

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Charleston County School District (S411C200014)

Reader #1: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Design | 45 | 44 |
| Sub Total | 45 | 44 |
| Resources and Quality of Management Plan | | |
| Resources and Quality of Management Plan | | |
| 1. Resources and Management | 30 | 25 |
| Sub Total | 30 | 25 |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 25 | 20 |
| Sub Total | 25 | 20 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| CPP | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2 | | |
| 1. SEA Partnership | 5 | 5 |
| Sub Total | 5 | 5 |
| Total | 105 | 94 |

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Charleston County School District (S411C200014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 44

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which professional learning funded through the stipend will replace existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers at the following levels:

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| Less than 20%- 0 points | 20%- 5 points |
| 40%- 10 points | 60%- 15 points |
| 80%- 20 points | 100%-25 points |

Strengths:

100% of existing mandatory cultural competency professional learning for EIR participants is replaced by teacher-directed professional learning (page 5 of 25, e23)

Weaknesses:

Factor 1: None noted

Reader's Score: 25

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

Strengths:

The application indicates that the Frontline human capital management system will be used for participants to submit a request that will be approved by the development team if the requested activity meets the definition of professional learning. Teachers will provide appropriate documentation about the activity for review. They will also complete a survey about the training (pages 6 – 7 of 25, pages e24-25).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project will offer teachers flexibility and autonomy regarding the extent of the choice teachers have in selecting their professional learning.**

Strengths:

A resource bank of existing professional learning activities is available and participants can submit requests for other activities (page 7 of 25, e25).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

- 4. (4) The likelihood that the procedures and resources for teachers result in a simple process to select or request professional learning based on their professional learning needs and those identified needs of high-need students.**

Strengths:

The funds for teacher selected professional learning will be distributed to schools; teachers submit a request 10 days prior to the activity they wish to attend which is then paid for by the school. Teachers may submit requests for reimbursement for travel-related expenses within 3 days of the event to be reimbursed within two weeks by the school. (Pages 5 and 6, e24-25)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

Table 3 provides details about assessment tools to be used and specific goals related to improving achievement of Black students to that of all students.

Weaknesses:

The rate of improvement over the course of the grant period described in Table 3 is not clear. For example, it is not clear what "at least 2 percentage points over 2018-19 baseline" for each of Years 1-5 means. For 1a, the baseline for Black students is 24% and the percentage for all students is 54%. It is not clear how a change in in-school suspensions of Black students can be attributed to changes in teaching practices associated with program activities.

Reader's Score: 4

Resources and Quality of Management Plan - Resources and Quality of Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

1. (1) The sufficiency of the stipend amount to enable professional learning funded through the stipend to replace a significant portion of existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers.

Strengths:

The application indicates that a cost analysis of professional learning indicates that [REDACTED] is sufficient. (page 13 of 25, e31)

Weaknesses:

The proposal would be strengthened with details regarding the cost analysis. These could include number and type of schools that were reviewed, number of teachers whose professional learning expenses were obtained, and the number and type of professional learning activities that were funded.

Reader's Score: 4

2. (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The average cost of [REDACTED] per student per year seems reasonable. (page 14 of 25, e32)

Weaknesses:

Only [REDACTED] of the estimated average cost of [REDACTED] per teacher directly benefits the participating teachers. (page 14 of 25, e32) Approximately [REDACTED] of the overall budget applies to contractual commitments to support program activities. Slightly over [REDACTED] is allotted for personnel and fringe benefits.

Reader's Score: 4

3. (3) The extent to which the proposed payment structure will enable teachers to have an opportunity to apply for and use the stipend with minimal burden.

Strengths:

Each school will have an EIR budget that will be managed by a bookkeeper to be trained by the project's Professional Learning Specialist. The application includes sufficient detail about the process for teachers to request funds to participate in an approved professional learning activity and to be reimbursed in a timely manner. (pages 14 -15, e32-33)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The backgrounds and experiences of the two Co-Project Advisors complement each other well and together indicate sufficient management skills to support project goals. Specifically, as a school principal, Dr. Woods promoted substantial student progress and has managerial experience related to finance. Ms. Modeen is a specialist in professional development. The application also includes plans for an extensive Steering Committee,

Sub

Professional Learning and Instruction Coaches, and Management Team. (pages 16-17, e34-35)

Weaknesses:

The application would be stronger with identified individuals to serve as the Project Director and the Professional Learning Specialist. These are two key individuals and, although the application includes job descriptions for these rolls, more detail about the background and experience of those hired for these positions would provide stronger evidence of their qualifications.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The timeline provided in Table 4 organizes project activities by project objectives and indicates which component of project management is responsible. Most of the activities are well-defined and occur at appropriate times and intervals.

