

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 03:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 1: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to address AP1, subpart b by establishing an urban teacher residency program to increase equitable access of effective teachers in high-need schools (e19). Working in partnership with 6 urban elementary schools and the University of South Florida the LEA will provide pre-service elementary teachers with an extended residency over 2 years. The proposed pre-service residency teacher development program meets the priority to a high extent.

Teacher residency programs are just beginning to emerge as an effective method to better prepare teachers for the rigors of working in challenging school environments. The applicant has chosen to work with undergraduate candidates rather than graduate level which is a different from existing residency programs. Embedded classroom coaching will benefit both the pre-service candidate and the collaborating classroom teacher. Collaborating teachers can pursue a Teacher Leader Certificate thereby increasing their capacity to examine their practice and have access to career ladder options adding novelty to the project (e22) .

The applicant cites relevant research in support of their proposed project. The research further calls for the need for more study on the efficacy of innovative models that create partnerships between LEAs and teacher development programs (e23). The model also allows for more exploration of increased teacher and principal efficacy by providing learning along

the continuum of practice from pre-service to resident to teacher leader and instructional leader roles (e23). A completed bibliography of references is provided (e44-48). This project has the potential to inform research on residency programs and their impact on teacher retention, effectiveness and student achievement (e20-22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

The applicant articulated three project goals (increased teacher effectiveness, equitable distribution and academic achievement of students). The four related objectives are measurable, to increase (the effectiveness of early and career teachers; number of effective teachers; retention of highly effective teachers in hard-to-staff schools; and student achievement (e16). The table (e25-26) clearly depicts the relationship between the goals, objectives and performance measures to formulate a clear action plan.

The logic model provided a succinct and coherent outline of the proposed project. Organized by the three goals, the model depicted a measurable objective supported by outputs (resources, activities and participants) short-medium-long-term outcomes and measures (e74-80).

The applicant provided detailed descriptions of seven foundational activities that support project goal attainment (e26-30). The activities are robust, appropriate and aligned with research-based practices to support the increased effectiveness of teachers and student achievement.

The applicant identified three potential risks that the project will need to address: recruitment into the pre-service program, turnover of collaborating teachers; and coordination of LEA and university schedules. They offered some workable suggestions such as re-locating the Teacher Leader Academy to school sites to mitigate teacher turnover that have the potential to mitigate these risks (e30-31).

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that a cohort of 35 students is needed annually to realize program efficacy. Not clear is how a "commitment letter" for priority hiring would assist in initial program recruitment since (a) it does not guarantee a position, and (b) a college freshman is often not focused on the end result four years down the road. Also not addressed were

strategies to insure on-going retention in the program should students determine they want to pursue other majors.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

The applicant presented a detailed project management timeline organized by the seven project framework activities. Each core activity listed sub-activities across a quarterly timeline with designated responsible parties and related progress assessments (e32-35). The timeline is an exemplar and will be a useful project management tool.

The applicant described the on-going and collaborative relationship between Hillsborough County SD and the University of South Florida through a formalized educational partnership. They further state that the partnerships have MOUs with the 6 participant school districts (e37). Principals, Residents and CTs serve as members on the Advisory Board that meets monthly. Letters of support from USF and two potential match partners were provided (e143-145).

The applicant states they will closely monitor program management and implementation through the use of an effective and efficient project management software – Smartsheet. They will also depend on the project's external evaluator to track project fidelity and outcomes (e37-38). The use of a recognized quality control process (Deming) provides a strong quality improvement process (e38).

The applicant identified the two co-project directors representing both key project partners. Additional staff who will have key roles in project oversight and implementation were also identified. The co-directors demonstrate strong experience in managing project similar in scope and size (e39-40). Resumes for key staff and the evaluator are included in the appendices (e82-141). FTEs for each designed program staff by year are clearly indicated in the budget narrative indicating adequate program staff coverage (e167).

