

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2023 03:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	7
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	57
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	57

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

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 factors:

Reader's Score: 7

Sub

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.

Strengths:

The proposed project; Math For All, (MFA) is a program designed to help teachers personalize rigorous mathematics instruction for a wide range of learners by receiving intensive professional learning (PL). The proposed project is based upon the premise that teacher professional learning supported by Neurodevelopmental Framework will be more effective than other professional learning models (E182).

Weaknesses:

The project (MFA) does not involve the development and demonstration of a promising new strategy that builds on or is an alternative to an existing strategy. Intensive or increased professional learning for teachers that focus on improving math instruction by understanding the holistic development of students is not new and this project does not represent an alternative strategy. Neurodevelopmental (Developmental) Theory is based upon the assumption that learning is not a one-dimensional process. Rather it involves eight different neuro-developmental systems or functions, which interact to enable students to acquire certain knowledge and skills or accomplish school tasks (E182). This theory is not new and is a widely accepted research-supported premise upon which numerous teaching strategies have been developed. In addition, the applicant did not present sufficient data from their initial grant period to support their assertion that the project was effective and should be scaled up (E18).

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 35

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant has clearly identified three specific strategies that will effectively address three specific barriers that have prevented them from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application. They described the three barriers as (1) the use of program developers rather than local facilitators to implement the PL, (2) insufficient local capacity to sustain and scale up MFA, and (3) a lack of MFA PL materials for middle school teachers (E25). To address these barriers, the applicant aims to utilize a systems-based approach to implementation, using three interconnected strategies, guided by Coburn's framework for scale (E25). Specifically, they intend to train local teacher leaders to serve as MFA facilitators to build capacity within each school district in an effort to embed the project activities into the instruction (E26). They plan to build capacity and scale up the project by offering an online PLC and partnering with teacher education programs, school district leadership, and communities (E27). Finally, they aim to develop MFA PL resources for use with middle school teachers (E28).

Weaknesses:

No weakness was found.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The applicant has developed a management plan that will effectively achieve the objectives on time and within budget. The inclusion of key personnel coupled with a description of their clearly defined responsibilities adds to the effectiveness of the plan (E32). For example, the Principal investigator has been assigned the responsibility to oversee all project activities, co-direct the implementation team, and contribute to formative data collection and analyses (E32). The management plan clearly articulates the notable timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (E218). For example, the timeline prominently illustrates the milestone of reaching their recruitment goal for the cohorts during the scale-up (E222.) The budget is aligned with project objectives and is sufficient to support the demonstration activities as part of the scale-up (E268).

Weaknesses:

There was a lack of specificity in the position of milestones within the management plan. The applicant has included a list of demonstration activities that will be implemented annually but there is limited differentiation between planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The applicant has presented sufficient evidence that they have the capacity to bring the proposed project to scale on a national level by planning to work directly with its partners during the grant period. The applicant will work collaboratively with several school districts and organizations in their effort to scale up the project. For example,

Sub

staff from EDC, BSC, NLU, NMSU, SKC, ROE 47, and IRC will serve as the implementation team, responsible for conducting the summer institutes for teacher leaders and school leaders and leading the MFA PL for teachers (E33). The key personnel charged with leading the proposed project have the experience and training to increase the scale of the project. For example; their implementation team consists of 12 highly experienced staff developers who have previously supported the training of more than 150 MFA facilitators and more than 1,000 teachers across nine different states (E34). The project has the financial resources to accomplish the scale-up tasks. They have secured in-kind and matching resources to support the project. For example; potential partners like the Bronx Charter School and Chicago Public Schools plan to contribute in-kind resources (E264).

Weaknesses:

No weakness was found.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The applicant has developed a number of effective mechanisms that will partially disseminate project information to support further development or replication. They include; presentations at regional and national conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, webinars, research briefs, mailing lists, research practice networks, and videos that will be housed on the project website and distributed through social media platforms (E35). These mechanisms have a higher probability of further development because their aim is to build a community of past, current, and future MFA users to support both sustainability and future scale-up (E36).

