

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2015 09:38 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U367D150019)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
Sub Total	4	4
Total	107	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 3: 84.367D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U367D150019)

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:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

This project expands multi-state partnerships demonstrating a potential national impact. The proposed project advances a theory and develops a practical model of teaching and learning as a contribution. This project will likely increase the magnitude of nationally board certified teachers. Strong links are made between the project and the general impact.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

Strengths:

Three clear, measurable goals aligned with outcomes and measures are provided alongside objectives for each. The comprehensive collaborative efforts across states and districts are a strength of this project. Specific and comprehensive activities are provided for each state involved. Case studies provided show the potential impact of the training. The

services described are of sufficient intensity, duration, and quality. The applicant sufficiently addresses area of shortages and disadvantaged students by partnering with sites and teachers who are working with the most high need students in areas such as rural Kentucky and New Mexico. A strong focus of the proposal also includes partnering with teachers of English language learners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.

(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.

(3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.

Strengths:

The personnel identified have relevant training and experience and experience working together on similar projects. A specific and thorough management plan is provided that lends confidence to the applicant's ability to accomplish project tasks on time and within budget. There is a clear delineation of responsibilities and timelines. The case for sufficient resources has been established as there is a demonstrated history of success and established collaborations as well a reasonable budget.

Weaknesses:

It appears that the team in place is already working together on a project. It is not clear how this proposed project would be able to fold in to the existing work load of the persons mentioned.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as

information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.

(3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant has a history of sustaining efforts. Some of the products of this project, such as professional discourse, will naturally sustain. Online knowledge platforms will effectively serve as dissemination venues. Existing networks ensure the likelihood that information will be shared beyond the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.

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

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:

(1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and

(2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/.

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

Strengths:

The applicant has clearly provided research questions that align with each specific objective for each goal. The methods of evaluation described are feasible and appropriate. The proposed evaluation uses both quantitative and qualitative measurements and data. The use of performance feedback is adequately addressed. The applicant provides sufficient information on how the evaluation plan will address WWC standards.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant provided strategies for cost effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The applicant addressed STEM preparation with a focus on the preparation of math teachers and stipends for participating teachers to attend STEM conferences.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The applicant addressed high need students. The positive impact on high need schools was clearly demonstrated.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2015 09:38 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/28/2015 09:51 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U367D150019)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	17
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
Sub Total	4	4
Total	107	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 3: 84.367D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U367D150019)

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:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

The national significance of the NBPTS and the prominence of the NBCTS and assessment process are well established

The proposal offers compelling evidence that the NT3 initiative is already impacting professional culture of K12 schools, particularly by bringing accomplished teaching into high-need sites (p. 12 NY example).

Collaborative leadership roles are likely to further develop for teachers under this proposal, especially the leadership roles for teachers that focus on early career teachers. In this way the applicant establishes mechanisms for recognizing and building accomplished practices in teachers earlier.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

Strengths:

The project goals are straightforward and clearly measurable.

The proposal makes a compelling case for the ability of the NT3 network to differential by site and nonetheless work toward common goal of a career continuum for teachers.

The STEM and specific math focus in, for instance, KY (p. 24) make sense as a "local site" decision on priorities (and meeting the challenge of shortages), while contributing to the national conversation on these issues.

B.5. NT3 Partners are already serving in schools with high needs, and the proposal intends to increase the number of NBCTs deploying their expertise in these sites.

Weaknesses:

The expectation that school leadership roles should be help for NBCTS "when NBCTs should have priority in leadership hiring" suggests that NBCTs are automatically a good fit/ have the skills for leadership. It would be good to explain the criteria for how these roles might be defined (or examples of the kinds of roles being imagined).

It is clear that STEM-qualified potential teachers want competitive salaries - it's not clear how NT3 specifically helps states (like NC, p. 24) "capitalize on these policies" to differential pay or offer other incentives.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:**

(1) **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.**

(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.**

(3) **The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.**

Strengths:

The proposal names and defines expanded roles and responsibilities for an experienced management team.

The convening power of NBPTS is already demonstrated (given earlier funding for significant collaborative work). As a result the applicant claim (p. 36) for the management plan to be able to carry out the proposal is compelling.

Weaknesses:

Given the overwhelming biz-speak terminology like "The Hub" and "Breakthrough Series Collaborative" and "Change Package Development," this reviewer would appreciate the proposal making a stronger case for why there's an appropriate parallel between health systems reform and this work with teachers and schools (see P. 35).

The work outlined at the state level is compelling and important. The proposal could do more to explain how the national network gives significant additional value in terms of model building - for instance, a better sense of what it means that the Hub will "coordinate knowledge management."