Weaknesses:

This criterion (stakeholder support) would have been stronger had the MOUs from the six districts been included as evidence of their understanding of and commitment to the proposed project. The MOUs might also have shown the commitment and support of the school-based teachers and administrators.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/17/2014 03:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 08:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	27
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	79

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 1: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

The proposed project addresses the absolute priority with a unique approach to increasing teacher and principal effectiveness, with goals that will have a positive effect on high need, low income students. Support will not only be provided for residents, but will also be provided for collaborating or supervising teachers and principals so that all participants are growing, learning and developing their skills as well as their effectiveness. The entire school community are is working towards the goal of school improvement.

There are several facets of this project that makes it unique. One facet is that residents are identified as undergraduate students. The collaboration with the university recognizes the need for extensive field experience, not a drive by approach that is consistent in the educational arena. Students will not only participate in the required one semester of field experience, but will have the opportunity to be in the school setting on an ongoing basis, learning and developing alongside the collaborating teacher, gaining valuable experience throughout the extended pre-serve period.

Support is also provided to collaborating teachers, offering them an opportunity to also further their career as teacher leaders, noted on p. 24. By providing incentives for the collaborating teachers, the project is two-fold in that it is increasing teacher retention while simultaneously creating a pool of newly, well trained candidates who are ready to embark upon the

teaching profession.

Focusing on the k-5 level only, the applicant concentrates its efforts towards the development of a practice based model that would aid in tried and true opportunities in the field of study. Information provided on p. 20, gives an overall view of the massive size of the Hillsborough School district which includes 215 schools and nearly 50% are classified as Title One schools, presents a challenge for all participants. With a successful implementation, this innovative model will serve as a roadmap to the development and advancement of like districts in the field of study.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

The project's three broad goals are clearly outlined with objectives and performance measures beginning on p. 25. The logic model further details the short, medium, and long term outcomes associated with each objective in Appendix D on pp. 74-80. Plan is designed so that the viewer is able to navigate through each section, to include charts, bold where emphasis is placed and appendixes are labeled.

Beautifully developed, the model also includes the resources and actions that are aligned with each objective. The actions are coherent and designed to meet the stated goals and objectives. Persons responsible for each action is are stated in the model. The seven activities being performed do not occur in isolation, but are ongoing throughout the project. It is evident that the applicant has a plan that has been well thought out, assuring the project's success.

The project addresses stated risk associated with each activity and provides concrete evidence of actions it will

incorporate to mitigate risk identified with all seven activities.

Weaknesses:

Although the plan accounts for risks associated with the project, the likelihood that all students and collaborating teachers will complete the program successfully remains a concern. Offering a commitment letter for priority hiring, (p. 30) does not assure graduates they will be guaranteed a teaching position. The opportunity for students to enter the program as undergraduates was noted as a strength, but students at such an early stage in their lives may have a change of heart and decide on another career path. This probability could alter the outcome and prove to be costly for the project.

Reader's Score: 27

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

Key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and performance metrics are outlined in detail for the three targeted goals. The project timeline lays out the ongoing seven project activities and the quarters in which they will take place throughout the project's implementation.

With a history of the district's strong relationship with the University of Florida, the project will be led by highly qualified personnel with background and knowledge of elementary learning who will continue to provide input into the project. The district and the University have a Memoranda of Understanding, which has been in place since 2009 with each of the six partnering schools, demonstrating their level of commitment, research, and support of residents, p. 37.

The table, beginning on p. 32 gives a line by line account of ongoing monitoring and assessment of activities. The plan

has identified personnel that will monitor the project and study data as it is collected to assess its progress in order to identify gaps and provide support along the way. In addition, Residents, Principals, and Cooperating Teachers will serve on the project's advisory board and meet monthly to discuss any needed corrections.

Because of the joint partnership with USF, the district will utilize a co-Project Director structure to implement the plan, with duties being shared with an employee of the University and an Elementary Generalist from the district. Both parties have experience managing programs and projects of similar size and scope. The Elementary Generalist is currently responsible for 23 schools in the district, inclusive of the 6 schools that are targeted from this project.

Weaknesses:

With a district the size of Hillsborough, serving over 200,000 students and 215 schools, the target group of 6 schools seems rather small in scope.