Weaknesses:

There is limited evidence of strategies to disseminate the information to Pk-12 stakeholders. The PK-12 setting is directly affected by implementation so there is a need to gain the input and feedback of teachers, administrators, and other district personnel to support further development and replication.

Reader's Score: 6

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

Strengths:

There is a moderate likelihood that the products produced from the project will be used effectively in a variety of settings. The level of availability and access increases the potential that these products will be used by other educators. For example, the applicant will offer the products openly licensed and made available through their website, but at a cost for subscribers (E37). These products will be available for school districts that are seeking resources for teacher professional learning and the research findings indicating their level of effectiveness will hopefully drive school district policy (E37). Because professional learning is an integral part of every school district's continuous improvement model; these products have the potential to be part of their annual expenditures.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

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: 15

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.**

Strengths:

There is a well-developed conceptual framework supported by research that drives the development of project inputs, demonstration activities, and outputs. The Logic Model is supported by the Neurodevelopmental (Developmental) Theory, which is based on the assumption that learning is not a one-dimensional process. Rather it involves eight different neuro-developmental systems or functions, which interact to enable students to acquire certain knowledge and skills or accomplish school tasks (E182). The applicant's strategy for the scale-up is Coburn's framework for scale-up which acknowledges the multiple dimensions of scale that are needed for interventions to create deep and lasting change (E39). With these two components, the applicant has aligned demonstration activities to improve student outcomes by improving teacher instruction. There is a logical flow to the Logic Model. For example; the Neurodevelopmental theory drives the professional learning for teachers and the professional learning is sanctioned/supported by school administrators. This leads to improved teacher instruction and ultimately to improved student outcomes (E39).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant has effectively presented goals, objectives, and outcomes that are clearly measurable and specific. The objectives focus on preparation, implementation, evaluation, and building an infrastructure for scaling up the proposed project (E40-41). For example, objective one (preparation) aims to provide one year of support to 80 pairs of MFA facilitators and this will be measured by the number of surveys, interviews, observations, and attendance at the professional learning sessions. The outcome of 160 MFA facilitators receiving support is clearly measurable. The goals, objectives, and outcomes are specific in that the timeline clearly indicates when each of them will be attempted and completed. For example; Objective 1 (Preparation) includes a milestone of training new MFA coaches and indicates that this task will occur during Year 1&2 of the proposed project (E316-318). This logical flow is consistent throughout the management plan that includes the goals, objectives, and outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

There is a high likelihood that the design of the proposed project is appropriate and will successfully address the needs of the target population. The proposed project implements increased professional learning based on the Neurodevelopmental theory for math teachers. There is a significant amount of research that supports the theory that learning is not one-dimensional but rather multi-dimensional and that a holistic approach to teaching tends to lead to improved student outcomes (E182). To that end, a project that increases the access and availability of this type of professional learning will improve student outcomes. The applicant not only seeks to increase the number of teachers receiving the enhanced training but also to embed it into the district and state structure for professional development (E18). This strategy has a high probability of addressing the need of the target population.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

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: 0

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

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 5 points)

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

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

Strengths:

No strengths were found.

Weaknesses:

The fiscal agent and primary implementer of the proposed project is the Education Development Center (EDC) and it does not meet the criteria as one of the selected entities. The application includes letters of support from entities that serve a significant number of the target population and meet the criteria as a selected entity, but they will primarily receive services from the applicant. The stakeholders do not have current prominent roles in the development, implementation, or evaluation of the proposed project.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2023 03:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2023 06:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	7
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	34
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	56
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	56

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

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 factors:

Reader's Score: 7

Sub

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.