Weaknesses:

It is not clear from the timeline in Table 4 participating teachers will have access to funds for professional learning and how project activities align with the school year. Under Overall Project Management 2/2021 is listed as the date for overseeing stipends. However, 5/2021 is listed as when the request forms will be made available to teachers. It is also not clear what evaluation updates will occur 4/2021.

Reader's Score: 4

6. **(6) The adequacy of procedures for leveraging the stipend program to inform continuous improvement and systematic changes to professional learning.**

Strengths:

The application includes some details about activities to inform continuous improvement, including surveys and focus groups of stakeholders. The logic model includes a feedback loop under Activities. (page 19 of 25). The feedback component is further described in the evaluation plan along with plans to regularly review the logic model and progress towards goals.

Weaknesses:

More details about the feedback loop are needed. Details about the surveys and focus groups are also needed.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project based on the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 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 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

Strengths:

The evaluation plan will use a quasi-experimental design that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations to compare outcomes in participating and non-participating schools. Propensity score matching will be used to match treatment and comparison schools and that comparison students will be selected from the comparison schools. Appropriate variables for the matching are included as well as plans to determine baseline equivalence. Some details about the 3-level hierarchical models to be used are provided.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan would be stronger if "business as usual" cultural competency professional learning activities were described. In several places the application indicates that there will be 10 treatment schools and 433 teachers but the number of schools is listed as 9 with 414 teachers in the Evaluation plan. An a priori power analysis was conducted. It is not clear how the teacher Intercultural Development Inventory assessment and the student survey of teacher cultural sensitivity data will be collected from the comparison schools. More detail about the different levels of the hierarchical linear models is needed.

Reader's Score: 12

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The evaluation plan includes three confirmatory research questions for the impact study and three formative research questions on the fidelity of implementation of project activities. Details about the fidelity matrices are provided.

Weaknesses:

The mediator analysis is not included in Appendix I, as indicated in the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 3

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

Strengths:

The evaluation plan includes plans to review the logic model and progress towards program goals on a regular basis. It also includes plans to provide interim and annual performance reports.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: SEA Partnership

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate it has established a partnership between an eligible entity and an SEA (with either member of the partnership serving as the applicant) to support the proposed project.

Strengths:

The application contains a detailed MOU outlining the project goals and the SEA's responsibilities (pages e44-45)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: **5**

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Charleston County School District (S411C200014)

Reader #2: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Design | 45 | 44 |
| Sub Total | 45 | 44 |
| Resources and Quality of Management Plan | | |
| Resources and Quality of Management Plan | | |
| 1. Resources and Management | 30 | 28 |
| Sub Total | 30 | 28 |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 25 | 24 |
| Sub Total | 25 | 24 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| CPP | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2 | | |
| 1. SEA Partnership | 5 | 5 |
| Sub Total | 5 | 5 |
| Total | 105 | 101 |

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Charleston County School District (S411C200014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 44

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which professional learning funded through the stipend will replace existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers at the following levels:

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| Less than 20%- 0 points | 20%- 5 points |
| 40%- 10 points | 60%- 15 points |
| 80%- 20 points | 100%-25 points |

Strengths:

The proposed project would adequately replace 100% of the existing PL requirement. As the District requires two cultural competency professional development days for teachers, the application seeks to fully replace those with two teacher-directed trainings. Funding from the grant would cover a substitute to release teachers from the classroom or compensate teachers for training completed outside of work hours. It would also reimburse teachers for additional costs such as travel, hotel and materials. (p. e23)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

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

Strengths:

The application outlines a thorough process for ensuring that stipends are used appropriately and for high-quality PL. Having a designated Senior Finance Analyst from the Office of Financial Services as a support will help to reduce the occurrence of fraud. Establishing a district policy and requiring signed MOU's for teachers and principals provides clear expectations around the parameters for the use of stipends. Teacher-selected trainings that are not on the pre-approved list will be vetted by the district's professional development team to ensure they meet the state's established guidelines for high-quality PL. The proposal outlines a plan to pay PL providers directly and reimburse teachers for additional costs (travel, hotel) within 2 weeks of submitting a request, thus reducing the burden of cost for teachers. (e24-25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project will offer teachers flexibility and autonomy regarding the extent of the choice teachers have in selecting their professional learning.

