadership Development Academy and Residency plan that is designed to improve the Human Capital Management System (HCMS) and Performance-Based Compensation System (PBCS) in the targeted high-need schools.

The applicant cites 2019 research from Gates, Baird, Master, Chavez-Herrerias that links systemic change to high-quality leadership (pg. 34), and the incentives from performance-based compensation for high performers provide benefits to everyone in the school to include higher academic achievement levels for students in the school. The applicant also notes that the proposed project design will create opportunities for top performers to take on a coaching role throughout the district, which will benefit schools across the district (pg. 34).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand serves that address the needs of the target population.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence of a systematic and ongoing training program for the coaches and teachers who have the potential and desire to assume leadership positions outside of the classroom. The proposed project design will build the capacity of the educator workforce in the district through the use of local talent in the identified school. For example, the proposed residency model will build their internal capacity by providing a cadre of leaders that can

Sub

be used throughout the district (pg. 35).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model, and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers unions) critical to the project’s long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant documents some evidence of a plan to sustain the project ends. For example, the applicant states that the majority of funds from the proposed application will be used to build and implement the various systems (i.e., evaluation, data) and the capacity of staff (i.e., leadership development training) that have strong potential for being integrated into the system. Moreover, the applicant states that they will deploy current resources (i.e., performance-based bonuses and district-level professional development activities) to support the project during and after federal funding ends (pg. 35-37).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide sufficient details on sustainability once federal funding ends. While the applicant provides letters of support, specifics on how these entities will support the project financially once federal funding ends. Moreover, the details on a multi-year financial and operating model, and the accompanying plan is not provided to assess the quality of the management plan (Appendix C).

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

- 1. Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.**

An applicant must--

- a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and**
- b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).**

General:

Strengths:

a) The applicant provides the census tract number for all the targeted schools they are proposing to serve. Each of the schools have been identified as a Qualified Opportunity Zone (pg. 4-5).

b) The applicant states that schools in the identified Opportunity Zones will be provided an equitable distribution of funds, services, and talent to improve academic success by providing leadership development activities and building the capacity of leaders. The applicant proposes to create career pathways and strategic compensation to support the curation,

development, and retention of a highly effective teacher and school leader (pg. 5).

Strengths:

a) No weaknesses noted.

b) No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0, 2, or 5 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate

a) The applicant has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds (0 or 5 points); or

b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the program from which it seeks funds, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, in the five years before the deadline date for submission of applications under the program. (0 or 2 points)

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2020 02:43 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2020 01:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Providence Public Schools (S374A200032)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	25	23
Sub Total	25	23
Selection Criterion		
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Sub Total	30	28
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources	25	23
Sub Total	45	41
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority #1		
Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones		
1. CPP 1	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority #2		
Diverse and Effective Workforce		
1. CPP 2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	107

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - TSL - 4: 84.374A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Providence Public Schools (S374A200032)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining evidence of the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 23

Sub

1. (i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

General:

The applicant, Providence Public Schools, (PPSD), clearly established that gaps and weaknesses exist in their current HCMS that impacts the organization's ability to address effective student achievement (pg. 20). The entity's Turnaround Action Plan (TAP) is a result of a governance-takeover (pg. 21) and feedback from a Johns Hopkins Institute report that documented a long history of systemic inequities that have endured for a generation (pg. 20). Within this grant, the entity has acutely focused in on leadership development as a clear pathway to ensure that students have access to high-quality instruction. The Turnaround Around Plan (TAP) unfolds 5 goals for the selected learning communities and addresses the misalignment between the performance metrics for administrators and student achievement (pg. 23). One of those goals include establishing a PLDA & Residency grounded in the research that connects leadership effectiveness to teacher effectiveness and student performance. Furthermore, the current compensation strategies are not explicitly aligned with student outcomes (pg. 25). As a result, the goal of the organization is to ensure that performance-based pay is connected to demonstrated impact on student outcomes (pg. 26).

With a foundational belief that effective leadership is the key element for change; the organization is seeking to improve its overall performance by aligning evidence-based leadership practices to transform the educational experiences of students across high-need schools (pg. 33).

Weaknesses:

PPSD must respond to the growing needs of the district, more specifically school leaders, by continuing to assess the current systems and making the changes necessary to improve them pg. 26). Within the framework of this current study, the project would have been strengthen had the voice and role of the teacher been included/addressed.