Strengths:

The applicant somewhat explains the significance of the project and the strategies that will be used to implement it. Math for All (MFA) is designed to help general and special education teachers in grades K-5 personalize rigorous mathematics instruction for learners, including students who are performing below grade level and students with disabilities (e17). The goal of the project is to implement, test, and refine strategies for expanding MFA to high-need schools in a variety of settings. Coburn's framework for scale is referenced with regard to enhancing local capacity among school staff. The MFA program consists of video case-based resources and experiential learning activities that form the core of two workshop series for teachers in two series: grades K-2 and grades 3-5 (e21). Each workshop series involves 30 hours of professional learning time and 10 hours of workshop-related assignments that participants carry out in their classrooms. MFA can be delivered online with a high degree of fidelity (e22). MFA is an innovative professional learning model as it integrates learning about personalizing instruction within the specific content area of math, and it engages teachers in considering the whole child and strengths each child brings (e24).

Weaknesses:

This is not a promising new strategy. Teacher professional development for math is not a new strategy. The online delivery of MFA (e22) is not unique as many professional development opportunities are now being delivered virtually. The discussion around special education is very generalized. The applicant does not discuss the role of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) with MFA delivery for special education students. More information is needed about special education if a strategy is to deliver MFA to that student group.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 34

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant clearly identifies barriers to scale. These include: the use of program developers rather than local facilitators to implement the professional learning; insufficient local capacity to sustain and scale up MFA; and a lack of MFA professional learning materials for middle school teachers (e25). The three strategies proposed to address these barriers are: training local teacher leaders to serve as MFA facilitators; building organizational capacity to support MFA professional learning; and developing MFA professional learning resources for use with middle school teachers. Implementing these strategies acknowledges that school districts conduct most professional learning internally which offers multiple advantages over having MFA professional learning conducted by external consultants (e26). The applicant will help school leaders build organizational capacity to support MFA professional learning (e28) to include creating a plan to integrate professional learning into their schools' existing professional learning schedules. Very detailed scaling strategies aligns to Coburn's Dimensions of Scale is provided in an appendix (e204-e205).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The management plan is mostly adequate. A chart with the key staff and their experience and primary responsibilities for the project is provided (e32-e33). The project director has experience with grant projects of this size and scope, and will oversee all project activities. The Director for Strategic Partnerships will grow the reach of impact of MFA with other organizations, as well as lead the development of digital resources to engage users. A timeline with activities, milestones, and responsible organizations is provided (e217). Activities include project management, supporting local facilitators, and evaluating the impact of MFA. Milestones include training new MFA coaches, conducting two two-day summer institutes, and providing follow-up coaching to a subsample of 20 facilitators per cohort. The staff responsible for achieving the project objectives are listed in a separate management plan (e218-e223). The management plan aligns the objectives to the data collected, outcomes, staff responsible, and performance measures.

Weaknesses:

The timeline provided is only for each year of the grant project (e217). The timeline should be more detailed and show activities and milestones by quarter or month. It is difficult to determine if the project can stay on time with the timeline being so generalized by year.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Sub

Strengths:

The project staff listed appear qualified in terms of education and experience, including grant experience (e33). Staff have experience with delivering teacher professional learning, math education, special education, bilingual education, research, product development and dissemination (e34). The applicant states they have the capacity to scale the project as they have 12 staff developers who have trained over 150 MFA facilitators (e35). Additionally, the online version of MFA was already created during the pandemic which will support adaptability in a variety of implementation contexts (e35).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The dissemination plan is mostly adequate to support further development. Methods of dissemination described are presentations at regional and national conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, webinars, research briefs, videos for the website and social media, and leveraging regional and national communication networks of partner organizations to share information about the research (e36). Participation in research-practice networks includes communities of practice and the Research Partnership for Professional Learning.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not thoroughly describe how they will disseminate information about MFA directly to teachers and schools (PK-12), or how it would be replicated with this audience. While they will disseminate among researchers and other professional learning leaders (e36), the information about MFA getting directly to schools and teachers to use is not clear. As the primary audience is school teachers, the plan to disseminate to them should be more thorough. The applicant also did not discuss dissemination regarding special education.