Strengths:

The application provides an adequate plan to inform teachers of the new options available in selecting PL around cultural competency. Placing the new information in the existing Frontline system means it is available in a familiar location for teachers to access. The information provided in the system, including a description of innovative options, qualified providers and other tools aligned to goal-specific opportunities and linked to self-assessment will aid teachers in the selection of the most appropriate training. Information will also be made available through flyers, principal packets and school-based coaches. (pp. e25-26)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. (4) The likelihood that the procedures and resources for teachers result in a simple process to select or request professional learning based on their professional learning needs and those identified needs of high-need students.

Strengths:

The proposed outreach strategy is sufficient for the project and includes: information sessions, social media, teacher roundtables, principal meetings, weekly district updates, coaches encouraging participation and reviewing the MOU for the stipend process. This provides information across a variety of levels from the classroom to the administration and the district, which leads to more opportunities for exposure about the program to teachers. Teachers will be able to find new information in the district's Frontline system, which is the current PL management tool. The process for teachers who select training that is not on the pre-approved list is simple and comparable to those selecting from the pre-approved list. This includes a roughly 10-day out request submission, as well as a sample agenda and how the goals of the training align with the district's policy. An analysis of each teacher's Intercultural Development Inventory will help with selecting the appropriate training. (pp. e26, e27, e33)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

The goals and objectives for the proposed project are clear, specific, and measurable. This includes goals for students, teachers, the stipend program and support for ongoing implementation. Specific goals include an annual increase of 2 percentage points in ELA, math and college readiness for Black students, an increase of 10% annually on the Intercultural Development Inventory from a baseline of 50% for teachers, an increased use of assessments to accurately select appropriate training, a 90% increase of teachers implementing culturally competent instructional strategies by year 5, and a 25% decrease of in-school suspension for Black students by year 5 of the grant, among others. (pp. e29-31)

Weaknesses:

Given the disparity in achievement scores between Black students and all others, an annual goal of 2% improvement is insufficient to move the needle in a significant way. At that rate, it would take 10-15 years to close the gap. Increasing the goal of annual achievement would strengthen this proposal. (pp. e29-31)

Reader's Score: 4

Resources and Quality of Management Plan - Resources and Quality of Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

- (1) The sufficiency of the stipend amount to enable professional learning funded through the stipend to replace a significant portion of existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers.**

Strengths:

The proposed stipend amount for each of 433 teachers is [REDACTED] per year to cover cultural competency PL including; registration, travel, hotel, and materials. This amount is clearly sufficient for any local training. (p. e32)

Weaknesses:

While the application states that an analysis of teacher and school level PL for the past three years was completed, no details are provided in regards to the findings to help determine if the proposed [REDACTED] stipend amount will be sufficient for two annual trainings, particularly those requiring travel. (p.e31)

Reader's Score: 4

- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The overall project cost of [REDACTED] per teacher and [REDACTED] per student each year is reasonable for the proposed objectives and project design. The majority of the proposed program costs are directly related to the assessment, training and on-going support of teachers to help meet the stated goals. (pp. e110-120)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) **The extent to which the proposed payment structure will enable teachers to have an opportunity to apply for and use the stipend with minimal burden.**

Strengths:

The proposed process for teachers to pay and be reimbursed for training is efficient and allows teachers to use the stipend with minimal burden. Those choosing a pre-approved training must submit their request within 10 days and the vendor will be paid directly by the school. Those choosing a training that is not on the list must submit their request at least 10 days prior along with an agenda and description of how the program aligns with the district's policy. Teachers will receive a response within 2 business days and payment will be made directly to the vendor, if approved. For all training requiring travel, receipts are to be submitted within 3 days of returning and payment will be made within 10 days. (p. e33)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The experience, training, and qualifications of the key personnel for the proposed project are more than adequate for successful implementation. The co-project advisors have progressive experience in education covering 15-20 plus years beginning with teaching and moving through the administrative ranks. Both have higher education degrees including a Master's and a PhD. The senior analyst, project manager and external evaluators all possess the appropriate education and experience for the roles and responsibilities associated with the project. (pp. e49-63)

Weaknesses:

No weakness.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The proposed management plan provides a detailed outline of the tasks to be completed including the timeline and persons responsible. This plan is aligned with the proposed objectives of the project. (pp. e35-36)

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weakness.

Reader's Score: 5

6. (6) The adequacy of procedures for leveraging the stipend program to inform continuous improvement and systematic changes to professional learning.