Reader's Score:

2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve Relevant Outcomes (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

Sub

General:

Strengths:

The applicant, Providence Public Schools, (PPSD), clearly established that gaps and weaknesses exist in their current HCMS that impacts the organization's ability to address effective student achievement (pg. 20). The entity's Turnaround Action Plan (TAP) is a result of a governance-takeover (pg. 21) and feedback from a Johns Hopkins Institute report that documented a long history of systemic inequities that have endured for a generation (pg. 20). Within this grant, the entity has acutely focused in on leadership development as a clear pathway to ensure that students have access to high-quality instruction. The Turnaround Around Plan (TAP) unfolds 5 goals for the selected learning communities and addresses the misalignment between the performance metrics for administrators and student achievement (pg. 23). One of those goals include establishing a PLDA & Residency grounded in the research that connects leadership effectiveness to teacher effectiveness and student performance. Furthermore, the current compensation strategies are not explicitly aligned with student outcomes (pg. 25). As a result, the goal of the organization is to ensure that performance-based pay is connected to demonstrated impact on student outcomes (pg. 26).

With a foundational belief that effective leadership is the key element for change; the organization is seeking to improve its overall performance by aligning evidence-based leadership practices to transform the educational experiences of students across high-need schools (pg. 33).

Weaknesses:

PPSD must respond to the growing needs of the district, more specifically school leaders, by continuing to assess the current systems and making the changes necessary to improve them (pg. 26). Within the framework of this current study, the project would have been strengthen had the voice and role of the teacher been included/addressed.

Reader's Score:

3. (iii) **The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant, Providence Public Schools, (PPSD), clearly established that gaps and weaknesses exist in their current HCMS that impacts the organization's ability to address effective student achievement (pg. 20). The entity's Turnaround Action Plan (TAP) is a result of a governance-takeover (pg. 21) and feedback from a Johns Hopkins Institute report that documented a long history of systemic inequities that have endured for a generation (pg. 20). Within this grant, the entity has acutely focused in on leadership development as a clear pathway to ensure that students have access to high-quality instruction. The Turnaround Around Plan (TAP) unfolds 5 goals for the selected learning communities and addresses the misalignment between the performance metrics for administrators and student achievement (pg. 23). One of those goals include establishing a PLDA & Residency grounded in the research that connects leadership effectiveness to teacher effectiveness and student performance. Furthermore, the current compensation strategies are not explicitly aligned with student outcomes (pg. 25). As a result, the goal of the organization is to ensure that performance-based pay is connected to demonstrated impact on student outcomes (pg. 26).

With a foundational belief that effective leadership is the key element for change; the organization is seeking to improve its overall performance by aligning evidence-based leadership practices to transform the educational experiences of students across high-need schools (pg. 33).

Weaknesses:

PPSD must respond to the growing needs of the district, more specifically school leaders, by continuing to assess the current systems and making the changes necessary to improve them (pg. 26). Within the framework of this current study, the project would have been strengthen had the voice and role of the teacher been included/addressed.

Sub

Reader's Score:

- 4. (iv) 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.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant, Providence Public Schools, (PPSD), clearly established that gaps and weaknesses exist in their current HCMS that impacts the organization's ability to address effective student achievement (pg. 20). The entity's Turnaround Action Plan (TAP) is a result of a governance-takeover (pg. 21) and feedback from a Johns Hopkins Institute report that documented a long history of systemic inequities that have endured for a generation (pg. 20). Within this grant, the entity has acutely focused in on leadership development as a clear pathway to ensure that students have access to high-quality instruction. The Turnaround Around Plan (TAP) unfolds 5 goals for the selected learning communities and addresses the misalignment between the performance metrics for administrators and student achievement (pg. 23). One of those goals include establishing a PLDA & Residency grounded in the research that connects leadership effectiveness to teacher effectiveness and student performance. Furthermore, the current compensation strategies are not explicitly aligned with student outcomes (pg. 25). As a result, the goal of the organization is to ensure that performance-based pay is connected to demonstrated impact on student outcomes (pg. 26).

With a foundational belief that effective leadership is the key element for change; the organization is seeking to improve its overall performance by aligning evidence-based leadership practices to transform the educational experiences of students across high-need schools (pg. 33).