Reader's Score: 6

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

Strengths:

The applicant mostly describes the utility of the products that will be developed through this project and their potential for use in other settings. The resources and materials developed from this project will be openly licensed and free through the applicant's website. Program materials include videos, teacher handouts, and facilitation guides (e31). To ensure MFA will be used with high fidelity, checklists will be developed to allow local facilitators and administrators to self-monitor use (e37).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant states the K-5 materials have been successfully used in different settings with diverse populations of teachers (e37), there is a lack of data supporting this claim to ensure that the 6-8 materials are also transferable to different settings. Additionally, the actual utility of the products is not fully described. While these would be free math materials, the value of MFA as a result of this project is not clear.

Reader's Score: 4

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: 15

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.

Strengths:

The conceptual framework is appropriate and is based on Coburn's framework for scaleup (e39). A logic model is provided that aligns the project inputs to the teaching outcomes, student outcomes, and moderating variables (e171). Teacher outcomes are enhanced self-efficacy, improved growth mindset, and improved teacher retention. Student outcomes are mathematics achievement, engagement in mathematics, mathematical identify, and self-advocacy skills. Moderating variables listed are teacher characteristics, student characteristics, and organizational context. The theory of change for MFA is that it is a professional learning program that introduces teachers to a neurodevelopmental framework of learning as a lens to better understand both individual students' strengths and challenges in learning mathematics and the demands of mathematical activities (e112).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

An adequate table is provided that aligns the project goals to the objectives, primary measures, and outputs and outcomes (e40-e41). Goals include: prepare local facilitators and school leaders to implement MFA professional learning; local facilitators implement MFA professional learning for teachers with high fidelity; evaluate MFA impact and meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations; and build infrastructure for continued MFA expansion and disseminate findings. Examples of objectives include: conduct two summer institutes per cohort; provide one year of support to 80 pairs of MFA facilitators; and refine facilitator supports using formative and fidelity of implementation data (e40).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The proposed project design will address the needs of the target population, which is elementary and middle school students and their teachers (e41). There is a need to build the capacity of teacher leaders - there is little attention paid to who is teaching the teacher leaders at the local level (e42). MFA addresses the need for professional

Sub

learning for teacher leaders.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

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: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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.**

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Sub

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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 5 points)

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

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

Strengths:

No strengths found.

Weaknesses:

The institutions listed do not currently have prominent roles with the development and implementation. While the applicant states they are partnering with teacher education programs from two minority serving institutions (National Louis University and New Mexico State University) and a tribal college (Salish Kootenai College) (e25), their role is not concrete with regards to full partnership and implementation. More information is needed about the institutional partnership to address this criterion

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/15/2023 06:19 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2023 04:37 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	14
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	64
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	64

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

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 factors:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

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.

Strengths:

The Education Development Center (EDC) propose a project that promises new strategies that building upon existing strategies. The EDC offers valid evidence of the significance of its "Math for All: An Expanding Professional Learning to Improve Mathematics for Students in High Needs Schools" project (MFA) that promises new strategies that build on existing strategies. The MFA proposal is compelling, timely, essential, and designed to provide supports to students with disabilities and from low-income family backgrounds who are underperforming in mathematics. For instance, the main focus of the project is to (2) build local capacity to implement and sustain MFA, (2) improve the ability of teacher leaders to implement Professional Learning (PL) that ensures teachers make mathematics accessible to all students, (3) improve teacher's delivery of math instruction, and (4) improve mathematics performance for all high students with a disability or from low family backgrounds (page e13). Not only does the project promise to support students with disabilities and students from low-income families, but it aims to provide a strategic approach to providing professional learning for teacher leaders, classroom teachers, and administrators in the participating districts (pages e26-e30). MFA provided recently published evidence related to the proposed work, which has been cited to support the project's significance and how the COVID-19 pandemic amplified the performance gaps in mathematics (page e18). Furthermore, a final strength of the project is the 2019 and 2022 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data that was shared, depicting the decline in the percentage of students with disabilities and students from low-income family backgrounds compared to the general population (page e18). The data the EDC shared validated a need for the MFA project and why there is a need to provide comprehensive and personalized approaches to mathematics instruction that address the learning gaps of diverse learners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 35