Strengths:

The application provides an adequate plan for continuous improvement including annually reviewing the feedback of key stakeholders to identify areas of improvement for the selection, vetting and payment process for the stipend program. This information will be used to refine the implementation of the program to ensure continuing success. (p. e37)

Weaknesses:

The continuous improvement plan does not specify a plan to increase the number of teachers participating in teacher-directed professional learning. (p. e37)

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 24

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

Strengths:

The proposed evaluation meets the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations. It is a quasi-experimental design with low attrition. The pool of comparison schools is identified as those within the district not participating in teacher-directed professional learning. Students from comparison schools will be matched on key variables such as baseline test scores, the rate of free and reduced lunch, percent of minority students, geographic location, pupil-teacher ratio, teacher demographics and enrollment. (p. e37-38)

Weaknesses:

It is unclear if the same data will be collected from the comparison group that will be collected from the such as student surveys and teacher feedback. (page not found)

Reader's Score: 14

Sub

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

Strengths:

The proposed evaluation clearly identifies the key components of the project along with mediators, outcomes and thresholds for acceptable implementation. Key components include an effective stipend system, a high-quality teacher assessment, and ongoing implementation support. Mediators such as teacher stipends, professional learning specialists, professional learning coaches, and content specialists will aid teachers in meeting the stated goals. (p.e22, e29-31)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The application details a thorough plan for utilizing a variety of measures to gauge the program's progress in achieving the intended outcomes. The logic model, performance measures, qualitative study and outcome data will be regularly reviewed to determine the effectiveness of both the stipend program and cultural competency training on student achievement, as well as progress towards the stated goals and objectives to inform the need for any changes. (p. e41)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: SEA Partnership

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate it has established a partnership between an eligible entity and an SEA (with either member of the partnership serving as the applicant) to support the proposed project.

Strengths:

The application includes a signed MOU with the South Carolina Department of Education which details the responsibilities of the SEA towards providing professional learning around cultural competency. (pp. e44-45)

Weaknesses:

No weakness.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Charleston County School District (S411C200014)

Reader #3: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Design | 45 | 37 |
| Sub Total | 45 | 37 |
| Resources and Quality of Management Plan | | |
| Resources and Quality of Management Plan | | |
| 1. Resources and Management | 30 | 25 |
| Sub Total | 30 | 25 |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 25 | 22 |
| Sub Total | 25 | 22 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| CPP | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2 | | |
| 1. SEA Partnership | 5 | 5 |
| Sub Total | 5 | 5 |
| Total | 105 | 89 |

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Charleston County School District (S411C200014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 37

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which professional learning funded through the stipend will replace existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers at the following levels:

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| Less than 20%- 0 points | 20%- 5 points |
| 40%- 10 points | 60%- 15 points |
| 80%- 20 points | 100%-25 points |

Strengths:

The applicant plans to replace 100% of mandatory cultural competency training instituted by the school board with teacher-directed professional learning (page e23). The proposal calls for teachers to have autonomy to select opportunities, modalities, and frequency of professional learning related to cultural competency (page e23).

Weaknesses:

It is unclear if there are other mandatory professional learning expectations for teachers beyond the cultural competency training, such as content specific PD and/or ongoing hours needed for certification. Additional details are needed to confirm this approach is addressing 100% of all mandated professional learning.

Reader's Score: 20

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

Strengths:

The applicant outlines a number of procedures, such as establishing a prepayment and reimbursement system along with utilizing the existing human capital management tool to track professional learning needs, to demonstrate that the district can adequately monitor the use of stipends for high quality professional learning (pages e24-e25). These mechanisms will also allow the district to protect against fraud, waste, and abuse.

Weaknesses:

Because the school principal often has a say on when teachers are out and which PD they attend, details about what is included in the MOU between the teacher and school principal are needed (page e24).

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

3. (3) The extent to which the proposed project will offer teachers flexibility and autonomy regarding the extent of the choice teachers have in selecting their professional learning.

Strengths:

The district has identified a number of existing opportunities for teachers to choose for PL options not previously available to teachers (page e25). Flexibility in the selection process is noted through the various timeframes teachers can attend PL and the various modalities (page e26).

The district has included a number of community partners in this work as potential PL providers (see Commitment Letters), which may allow for additional flexibility from traditional PD opportunities.

Weaknesses:

To allow for additional autonomy, further details on how teacher selected PD, as opposed to those options provided by the district, will be vetted and approved for professional learning is needed (page e26).

Additional details on how current PD providers have been validated are needed to ensure similar standards are being adhered to.