Weaknesses:

PPSD must respond to the growing needs of the district, more specifically school leaders, by continuing to assess the current systems and making the changes necessary to improve them (pg. 26). Within the framework of this current study, the project would have been strengthen had the voice and role of the teacher been included/addressed.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criterion - Quality of the 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. (i) The extent to which the proposed project Demonstrates a Rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

General:

Strengths:

The PLDA & Residency model is grounded in research and connects leadership to teacher effectiveness and student performance (pg. 34). One focus of this project is to enhance the quality of leadership across PPSD schools. The PLDA & Residency model is grounded in research and connects leadership to teacher effectiveness and student performance (pg. 34). Moreover, included in this framework is ongoing professional development, coaching, and support for leaders. Additionally, this project will study the introduction of career pathways and strategic compensation to cultivate, grow, and retain excellent classroom teachers. This study is also designed to address the gaps and weaknesses in the current HCMS in order to impact student outcomes. The three long-term

Sub

outcomes articulated by the applicant to reach long-term outcomes that will lead to improved education experiences and better outcomes for students include, educator evaluation, leadership development, and career pathways & compensation. To achieve astute feedback and ongoing assessment, PPSD, will contract with an external evaluator to assess the progress of the grant and determine any needed, midcourse corrections (pg. 42). Additionally, PPSD, effectively articulated that it has experience partnering with external evaluators and it will work with internal offices to ensure an effective data collection system is in place (pg. 42). Moreover, the organization will utilize qualitative and quantitative within this project.

Weaknesses:

PPSD will contract with an external evaluator to assess the progress of the grant project and determine course corrections. There will be regularly scheduled dialogue between the team supporting the design and the external evaluator (pg. 41). For further clarification and to strengthen the application, the timeframe of regularly scheduled meetings could have been established (weekly, monthly, or annual meetings).

Reader's Score:

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

General:

Strengths:

The PLDA & Residency model is grounded in research and connects leadership to teacher effectiveness and student performance (pg. 34). One focus of this project is to enhance the quality of leadership across PPSD schools. The PLDA & Residency model is grounded in research and connects leadership to teacher effectiveness and student performance (pg. 34). Moreover, included in this framework is ongoing professional development, coaching, and support for leaders. Additionally, this project will study the introduction of career pathways and strategic compensation to cultivate, grow, and retain excellent classroom teachers. This study is also designed to address the gaps and weaknesses in the current HCMS in order to impact student outcomes. The three long-term outcomes articulated by the applicant to reach long-term outcomes that will lead to improved education experiences and better outcomes for students include, educator evaluation, leadership development, and career pathways & compensation. To achieve astute feedback and ongoing assessment, PPSD, will contract with an external evaluator to assess the progress of the grant and determine any needed, midcourse corrections (pg. 42). Additionally, PPSD, effectively articulated that it has experience partnering with external evaluators and it will work with internal offices to ensure an effective data collection system is in place (pg. 42). Moreover, the organization will utilize qualitative and quantitative within this project.

Weaknesses:

PPSD will contract with an external evaluator to assess the progress of the grant project and determine course corrections. There will be regularly scheduled dialogue between the team supporting the design and the external evaluator (pg. 41). For further clarification and to strengthen the application, the timeframe of regularly scheduled meetings could have been established (weekly, monthly, or annual meetings).

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, 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.**

General:

Strengths:

The PLDA & Residency model is grounded in research and connects leadership to teacher effectiveness and student performance (pg. 34). One focus of this project is to enhance the quality of leadership across PPSD schools. The PLDA & Residency model is grounded in research and connects leadership to teacher effectiveness and student performance (pg. 34). Moreover, included in this framework is ongoing professional development, coaching, and support for leaders. Additionally, this project will study the introduction of career pathways and strategic compensation to cultivate, grow, and retain excellent classroom teachers. This study is also designed to address the gaps and weaknesses in the current HCMS in order to impact student outcomes. The three long-term outcomes articulated by the applicant to reach long-term outcomes that will lead to improved education experiences and better outcomes for students include, educator evaluation, leadership development, and career pathways & compensation. To achieve astute feedback and ongoing assessment, PPSD, will contract with an external evaluator to assess the progress of the grant and determine any needed, midcourse corrections (pg. 42). Additionally, PPSD, effectively articulated that it has experience partnering with external evaluators and it will work with internal offices to ensure an effective data collection system is in place (pg. 42). Moreover, the organization will utilize qualitative and quantitative within this project.

Weaknesses:

PPSD will contract with an external evaluator to assess the progress of the grant project and determine course corrections. There will be regularly scheduled dialogue between the team supporting the design and the external evaluator (pg. 41). For further clarification and to strengthen the application, the timeframe of regularly scheduled meetings could have been established (weekly, monthly, or annual meetings).