Sub

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

Strengths:

The Education Development Center (EDC) clearly identified three strategies that specifically address particular barriers that could prevent the project from reaching the scale level for Mathematics for All (MFA) project. As highlighted on page e25, those three barriers included (1) the use of program developers rather than local facilitators to implement professional learning (PL), (2) insufficient local capacity to sustain and scale up MFA, and (3) a lack of MFA PL materials for participating middle school teachers. The applicant states strategies that directly address the barriers that would help the project reach scale. For instance, on pages e26 - e30, the applicant's plan to ensure they train local teachers to serve as MFA facilitators is to build on the capacity of local teachers to support, sustain, and expand the project. A further strength of this particular strategy is that MFA has devised a plan of delivering a two-day summer institute for the participating teachers, provide ongoing support/monthly workshops throughout the school year following the institute, and offer an online Professional Learning Community (PLC) for the teachers (page e27). EDC's strength lies in its ability to provide teachers with more robust professional learning experiences as they implement engaging mathematics instruction for diverse students. These innovative approaches extend reach into Illinois, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, and New York (page e10).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The Education Development Center (EDC) provides a management plan that demonstrates its commitment to achieving the objectives of the "Math for All: An Expanding Professional Learning to Improve Mathematics for Students in High Needs Schools" project (MFA). In the plan, the applicant clearly outlines the goals, objectives, data collected, outcomes, responsible persons, and performance measures for each year of the MFA project (pages e218 – e223). The activities highlighted within the management plan align with the goals and strategies the EDC presented on pages e26-e30 and identify the personnel responsible for executing the tasks. Identifying the persons accountable for completing critical components of the management plan holds essential personnel responsible for ensuring the successful implementation of all of the outcomes designated in the management plan. The Organizational Chart on page e31 demonstrates how the EDC will leverage its partnerships with other organizations, such as the Bank Street College of Education and the Illinois Resource Center, to name a few, that are part of its implementation team. Another strength of the management plan is that the EDC provides an "Overview of Math for All Measures" on page e239 that aligns with its management plan. A budget narrative is provided and offers a comprehensive breakdown of costs associated with the project that rationalizes the cost of the study starting on page e268.

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to highlight the milestones for the MFA project (page e217). Failure to include the milestones could prevent a timely and successful implementation of the project.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The Education Development Center's capacity to bring the project to scale on a national level is defined throughout the application. For example, the Education Development Center (EDC) demonstrates that team members are highly qualified to adhere to the requirements of this project and provide the necessary support to ensure the successful implementation of the project as outlined in the grant application. For instance, the biographical sketches on pages e75-e137 and the detailed explanations of roles, experiences, and primary responsibilities of key personnel on page e34, indicate that a diverse group of personnel for this project covers a wide range of expertise from higher education to K-12 educational settings. Among the innovations of MFA is its strategic inclusion of university faculty, industry practitioners, teachers, directors of teacher preparation programs, and other math experts as resource providers (pages e16-e18 in Exhibit 3). The EDC furnished a detailed explanation of each person's role as it pertains to the intricacies of the grant(pages e16 – e18, in Exhibit 3). All in all, the applicant demonstrated that members of its team are highly qualified to adhere to the requirements of this project and provide the necessary support to ensure the successful implementation of the project at the proposed scale, as outlined in the grant application.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The Education Development Center (EDC) will use a variety of mechanisms to disseminate information on its Math for All broadly: An Expanding Professional Learning to Improve Mathematics for Students in High Needs Schools" project (MFA). For instance, the EDC will disseminate the project findings to other Professional Learning programs to build an active community of users who can support its expansion (page e35). Additionally, the EDC will disseminate information at regional and national conferences, including the National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics and the American Educational Research Association, Journals for Research of Mathematics Education, and Exceptional Children (page e36). The applicant indicates its use of the MFA website and social media channels to disseminate information, which increases the probability of reaching a significant number of potential participants throughout the project.