The district shared that it has previously implemented multiple efforts to address the unique needs of its urban schools and none have worked. Collaborative teachers are part of this group of key persons perhaps that were part of previous efforts. It will be important for these persons to be on board 100% in order for this project to be successful.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

“N/A. Scored by another reviewer”

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 08:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 10:07 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	27
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 1: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

As stated clearly on pages e19-e20, Hillsborough County Public Schools proposes to continue and expand its Urban Teacher Residency program, already in operation within the district for three years, and prepare 35 additional Residents each year of the project for priority hiring status, targeting six high-need, low-performing schools for improved student performance. This goal is highly consistent with the criteria of Absolute Priority 1(B) which the applicant seeks to meet, inasmuch the proposed residency model to be employed as an alternative pathway to teacher preparation, is a recognized approach to improving teachers' effectiveness along with increasing their availability to serve students in high-need schools.

The applicant provides a thorough discussion of how its Urban Teacher Residency program fits into existing theory, knowledge, and practice, providing references to the findings from another residency model, Boston Teacher Residency (p. e23), as well as to the research supporting the applicant's approach - for example, prolonged immersion in pre-service practice, job-embedded professional development, and numerous pedagogies associated with effective practice.

While the model is well-established nationally as an alternative pathway for preparing prospective teachers for the regular classroom, the project offers strong potential as a novel approach to impacting the broader system, as explained on page e23, under the assumption that experienced teachers and principals will be integrally involved in project activities as

proposed.

The project's aim to study the broader impact of the applicant's residency model in its proposed interrelationship with efforts to improve teacher and principal effectiveness overall throughout a school and district has high potential for creating an exemplary model of a professional learning continuum from pre-service through end of career that will result in higher student achievement.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

The applicant presents (pp. e25-e26) a set of very clear and coherent goals for the project: selecting residents for the program, providing preparation, coordinating placement support, and evaluating/improving the model. The project has a fully-developed logic model (p. e44) which is exceptional for the way it lists resources to support activities - described in detail within the narrative - with project activities linked to stated goals and short-term measures of progress leading to expected long-term outcomes.

The applicant's action plan as described on pp. e22-e28 appears exceptionally complete, including details of selecting residents, securing university credentialing partners, assuring appropriate involvement of school sites and mentor teachers, and implementing the various facets of preparation.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant identifies several risks to project success that have already been successfully mitigated in the context of past initiatives, there remains a need to anticipate potential new challenges for the currently proposed project in order to ensure that project implementation is successful.

In light of the applicant's stated emphasis on employing a "place-conscious" approach (p. e21) in preparing educators for teaching in urban settings, there is a lack of detail regarding how the project's proposed activities specifically address this particular approach. The brief reference (p. e27) to course content that exposes Residents to culturally relevant content does not appear adequate for helping Residents make substantial use of such knowledge to improve student learning through, for example, opportunities to practice explicit strategies that draw from the social and cultural context of students' lives.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

On pages e32-e35 the applicant presents a complete management plan for project implementation that indicates the timeline for implementing the project's major strategies to address identified objectives cited earlier (pp. e25-e26). The plan also lists persons or groups responsible along the measures to be used to monitor progress in achieving project goals.

On page e38 the applicant details a number of excellent procedures for gathering feedback to inform and improve project implementation - including systematic use of the Plan-Do-Check-Act (Deming/Quality Management) Cycle, meetings of the project Advisory Board, bi-annual surveys, interviews, focus groups, and rubric-guided classroom observations.

The co-director structure of project leadership appears appropriate to the partnership design of the project, involving a person from the University of South Florida with experience in the present work of the Partnership along with other related grant initiatives, and a person from the school district who is the supervisor of the district's elementary schools. This noted background of the co-directors in managing large scale initiatives is adequate for managing the project as currently proposed.

