

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2012 08:59 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Significance		
1. Significance	35	33
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management and Personnel	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	78
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes		
1. CPP 6	1	0
Innovations that Support College Access & Success		
1. CPP 7	1	0
Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs		
1. CPP 8	1	0
Improving Productivity		
1. CPP 9	1	1
Technology		
1. CPP 10	1	1
Sub Total	5	2
Total	105	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Full Development Panel - 1: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Questions

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 project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The eligible applicants estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

The goal of the applicant's proposal is to link pre-service education and induction training of new teachers in a continuum to improve teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

Strategies and action include the use of videos highlighting case studies and examples of effective teaching.

These cases will be housed online and are called Accomplished Teaching Learning Standards (ATLAS)

Strategies and action include providing new teachers with examples on self reflection on teaching, instructional practices, and curriculum and assessment.

Applicant has identified and linked with partners from NY, Tennessee and Washington, where schools are located in high needs/poverty areas.

Applicant has also identified higher education partners from those aforementioned areas (states).

Targeted students include students in grades 3-6 placed in mathematics and science.

Costs per student are relatively low at \$8 per student.

Scaling costs are equally reasonable at \$8, \$4, and \$3 respectively for 100k, 250k, and 500k students.

Sustainability is expected to be good since access to videos will continue to be part of the applicant's certification process.

Weaknesses:

None was noted

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of the project,

the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.
- (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes an exceptional approach linking LEAs and Higher Education as partners in a concerted effort for preparing more effective teachers.

Support for those partners is enhanced by the National Board Certification which has a history of identifying and certifying exceptional teachers.

Developing a program which builds a continuum of teacher preparation from pre-service to induction could naturally improve teacher education and preparedness.

The unique partnerships involved in this consistent continuum from preservice to induction will generate information and knowledge that can add to the field of teacher preparation.

ATLAS will provide a wide range of scenarios to choose from depending on the instructional needs of the teacher.

Weaknesses:

While the target population is math/science students in grades 3-6, there is no other possible claim or prospective benefits which may help the targeted population beyond those grades, e.g., narrowing of achievement gaps with other subgroups not under the intervention.

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.
- (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Applicant included a comprehensible table noting: milestones (design, pilot testing, evaluation and ongoing activities), along with the commensurate resources.

All partners are included in project timeline and milestones: LEAs, Higher Ed, and AIR (evaluator)

In addition to National Board representation and the evaluator from AIR, specific personnel members - one with a national reputation in the area of teacher education - are included: Linda Darling Hammond (PI) as well as others are from the various colleges and universities with expertise in teacher education programs.

Personnel members for the project will also be supported by an Advisory Board

Weaknesses:

None was noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

na

.

Weaknesses:

na

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Not addressed

Weaknesses:

Not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Not addressed

Weaknesses:

Not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Not addressed

Weaknesses:

Not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Productivity

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The proposal is an effective approach which aligns pre-service training at one end to induction at the other end. The approach is complemented by online technology of effective teaching practices, thereby enhancing and improving instructional opportunities that can cohesively enhance teacher effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

none

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Technology

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

ATLAS will provide the teacher with high quality examples of effective teaching lessons. It will also have the capability to search for specific examples of instructional concerns identified by teacher.

Weaknesses:

none

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2012 08:59 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2012 09:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management and Personnel	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	80
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes		
1. CPP 6	1	
Innovations that Support College Access & Success		
1. CPP 7	1	
Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs		
1. CPP 8	1	
Improving Productivity		
1. CPP 9	1	1
Technology		
1. CPP 10	1	1
Sub Total	5	2
Total	105	82

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Full Development Panel - 1: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Questions

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 project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The eligible applicants estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

The design of this project helps create a shared understanding of what accomplished teaching looks like. The use of videos for teaching reflective analyses can contribute to the improvement of teaching performance in multiple areas. (p. 4) Starting new teachers with the development of reflective analyses as a skill will serve them well in the profession. This skill helps to support quality assessment and evaluation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on

improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths:

The proposal presents and emphasizes the need for a professional continuum for teachers as they enter and advance in the profession. This proposal further presents the use of a peer-developed process to support accomplished practice in the teaching profession. This represents a significant way to build a pipeline of teaching excellence. The fact that many Board certified teachers are in high-poverty schools lends credibility to the need to expand the use of proven strategies and tools. As stated in the proposal on page 2, the accomplishment of the goals of this proposal will help to create an evidence base and collection of resources that can scale rapidly and reach many more teachers and their students in a cost-effective way.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The proposal presents an impressive list of practitioners and researchers who will support implementation of this proposal. The plan is focused and provides a details on how the partner groups will come together to achieve the identified goals. The plan was further enhanced by the inclusion of an advisory board as a part of the management plan.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements

and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college

application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

- 1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Productivity

- 1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.**

Strengths:

Using the project partners to collaboratively develop instructional guidelines is not only efficient but it provides a broader perspective on the knowledge and skills needed for accomplished teachers. Having a ready source of videos to examine and help create a shared understanding of accomplished teaching will increase the productivity of the teachers involved in the program.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Technology