Weaknesses:

The EDC does not provide the names of the Professional Learning (PL) programs it will use to disseminate its findings during and after the project's conclusion. The applicant fails to deliver a plan for disseminating written products it identifies as a strategy (page e35). More specificity regarding the target dates for sharing the written products would strengthen the proposal. Additionally, EDC fails to demonstrate how it will disseminate information to teachers and students in PK educational settings who work with directly with students with disabilities, which is a significant component of the project. Failure to include a plan to share information with participating PK-12 settings could limit the number of potential clients that EDC may reach throughout the project. Finally, it is unclear what methods will be taken to replicate the project. For example, failure to include this information can potentially decrease the possibility of success for the targeted population of stakeholders (page e13).

Sub

Reader's Score: 6

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

Strengths:

The Education Development Center (EDC) provides a project that will be used effectively in Illinois, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, and New York. As part of this expansion project, the Education Development Center (EDC) "Math for All: An Expanding Professional Learning to Improve Mathematics for Students in High Needs Schools" project (MFA) project promises to provide several products and resources to support its facilitators and administrators in implementing MFA. This includes designing professional learning (PL) resources such as checklists to allow facilitators and administrators to self-monitor MFA and fee-for-service training institutes through Bank Street's Continuing Professional Services program (page e37). Also, another strength is EDC's intention to demonstrate how the potential of its MFA project fits into various school contexts and how to implement it with fidelity across geographic regions with different populations of students and adult learners (page e38).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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: 14

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.

Strengths:

The Education Development Center provides a conceptual framework/logic model that serves as the foundation for its Math for All: An Expanding Professional Learning to Improve Mathematics for Students in High Needs Schools" project (MFA) (pages e239 and e171). A vital element of the MFA Logic Model is its attention to how key factors, such as implementation supports, MFA professional learning (PL), improved PL capacity within schools, ESA's and Teacher Education Programs, and strategic alliances with collaborative partners, will impact student learning outcomes in mathematics. The model provided by the EDC is presented coherently, building consensus and understanding among all stakeholders involved in the project. The inputs, activities, outputs, teacher and student outputs, and outcomes align appropriately with the three goals listed on the Logic Model (pages e239 and e171), thus setting the groundwork for successfully implementing the project on its participants. The applicant also provides samples of the model/curriculum, checklists, and lesson plans (pages e267-e431). A Theory of Change is explained deeply on pages e172 – e174. It provides a narrative of the teacher outcomes and student outcomes, all of which demonstrate the direct impact on participating teachers' beliefs about teaching and participating students' beliefs about learning. A final strength of the model is that the Coburn Framework guides it and acknowledges multidimensions of scale needed for critical interventions to create lasting change (page e39).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The Education Development Center (EDC) successfully outlines the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes are to be achieved by the Math for All: An Expanding Professional Learning to Improve Mathematics for Students in High Needs Schools" project (MFA) (page e40 - e41; e217; e316). For instance, the research priorities are well justified, and the anticipated outcomes are clear. A further strength of the MFA project is the description of objectives, how they will be measured, and the desired outcomes resulting from their goals, and each plan is measurable. The applicant outlines several objectives, measures, and thresholds for the project, including how these objectives relate to the existing strategies outlined in the application. Overall, the goals and objectives demonstrate how the EDC plans to scale the MFA project with teacher leaders, school leaders, and classroom teachers who work with students with disabilities and students from low-income households.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The Education Development Center (CDC) successfully addresses the needs of the target population for its Math for All: An Expanding Professional Learning to Improve Mathematics for Students in High Needs Schools" project (MFA). One of the application's strengths is its goal of supporting and serving students in schools with a high proportion of elementary and middle school students underperforming in math with disabilities and from low-income families (page e13 and page e41). Additionally, the EDC is targeting the teachers and teacher leaders who support these students with diverse academic and social-emotional learning (SEL) needs (page e41). Another project strength is its intention to target 80 high-needs schools throughout Illinois, Montana, New Mexico, New Jersey, and New York (page e17). Page e41 of the proposal provides a very descriptive plan of provisions the EDC will make to ensure that the needs of all participating students, teacher leaders, teachers, and administrators will be met easily. For instance, the project addresses a need for the teachers in MFA to administer formative assessments to elementary and middle school students that enable the teachers to identify the strengths of the target population and how to re-engage the target population after prolonged absences from school—ultimately furthering preparedness and success. Another strength of this application is its intention to use poverty indicators to focus on high-needs students such as English Language Learners, special education students, and students with disabilities (pages e41-e42).