Weaknesses:

Under the assumption that the proposed project represents a significant outgrowth of the present work of the Partnership, more specific evidence of commitment to the project as now proposed - beyond the school district commitment cited on page e37 - is essential to ensure the success of the project as it is currently designed for requested support.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 10:07 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 09:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	13
Total	100	13

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 1: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

- (1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The project evaluation portion of the proposal identifies 5 research questions (pgs. e40-41). These questions are clearly aligned with Project Goals and Objectives (pgs. e25-26) and are closely and clearly associated with appropriate data metrics (pgs. e73-e80).

The research design is outlined and includes references to sample size, method for matching control to experimental groups, and considerations of bias in the sample (pgs e41-e42). Analyses are clearly outlined and are credible given the design and scope of the program (pg e42). Effect size is addressed (pg. e42).

Data are both qualitative and quantitative and do align with research questions on project implementation as well as teacher perception/performance and student achievement (pgs. e25-26; e73-80). There is a timeline for the collection of various data measures included in the chart on pages e32-e34).

Procedures are in place to ensure ongoing analyses and feedback so that implementation of the program is monitored (pg. e38). Fidelity of implementation will be measured along 5 dimensions (pg. e43). These procedures are supported by cited research within the narrative.

Resources are set aside for an external evaluation and the individuals identified who will be working on the evaluation do have extensive research experience (pgs. e43, budget narrative).

Weaknesses:

The program evaluation does not include an analysis to examine the effects of student and teacher demographics on the project's outcome (pgs. e42-43). For example, are teachers more effective when students are from cultural backgrounds that are similar to their own? Are such effects mitigated by the residency and training received in the current project?

The program evaluation also does not include information on the specific types of student achievement data to be collected (pgs. e41-e43). Some description of assessment(s) and performance scores to be collected would allow the reader to better understand whether the data will be used to measure student growth over time or simply performance at the end of the program.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 09:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2014 03:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	12
Total	100	12

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 1: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Hillsborough County Public Schools (U411C140098)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The applicant has included a highly detailed, complete Logic Model (Appendix D) for each of the stated three goals that connects each goal with its stated objective, resources, and activities and participation with short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes.

The applicant has named an external evaluator to provide the external evaluation for the project, clearly including a detailed description of staff qualifications. In addition, the application includes a budget of \$300,000 allotted for the evaluation, which would be sufficient to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

The project proposes that the external evaluation team will utilize online management software (p.21), enabling shared communication between the evaluators and PIs, improving the ability to provide relevant feedback necessary for formative evaluations to be effective.

The applicant proposes a sample size of 70 teachers (assigned to treatment and control conditions) which includes a relevant and detailed discussion of a minimum detectable effect size (p.23-24).

The applicant clearly identifies 5 key research questions (p.22-23) to be addressed by the project evaluation and clearly includes a discussion of appropriate methods to address each one. In addition, the project defines 3 broad goals supported by 4 objectives (p.7-8) which includes relevant performance measures, one of which (objective 2.2) proposes a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

The applicant appropriately suggests the use of multi-level modeling (p.24) to account for the clustering of students within teachers, which will include longitudinal growth models to study amount of change over the years of the study, as well as student achievement across teachers (p.24).

Weaknesses:

Of the goals and objectives stated on p.7-8, the discussion of how objectives 2.1 and 3.1 would be measured is not well developed.

In addition, the stated goals (other than 2.2 as mentioned as a strength), do not include proposed measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation.

The applicant states (p.23-24) two cohorts of teachers will be established and matched with non-participating traditional pre-service teachers as control groups, but includes a discussion revealing that the first comparison group will consist of teachers who applied for the program and were denied entry. The discussion of the accounting for selection bias is not adequate to make up for the lack of random assignment in this project or for validity subsequent in statistical analysis.

Under key components and outcomes of the project, the applicant provides details of assessments to be used in sections D1 and D2. In addition, the applicant states that the implementation methods are “discussed in section C” (p.25). Appendix C is a response to statutory eligibility requirements and provides evidence that those have been reached. This serves to provide evidence of effectiveness of past studies; however, the application of specifics to the current study’s evaluation plan is unclear.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/16/2014 03:09 PM