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

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

Reader's Score: 23

Sub

- 1. (i) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant effectively articulated that the Providence Leadership Development Academy and Residency will build the capacity of current leaders and offer a pipeline to prepare and support future leaders (pg. 51). Additionally, this project will align the HCMS and PBCS for PPSD since performance-based compensation supports the recruitment and retention of high performers pg. 51). The applicant underscored that PPSD has a clear plan to sustain the program after the grant period. The plan will build the internal capacity at the central office, and in Network Superintendent teams, over the course of the grant, this will ensure that the reforms can be sustained, and continuously improved, placing PPSD on a pathway for ongoing progress to transformation (pg. 52). To support sustainability of this initiative, PPSD, will redeploy current resources that are funded but not clearly aligned to school and district-level improvement activities and seek innovative ways to increase revenue (pg. 53).

Weaknesses:

According to the entity, we believe that this comprehensive and coherent approach to leadership development will

Sub

yield systems-level change in the way that our school leaders operate, and how they support our students (pg. 51). However, this model does not fully address and the application could have been strengthened had the entity established how leadership will support and engage with teachers.

Reader's Score:

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand serves that address the needs of the target population.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant effectively articulated that the Providence Leadership Development Academy and Residency will build the capacity of current leaders and offer a pipeline to prepare and support future leaders (pg. 51). Additionally, this project will align the HCMS and PBCS for PPSD since performance-based compensation supports the recruitment and retention of high performers (pg. 51). The applicant underscored that PPSD has a clear plan to sustain the program after the grant period. The plan will build the internal capacity at the central office, and in Network Superintendent teams, over the course of the grant, this will ensure that the reforms can be sustained, and continuously improved, placing PPSD on a pathway for ongoing progress to transformation (pg. 52). To support sustainability of this initiative, PPSD, will redeploy current resources that are funded but not clearly aligned to school and district-level improvement activities and seek innovative ways to increase revenue (pg. 53).

Weaknesses:

According to the entity, we believe that this comprehensive and coherent approach to leadership development will yield systems-level change in the way that our school leaders operate, and how they support our students (pg. 51). However, this model does not fully address and the application could have been strengthened had the entity established how leadership will support and engage with teachers.

Reader's Score:

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model, and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., SEAs, teachers unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant effectively articulated that the Providence Leadership Development Academy and Residency will build the capacity of current leaders and offer a pipeline to prepare and support future leaders (pg. 51). Additionally, this project will align the HCMS and PBCS for PPSD since performance-based compensation supports the recruitment and retention of high performers (pg. 51). The applicant underscored that PPSD has a clear plan to sustain the program after the grant period. The plan will build the internal capacity at the central office, and in Network Superintendent teams, over the course of the grant, this will ensure that the reforms can be sustained, and continuously improved, placing PPSD on a pathway for ongoing progress to transformation (pg. 52). To support sustainability of this initiative, PPSD, will redeploy current resources that are funded but not clearly aligned to school and district-level improvement activities and seek innovative ways to increase revenue (pg. 53).

Weaknesses:

According to the entity, we believe that this comprehensive and coherent approach to leadership development will yield systems-level change in the way that our school leaders operate, and how they support our students (pg. 51). However, this model does not fully address and the application could have been strengthened had the entity established how leadership will support and engage with teachers.

Sub

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority #1 - Spurring Investment in Qualified Opportunity Zones

1. Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the area in which the applicant proposes to provide services overlaps with a Qualified Opportunity Zone, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code.

An applicant must--

- a) Provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposes to provide services; (ED Panel monitor will verify the QOZ using this link.) and
- b) Describe how the applicant will provide services in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s).

General:

Strengths:

The applicant did provide the census tract number of the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s) in which it proposed to provide services (pg. 22). The applicant articulated that it will provide funds, services, and talent to improve the academic success of the students residing within these QOZ (pg. 22). Additionally, the entity underscored that students, families, and the community will have access to a welcoming and inclusive school environment with access to high-quality instruction that prepares students to reach their goals (pg. 22).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference Priority #2 - Diverse and Effective Workforce

1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0, 2, or 5 points).

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate

- a) The applicant has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds (0 or 5 points); or
- b) The applicant has not had an active discretionary grant under the program from which it seeks funds, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, in the five years before the deadline date for submission of applications under the program. (0 or 2 points)

General:

Strengths:

The applicant has never had a TIF or TSL grant.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2020 01:32 PM