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.
- (3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

As a result of the proposal, at the state/school system level there will be more NBCTs serving in important roles, and these roles will be institutionalized and therefore sustained.

It would be useful to name some parallel systems for "teacher growth and development" that could learn from the NBPTS networking example, but the intention to spread organizational knowledge is clear.

The collaboration with AIR and Carnegie suggest that there is a clear strategy for determining results and sharing findings. The idea of learning from PR campaigns (p. 39) about marketing the NBPTS (and more importantly the power of accomplished teaching) is smart and strategic.

Weaknesses:

no weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:
(1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idoctrviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and
(2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/.

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

Strengths:

The comprehensive research questions are broken down into specific objectives and resulting provocative and complex research questions about teacher leadership impacts that will be important to answer.

The plan to use cross-site comparisons (p. 44) makes sense in terms of understanding implementation factors as well as impact measures.

There is a sophisticated plan for how the evaluation design will lead to results that meet WWC without reservations. Earlier in the narrative, the discussion about meeting priority #1 indicates that the organization is keenly aware of this standard of evidence.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

There is a clear case made that NBCTs can be better utilized and that this will lead to broad educational savings.

Weaknesses:

none.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

Gains for states in increasing STEM teachers is a by-product of the broader NBPTS initiative.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference

priority.

Strengths:

The application clearly demonstrates strategic plannings that will expand the positive impact of NBCTs on high need schools.

Weaknesses:

none

Reader's Score: **4**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/28/2015 09:51 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2015 02:49 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U367D150019)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	35
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	17
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
Sub Total	4	4
Total	107	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 3: 84.367D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U367D150019)

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:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

The applicant provides clear details to show the significance of the proposed project on a National Level. For example, the applicant discussed that The National Board is uniquely positioned to lead the way in this movement. National Board Standards are developed by accomplished teachers to define accomplished practice across 25 certificate areas. Accomplished practice is measured using a valid, reliable standards-based performance assessment that employs multiple measures of effectiveness.

The applicant provides compelling details to show the potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices. (This can be evidenced by the applicant discussing that this initiative aims to contribute to theory, knowledge, and practices in two ways: (1) by advancing a unifying theory for the transformation of the structures, policies, and programs that support teachers and define the teaching profession and (2) by deploying a practical model that alters the way teaching and learning—and the systems that support it—are analyzed, evaluated, and improved.

The applicant provided sound evidence to show the importance of the results likely to be attained by the proposed project resulting in teaching and student achievement. This can be evidenced by the applicant discussing that NT3 building from this extensive evidence base to improve teaching quality and student learning across sites, especially in STEM subjects and high-need schools. In doing so, it will create “proof points”—districts and states that more coherently support teacher growth and development across the career continuum. (pp. 9)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

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

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

(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

Strengths:

The applicant provided compelling details to show the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable. For example, the applicant wrote that NT3 is grounded in common goals, organized by intermediate objectives, and measured by shared outcomes that support the development of breakthrough improvements. The three goals link to each stage of the teaching career continuum: Goal 1: Increase the number of NBCTs; Goal 2: Increase the number of NBCTs in instructional leadership roles; and Goal 3: Increase the number of early career educators developing into accomplished teachers. (pp. 13)

The applicant provided compelling details to show the extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. For example, the applicant discussed that NT3 partners include ten groups of states and districts, each represented by a wide range of labor, management, and NBCT professionals. The applicant also provided a table to show participating state-district partners, and where district partners have not yet been identified, they will be determined through a competitive selection process based on specific and rigorous criteria. (pp. 18)

The applicant provided distinct evidence to show the extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. For example, the applicant wrote that the careful alignment of need, response, and significance ensures that professional learning achieves a high level of quality, with the intensity and duration needed to address specific challenges and produce meaningful results/ (pp. 20)

The applicant provided strong details to show the extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated. For example the applicant discussed that the National Board has a strong record of promoting STEM education. Approximately 56,300 NBCTs are certified in a STEM subject, representing over half of all NBCTs nationwide. National Board Standards in multiple content areas support the Next Generation Science Standards and the Common Core State Standards, ensuring that NBCTs are well positioned to support their students' STEM education. By expanding NT3 to four new state district partners, the applicant discussed that the initiative will continue increasing those numbers while expanding collaboration on the development of STEM-related structures, policies, and programs.