Reader's Score: 4

4. (4) The likelihood that the procedures and resources for teachers result in a simple process to select or request professional learning based on their professional learning needs and those identified needs of high-need students.

Strengths:

The applicant identified the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) as a measure to provide individual teacher profiles based on how one engages cultural difference in situations as the mechanism to help guide individual professional learning selections (page e27).

The applicant adequately connects the independent professional learning to the teacher evaluation components as a tool to identify teacher professional learning needs (page e27).

Weaknesses:

Additional details on the process teachers will use to select PD are needed. For example, the applicant notes that outreach will happen in a variety of ways (page e27), but how the teachers are then to react to this outreach and selected PL opportunities is unclear.

Much of the project design centers on the teacher's IDI score and evaluation process, additional details on how the process builds in the needs of students are needed.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant provides specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by this project (page e29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Resources and Quality of Management Plan - Resources and Quality of Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

- 1. (1) The sufficiency of the stipend amount to enable professional learning funded through the stipend to replace a significant portion of existing mandatory professional development for participating teachers.**

Strengths:

The applicant outlines opportunities for teachers to pool their stipends to coordinate PD across their school (page e31).

The applicant also includes adequate substitute coverage for teachers participating in this program (page e31).

Weaknesses:

Additional details on the cost analysis (page e31) are needed. Examples of what the district paid per teacher for PD over the past couple of years and the cost per teacher for the cultural competency training for teachers not in participating schools would be beneficial.

Reader's Score: 4

- 2. (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The budget presented is fair and reasonable to achieve the goals and objectives outlined, including in-kind district support (pages e109-e120).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub

3. (3) The extent to which the proposed payment structure will enable teachers to have an opportunity to apply for and use the stipend with minimal burden.

Strengths:

The applicant outlines an appropriate process for approval for attending PD opportunities (page e33).

Weaknesses:

Previous examples of the time it traditionally takes the district to provide reimbursement is needed. In addition, details are needed to understand if the timeframe presented allows for adequate substitute coverage to be reserved (page e33).

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The key personnel identified have adequate training and experience related to the overall approach of this work (page e34). In addition, appropriate requirements are included for the new positions that will be hired (page e34).

The inclusion of resumes of project staff and full job descriptions provided additional assurances of the skills and abilities of key personnel (pages e49-e75).

Weaknesses:

Because this is a project aimed at teacher PD the inclusion of a teacher on the steering committee could strengthen the overall management (page e34).

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The management plan chart on pages e35-e36 clearly outlines the goals, objectives, activities, timeframe, and responsible party.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

6. (6) The adequacy of procedures for leveraging the stipend program to inform continuous improvement and systematic changes to professional learning.

Strengths:

The applicant outlines a reasonable feedback system to continuously improve the stipend process and vetting of PD provided (page e37)

Sub

Weaknesses:

Additional details on how the surveys and focus groups will inform system changes to professional learning, beyond process, is needed (page e37). Details on what information is being captured in the surveys and focus groups would be beneficial.

Details on how the district will expand the use of professional learning stipends across more teachers over time are needed.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project based on the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 22

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Strengths:

The applicant has selected an independent evaluator with adequate skills and experience (page e37).

A quasi-experimental design is presented, with appropriate power analysis and selection of treatment and comparison school (page e38). An adequate process for determining baseline equivalence was included in the proposal (page e39). The methodology describes meets the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide adequate details on how comparison data will be captured in the control sites, including student surveys. The administration of student surveys can be extremely time consuming, details on how the evaluator would incentivize data collection for teachers not involved in the study are needed.

Reader's Score: 14

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

Strengths:

The evaluation plan clearly outlines key project components, mediators, and outcomes (page e40).

Appendix I included substantial evaluation details on psychometrics, fidelity matrix, additional indicators, and draft surveys to be used (pages e88-e103).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant includes details on ensuring scalability and replicability of the study via publications in ERIC and presentations at conferences (page e41).

Weaknesses:

Additional details are needed on who is conducting the quarterly review of logic model and monthly review of progress to identify needed changes (page e41). It is unclear if this is the responsibility of the evaluation team, the steering committee, or another group. It is also unclear how these findings are shared with participating teachers.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: SEA Partnership

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate it has established a partnership between an eligible entity and an SEA (with either member of the partnership serving as the applicant) to support the proposed project.

Strengths:

Representatives from the State Department of Education will be included on the Steering Committee (page e16).

The MOU between the district and the state department of education outline clear expectations and roles for each entity (pages e44-e45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 03:17 PM