Weaknesses:

The EDC states it will serve elementary and middle school students throughout the application. The targeted grade level of MFA students to be served is inconsistent throughout the application. It will be beneficial to clarify whether the grade level the MFA will help is K-5 or K-8 (page e17).

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. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

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.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

N/A

Sub

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

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 5 points)

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

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

On page e13 of the application, the Education Development Center states that it will partner with the National Louis University, New Mexico State, Salish Kootenai College, and Bank Street College. The letters of collaboration presented on pages e144 through e169 did not come from these critical experts to clearly explain the level of support that would be provided to the EDC for its expansion phase. Failure to include this information made understanding the degree of support offered to the EDC from the colleges and universities somewhat unclear. This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2023 04:37 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2023 03:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Sub Total	100	27
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

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 factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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: 0

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.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides an well-developed evaluation plan that focuses on the implementation of the Math for All (MFA) program and the achievement of the project objectives. In addition, the plan clearly seeks to gather data on expanding the project into different settings, dealing with additional populations, and testing for scale up strategies (page e42). The plan includes the use of a primary random controlled trial (RCT) to study the impact of the project. This process will conform with What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. Using a series of research questions, the evaluation plan will seek to determine the impact the project has on achievement in mathematics in grades three through five and grades six through eight. Using appropriate statistical analysis over a five-year timeframe, the project will enable the researchers to determine the long-term influence that all the Math for All program has on both students and teachers. The study will focus on 20 K-8 schools which will be paired with other schools. The plan will employ a comprehensive set of interviews, surveys, and administrative data collection activities across such populations as school leaders, teacher leaders, and teachers.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear if the applicant considered the issue of bias in it is use of random controlled trials. Bias is always a consideration that may have an impact on sampling, attrition, and other statistical procedures. Specific information is needed concerning how the applicant deals with bias in terms of the overall evaluation process.

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides effective strategies for replication by providing guidance in the overall core elements of the Math for All program, how it fits different school contexts, the fidelity of implementation concerns, adjustments for different settings, and an analysis of costs (page e48). The guides will also include a description and discussion of quantitative and qualitative implementation data as well as the required training and resources needed to support facilitators. These strategies will provide some assistance in considering replication.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the applicant will make this information available. Information about such issues as printed material, digital files, websites, and conferencing for dissemination were not discussed in the evaluation plan.

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.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clear description of the project as part of the design phase and includes a logic model that provides limited additional information about the various components and their relationships (page e39). The logic model identifies the input associated with the project and how they will generate both teacher and leader output. Key mediators are teachers' lesson planning and classroom practices. In addition, the model shows the

Sub

relationships of the project components and how they interact to achieve short term (proximal) and long term (distal) outcomes. The model and the narrative indicate that the evaluation plan articulates a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. (4) 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 employs appropriate periodic assessment processes to support the project (page e51). The applicant notes that performance feedback will be gained from the ongoing formative data collected from surveys and observations, from the annual interviews with various stakeholders, from input provided by external advisory groups, and from multiple cohorts of participants. In addition, the evaluation consultant will provide feedback that will enable decision makers to refine program implementation, evaluation strategies, and dissemination activities to periodically assess progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

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 5 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:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2023 03:35 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2023 08:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Sub Total	100	27
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (S411A230007)

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 factors:

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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: 0

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.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

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:

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents a satisfactory evaluation plan. The plan features a multi-cohort randomized controlled trial study with a three-level model that will be used to examine impact on student and teacher outcomes (pgs. e43, e46). The study is also designed to learn if project impacts can be successfully replicated in other settings and with different populations (pg. e18). An external evaluation team will lead the evaluation design, assign schools to study conditions, and collect and analyze data (pg. e34). Random assignment will be made at the school level.