- 1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

The use of ATLAS as a technology tool will enable the grantees to increase the availability of the tool beyond the parameters of the National Board. Because the participants are in three different areas of the country, this tool will enable them to come together as collaborative learning community.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2012 09:02 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2012 09:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management and Personnel	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	80
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes		
1. CPP 6	1	
Innovations that Support College Access & Success		
1. CPP 7	1	
Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs		
1. CPP 8	1	
Improving Productivity		
1. CPP 9	1	1
Technology		
1. CPP 10	1	1
Sub Total	5	2
Total	105	82

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Full Development Panel - 1: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Questions

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 project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The eligible applicants estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

The applicant has done a extraordinary job of designing this proposal. Each aspect of this application is thoughtfully crafted. Some of the major strengths are the following: 1. The goals, objectives and strategies are clear and well aligned with Priority #1 (page 2 and pages 9 - 16). 2. The applicant has strategically designed its partnership with seven school districts and six teacher preparation programs. The seven school districts are located in three states within three different regions of our country. (New York, Tennessee and Washington) The partnering schools are located in cities, suburbs and rural areas. The six partnering U.S. teacher preparation programs are housed in universities in the same three states as the participating school districts. The school districts have made critical commitments to National Board regarding hiring IHES students whenever possible and utilizing the videos of ATLAS as well as implementing National Board Certification strategies into their induction programs with new teachers. Likewise, the IHE partners have made commitments to this project to use the ATLAS resource and National Board protocols in their courses. They also have committed to collaborate with one or two school district partners that typically hire their graduates. (page 10 and e136 - e160) 3. Because the design for this project is so cohesive, logical and significant, the applicant was able to provide positive evidence that the goals and strategies of this proposal will not only be incorporated into all the partners ' programs (school districts and universities) at the end of the grant, but the outcomes of this project will be used as a standard for all teacher preparation programs in the U.S. and eventually around the world.

Weaknesses:

No weakness was noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.
- (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths:

There are a multitude of reasons that this project is an exceptional approach to increasing student achievement. A few of its significant strengths are the following: 1. This proposal builds upon the successful framework and standards of the National Board Certification organization which strongly connect and support the goals of Priority #1. Research shows that Board-certified teachers advance student achievement and that the certification process supports teacher retention and professional growth. (page 3) Thus, this applicant is in a unique position to implement this project because it will be able to use its own processes for Board certification (which is well respected throughout the world) and its in depth studies about accomplished teaching practices to further advance research, theory and practice in the field of teacher preparation. 2. This project is significant because of its objective to embed resources into the continuum of advancement of teacher practices from pre-service through induction... (page 2) In other words, this goal has the potential to bring the teaching profession closer to a common understanding of what accomplished teaching looks like. By achieving this goal, the teaching profession will move to having a common language and agreed upon expectations -- needs which are the root of most challenges in our teacher preparation programs. (pages 4 - 6) Providing aspiring teachers with sufficient exposure to accomplished practice is particularly evident in the difficulties teacher preparation programs have in finding accomplished experienced teachers willing to be mentors for aspiring teachers. Having access to ATLAS and all its cases will help teacher preparation programs provide exemplars of accomplished practices in a cost-effective, scalable, and efficient manner. (pages 6 - 7) 4. This project is significant because of the unique selection of the partners (discussed in Quality of Design) and the positive commitments they have made to its implementation. This partnership and this study could become a model for future research into strategies to improve teacher preparation programs. 5. The design of ATLAS is significant and different from others because the cases not only include images of quality teaching but also the design provides access to how the accomplished teachers analyze their own instructional practices. This emphasis on reflection could have further impact upon future studies regarding the relationship of reflection to increasing teacher effectiveness (page 7) 6. Finally, given that this project is embedded with grounded research and theory, it is in a position of making unimaginable impact upon the practices of teacher preparation programs and on the advancement of teaching as a true profession.

Weaknesses:

No weakness was noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time

and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant has designed an exceptionally high quality management plan which is discussed and illustrated on pages 22 - 23. Through the framework of this management chart, one can easily see the expected milestones and actions within the time frame of the five years to implement the grant. It also names the person or group responsible for each of the actions. In terms of key personnel to work on this project, the applicant has provided adequate information about their skills and experiences which are impressive. There is no doubt that they have the abilities to manage this project in a most successful manner within its budget and time frame. (pages 23 - 25 and e63 - e133)

Weaknesses:

No weakness was noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To

meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students

with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Productivity

- 1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.**

Strengths:

Presently teacher preparation programs and schools across the country spend time and money to recruit and vet master teachers for field experiences and college course activities. Providing students exemplars of accomplished practices has been their challenge. National Board Certification organization plans to make available the resource of ATLAS to all teacher preparation programs and schools. In other words, educators will have access to the video libraries to be stored in ATLAS that focus on teachers demonstrating accomplished practices. This innovative library of videos will save teacher preparation programs and schools efficiency in the use of time, staff, money or other resources while at the same time help to improve teacher effectiveness. (page 7)