The applicant provided compelling evidence to show extent to which the proposed project will focus on addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals. For example, the applicant wrote that high-need students are taught by teachers who do not have adequate preparation and support to teach them well. In high-need schools, teacher turnover can be great, professional culture weak, and student achievement persistently low (Borman & Kimball, 2005; Ferguson, 1998; Jacob, Vidyarthi, & Carroll, 2012; Kain & Singleton, 1996). Across sites, diverse groups of students facing disadvantages exist, all of whom deserve the opportunity to learn and develop the full potential of their talents regardless of their zip code, first language, socioeconomic status, place of birth or disability. (pp. 25)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.
- (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.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.

Strengths:

The applicant provides clear details to show the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors. The applicant discussed that the Project Director ensures there is alignment between NT3 goals, objectives, and available resources, providing executive oversight and tactical guidance. As Senior Vice President of Strategy and Policy, [REDACTED] has served as the Project Director since 2013. He has extensive experience working with stakeholder groups to improve educational outcomes, especially for low-income and minority youth. The Improvement Advisor is responsible for network outcomes, and must be trained in improvement science theory and methods by the Institute for Healthcare Improvement, National Board Director of Policy and Partnerships [REDACTED] is an NBCT (Adolescent and Young Adulthood Social Studies-History) with knowledge and skill in coaching teams to advance outcomes.

The applicant provided compelling details to show 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. For example, the applicant discussed their plans to provide more effective and relevant professional development for all teachers who teach STEM to improve STEM learning outcomes.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide details to show how the project would affect workload of current staff members.

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.
- (3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant provided compelling details to show the extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The applicant wrote that NT3 has been designed from the start to yield sustainable progress that will continue beyond the period of federal assistance through changed systems, built capacity, and transformed cultures. The continuous improvement approach facilitates the process of tailoring system changes to the educator continuum so that they are meaningful and successful within local contexts, marrying the imperative to address local issues with the power of working within a national cooperative. In each site, NT3 has assembled stakeholder groups that represent labor, management, and practitioners in districts, and states.

The applicant provides effective details to show the extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations. The applicant discussed that this initiative will yield findings and products valuable to other states, districts, and organizations as they work to improve teaching effectiveness by transforming their structures, policies, and programs supporting teacher growth. In particular, the strategies and data collected as part of a change package for each project goal will be documented and disseminated by the National Board for adaptation and use by other states and districts seeking similar improvements in teaching practice. These materials will be disseminated through an online knowledge management platform and supported by case studies from NT3 sites and accompanying evidence from the implementation study conducted by AIR that this initiative will yield findings and products valuable to other states, districts, and organizations as they work to improve teaching effectiveness by transforming their structures, policies, and programs supporting teacher growth. In particular, the strategies and data collected as part of a change package for each project goal will be documented and disseminated by the National Board for adaptation and use by other states and districts seeking similar improvements in teaching practice. These materials will be disseminated through an online knowledge management platform and supported by case studies from NT3 sites and accompanying evidence from the implementation study conducted by AIR.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.**

Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:
(1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and
(2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/.

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of

Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

Strengths:

The applicant provides compelling details to show the extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies. The applicant provided clear details to show the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

The applicant provided clear details to show the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data. The applicant wrote that quantitative data will be used to answer research questions pertaining to program implementation and impact on school, teacher, and student outcomes. Several analytic methods will be used to examine these data.

The applicant provided clear details to show the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the evaluation will provide frequent formative feedback and summative information, including estimates of effects, enabling the National Board, its partners, and stakeholders to assess both implementation, feasibility, and impact of the initiative. (See Section E (3).)

The applicant provided well-documented details to show the extent to which the methods of evaluation will produce evidence about the projects effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations. For example, the applicant wrote that The NRC's conclusion is based on studies meeting What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards (with or without reservations) and other compelling studies. All the studies mentioned in this section were reviewed by WWC-certified reviewers against WWC standards. Studies meeting standards are discussed below; they collectively meet both the moderate and strong evidence requirements, by demonstrating statistically significant, favorable impacts on student achievement in settings that overlap with partner sites and include large, multi-site samples.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant provided details to show that they plan to use cost effective services at the State level.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The applicant provided clear details to show increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects. The applicant discussed their need to provide more effective and relevant professional development for all teachers who teach STEM.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The applicant wrote that too often, high-need students are taught by teachers that lack the preparation and support to serve them well. In high-need schools, teacher turnover can be great, professional culture weak, and student achievement persistently low (Borman & Kimball, 2005; Ferguson, 1998; Jacob, Vidyarthi, & Carroll, 2012; Kain & Singleton, 1996). Across sites, diverse groups of students facing disadvantages exist, all of whom deserve the opportunity to learn and develop the full potential of their talents regardless of their zip code, first language, socioeconomic status, place of birth or disability.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/29/2015 02:49 PM