The applicant satisfactorily describes how the analyses will have sufficient statistical power (pgs. e226-227). The sample size is satisfactory with the research including 960 teachers from 80 schools, 160 teacher leaders, 80 school leaders, and approximately 44,800 students (pg. e10). The applicant nicely explains how they expect that contamination of project effects will not be an issue due to their professional learning structure and their previous project experience (pg. e45). Several strategies will be employed to maintain low attrition including communicating expectations to teachers and over-recruiting schools (pgs. e46-47). The research questions are rigorous and clearly aligned with assessing project outcomes. The questions focus on teachers' knowledge, instructional use, and self-efficacy, student math achievement, fidelity of implementation, and scaling strategies (pg. e43).

Weaknesses:

The evaluation methods are not fully designed to meet What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations because the applicant does not say that the treatment and comparison groups will be similar on group characteristics. Similarity is one of the key components to meeting What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. Because the applicant reports they will use regionally diverse schools that vary in size, characteristics, and populations (pg. e48), it is crucial to know that the groups will be similar.

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

The applicant expects that the research results will demonstrate how the project can be generalized to different school contexts. Regionally diverse schools that vary in size, local characteristics, and teacher/student populations will participate in the impact study which could generate information that can help schools and districts in other settings to implement the project if the analyses are successfully conducted. A description of what supports are needed to implement the project with fidelity will also be produced from the research study (pg. e37). The evaluation features moderator analyses that will provide opportunities to look at differential impacts of the professional learning across settings and populations, specifically student disability status (pgs. e48-e49).

The applicant is now an affiliate of the Research Partnership for Professional Learning network; the project's research questions are aligned with the network's research agenda which will allow more opportunities to contribute findings to a larger-shared research effort (pg. e36).

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not fully describe their guidance about effective strategies suitable for project replication in other settings. Specific details on how the applicant would provide that guidance were not presented, such as a checklist or practice guide that would be shared at conferences.

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.

Strengths:

The evaluation plan satisfactorily articulates the key project components, mediators, outcomes, and measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation. The project objectives are to build local capacity to implement, sustain, and expand the project. The relevant outcomes are Improved capacity of teacher leaders to implement professional learning to help teachers provide high-quality math instruction to all students, improved mathematics instruction, and improved math performance for high-need students (pgs. e13, e39). One of the components of the evaluation plan is to assess project impact on math achievement when mediated by other variables such as teacher lesson planning and practices. The evaluation will also explore how the primary mediators of teacher lesson planning and practices are mediated by fidelity of implementation and school leader participation (pgs. e49, e235).

The applicant will employ minimum acceptable implementation thresholds for professional learning and teacher practices based on their previous project work. For example, they expect that facilitators will participate fully in the summer institute and attend 80% of the planning and debriefing meetings (pg. e50).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. (4) 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 methods are effectively designed to provide performance feedback and permit periodic assignment of progress toward project outcomes. The applicant incorporates four feedback sources to inform continuous improvement of project resources, research design and methods, and project implementation. Some of these feedback sources include session feedback surveys and interviews with school leaders and facilitators (pg. e51). Additionally, primary and secondary analyses will use data from various measures including state math achievement test results; teacher logs, surveys, and lesson plans; facilitator surveys, logs, observations, and interviews; and school leader interviews. For example, teacher survey and student math achievement data will be collected and analyzed to assess project impact (pgs. e11, e40). These multiple data sources will be helpful in providing performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress toward project outcomes.

The implementation and evaluation teams will each conduct weekly meetings to coordinate project activities. In addition, monthly meetings will bring together representatives from all partner organizations to provide updates about the ongoing work, reflect on program implementation and emergent research findings, review progress toward meeting objectives, and plan next steps (pgs. e34, e51).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

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 5 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:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2023 08:55 PM