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Technology

- 1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

The applicant is proposing a most exceptional use of technology to help increase student achievement and teacher effectiveness. They plan to house their collection of videos and teachers' reflective analyses into an online resource called ATLAS (Accomplished Teaching, Learning, and Schools. (page 6) These existing videotapes were made by National Board certified teachers during their certification process. The National Board Certification organization has decided to make ATLAS available to all educators along with its instructional guidelines. The number of cases housed in ATLAS is enormous. Further, the applicant expects that thousands of new cases will be added to the collection each year. (page 7)

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2012 09:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2012 12:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management and Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Sub Total	100	16
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes		
1. CPP 6	1	0
Innovations that Support College Access & Success		
1. CPP 7	1	0
Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs		
1. CPP 8	1	0
Improving Productivity		
1. CPP 9	1	0
Technology		
1. CPP 10	1	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	16

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Full Development Panel - 1: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Questions

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 project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The eligible applicants estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

Multiple data sources are planned for both the implementation and the impact study. The evaluation design is coherent - the data collection plan speaks to the research questions which are in line with project objectives. The statistical models are appropriate to answer the research questions.

Weaknesses:

It is not clear how valid and reliable the edTPA and Take One! are and if they will be tested for reliability and validity. It would also be helpful to articulate the rationales for using HLM and specify some covariates included in the models.

Reader's Score: 16

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on
 - (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
 - (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
 - (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that
 - (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
 - (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
 - (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Productivity

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Technology

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2012 12:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2012 05:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management and Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	17
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes		
1. CPP 6	1	0
Innovations that Support College Access & Success		
1. CPP 7	1	0
Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs		
1. CPP 8	1	0
Improving Productivity		
1. CPP 9	1	0
Technology		
1. CPP 10	1	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	17

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Full Development Panel - 1: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (U411C120117)

Questions

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 project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The eligible applicants estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The evaluation design includes both an implementation and an impact study to ensure that ongoing development and implementation is well documented and to allow for improvements and refinements to be made during the first half of the project (p. 17). The applicant presents a high-quality evaluation design: the key research questions address all major components of the planned intervention (p. 18) and are aligned with the logic model (p. e176), the proposed data collection instruments (p. e178), and the timeline of activities (p.

e177). The implementation study gathers sufficient data including project documents (p.18), interviews with various stakeholders, focus groups, and online surveys (p. 19) that will provide high-quality implementation data, performance feedback, and sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings. Evaluation of progress towards achieving the intended participant outcomes and the effectiveness of the intervention are measured via the edTPA (Teacher Performance Assessment) and Take One assessments for preservice and early career teachers, respectively (pp. 17, 19). Online participant surveys (p. 19) will provide important supplemental information for understanding specific areas of the success or challenges of the intervention that will be useful for both program improvement and replication purposes. The analysis plans for coding interviews, focus groups, and surveys are exemplary and likely to provide useful feedback; for example, the survey analysis includes Rasch modeling to provide a quantitative measure of the quality and quantity of participants' usage of ATLAS (p. 20).

The impact study directly evaluates the effects of the intervention on student achievement and includes sophisticated statistical analyses to lead to an understanding of the contributing factors involved in student outcomes (pp. 18, 183-185).

American Institutes for Research (AIR) is well qualified to conduct this evaluation (pp. 25) and has sufficient expertise and resources to implement the evaluation plan (pp. e112-117, e181). AIR will conduct formative data collection and analysis in all project years, and will provide quarterly updates that will be useful in assessing progress toward achieving intended outcomes (p. 22). The evaluation costs are reasonable to support the range of activities that will be completed (p. e194).

Weaknesses:

There are four possible levels of dosage: preservice ATLAS (Accomplished Teaching, Learning and Schools) early career ATLAS, preservice and early career ATLAS, and no ATLAS, but the statistical modeling contrasts examine ATLAS via dichotomous variables in separate contrasts and do not appear to include the preservice and early career ATLAS participation as a combined variable (pp. e183-185). The proposed statistical models add caveats that these contrasts will be calculated depending upon what data are available, but do not offer alternatives if the data are not available (pp. 183-184).

The evaluation plan does not track how many or which ATLAS cases the participant is exposed to; this is a missed opportunity for gathering important implementation data that could explain varying effects among ATLAS participants. More specificity is needed regarding the student performance state and local mathematics and science assessments (p. 19) including detail on whether these subjects are tested in each of grades 3-6, how the analyses will calibrate varying pre/post administration dates (e.g., spring to spring, fall to spring), and how like metrics will be developed among differing statewide and district tests.

Given that the edTPA (Teacher Performance Assessment) and Take One assessments are important outcome measures, information on the validity and reliability of these instruments is needed (pp. 17, 19).

The applicant does not discuss how it will assure participation of comparison groups; in particular, no mention is made of incentives for comparison teachers to complete the Take One assessment (p. e194).

Reader's Score: 17

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

- 1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on**

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: **0**

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Productivity

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: **0**

Competitive Preference Priority - Technology

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2012 05:05 PM