

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 02:57 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	13
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	29
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Management	35	32
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
<b>Total</b>	100	74

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

#### Strengths:

1. The magnitude of the problem to be addressed is significant as it reflects the poor mathematics performance of high needs and students with disabilities in K-5 school settings. This includes support based from the citation provided that in a 2013 study less than half (42%) of the elementary school math teachers felt prepared to plan instruction so students at different levels of achievement could increase their understanding. Another study cited illustrates that less than a quarter of elementary math teachers reported feeling well prepared to teach students with disabilities (SWD). The MFA math PD project proposed is also supported by Exhibit 1-NAEP Mathematics Assessment Results showing low performance for low income and students with disabilities. Page 3
2. The applicant makes a case for the national significance of the proposed project. The MFA project prepares elementary teachers for personalizing math content for heterogeneous groups of students with both diverse strengths and needs as well as the introduction of a PD math initiative that fits multiple level learners including SWD. Page 4
3. The proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority established for this completion. The program teaches teams of both general and special education teachers how to collaboratively plan and personalize math lessons to support all levels of students. This project helps teachers hone their observational skills and develop a deep understanding of math goals and how students learn best. The collaboration between regular education and special education teachers is a unique component of this project. MFA focuses on integrating learning about personalizing instruction with a specific disincline. The fifty hour PD component helps and supports teachers prepare for diverse students in multiple school type settings. Page 6

#### Weaknesses:

2. The applicant does not specifically cite/describe other than MFA PD, elementary math professional development programs in operation that have had success with varied school population ability levels, and/or have been implemented/tested in similar school districts with similar populations the lead agency hopes to serve that further strengthens the need for this project. Page 4
3. The specific outcomes/results of the prior field testing of MFA are not sufficiently enumerated/discussed/described to support that furthers the need for this project. Page 5

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.

#### Strengths:

1. The applicant demonstrates that there is unmet demand for the product that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application. The applicant supports that the demand for evidence based PD is needed in math which is heavily tested. The demand for participation in MFA is decisive with eager partners signed on to the project and pledged in-kind contributions to enhance the preparation of their staff developers, teacher leaders and school leaders for MFA PD. It is impressive that the number of students to be served reaches over 51,000 students in 54 high-need school districts and 541 elementary schools across four regions in Illinois which will assist in recruiting 60-80 schools. Page 9

2. The applicant identifies strategies that address a particular barrier that prevented the applicant in the past from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application. These include the need to use program developers to implement PD, the lack of school leader involvement and the implementation of the PD outside teachers' regular work schedule. Training local facilitators makes sense in building internal capacity and ownership of the intervention which allows MFA to have a lasting effect over time within the setting. Page 10

3. The applicant provide information for the feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project. Resources to promote MFA and local facilitators are published and made available to interested parties. Online materials with a supportive environment, models for adapting MFA to different schools with integrity will be made part of the outcomes of the project. MFA facilitator training will be available at the Center and Bank Street College's Professional Educational program to support staff developers in Ill and the US. Page 13

#### Weaknesses:

3. The applicant does not provide a discussion on possible funding mechanisms or organizations that might be able to assist those both in Ill and in other parts of the nation who desire to embrace MFA for their PD initiatives in the future. Page 13

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**
- (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.**

**Strengths:**

1. The objectives outcomes and measures for the project are provided and are clearly specified and measurable in Exhibit 2 – Objectives, Activities, Measures, and Outcomes. They are comprehensive, detailed and encompass tasks and activities to implement the project in sufficient detail. Page 18
2. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks is presented for this project. Exhibit 3-Organizational Chart illustrates lines of responsibility and responsible party. The timeline descriptive by yearly events is provided in Exhibit 4-Milestones, Timelines and Responsibilities. (Which organization) The lead agency and its partners have extensive experience in their areas of expertise related to project implementation. Page 19
3. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project are documented. Elements include ongoing formative data, session feedback surveys, observations of PD sessions, annual real-time interviews with samples of stakeholders. Monthly project meetings will afford the opportunity to make improvements and modifications as necessary. Page 20
4. The applicant's potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes beyond the end of the grant is provided with sufficient detail. The training will produce a cadre of trained MFA facilitators, invested school leaders, and a cost effective model for job-embedded MFA PD. Online environments and forums for MFA facilitators and others will be maintained. Bank Street College will and the Center will incorporate MFA facilitator institute in their teacher education classes and PD programs will be continue after grant funding ends. Page 22

**Weaknesses:**

1. With the duration of the project over several years, there should be some measurable outcome from the PD activities and components of the project in this section that in some way directly measures/links that improve student academic outcome/success as a result of the MFA initiative. Page 15
2. There is a limited FTE listed for the Co-Principal Investigator for implementing MFA in Chicago Public Schools at the 5% FTE number. This is also duplicated for schools served by ROE #47 which is also 5% for a second Co-Principal Investigator. This FTE support time appears less than adequate for the magnitude of this project. Page 20

**Reader's Score: 32**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the**

project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

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

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score:**      **0**

---

**Status:**              Submitted

**Last Updated:**    07/02/2018 02:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 02:43 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	26
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Management	35	35
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
<b>Total</b>	100	76

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

#### Strengths:

The applicant addresses the magnitude of the priority because it addresses teacher development in math instruction, students with disabilities, and math instruction implementation. On pages e27-e28, the data from NAEP highlights the national significance of the need to improve mathematics with an exceptional approach to meet the needs of K-5 students in personalized learning. The data in the appendices on pages e176-e178 supports the magnitude of the national and local problem.

#### Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.

**Strengths:**

The demand for effective professional development in mathematics with a focus on personalizing the instruction is of magnitude as noted on pages e33-e34. Specific barriers will be addressed in scalability which will include training of local MFA facilitators, school leaders, and embedding MFA into the teachers' regular work schedules. The professional development strategy will allow for ongoing support. Due to the resources of the program being provided locally, the implementation of MFA has been replicated with local facilitators. There online support is prevalent for the local use as mentioned on pages e38 and e39.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not acknowledge the need for additional funding mechanisms for MFA PD in case of turnover of facilitators, leaders, or teachers.

**Reader's Score: 26**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan****1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**
- (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.**

**Strengths:**

The project design supports a timeline which will showcase how teacher development will positively impact student growth on pages e40-e47. The objectives, outcomes, and milestones are clearly communicated with appropriate personnel supporting and leading the project as indicated through the resumes in the appendices which are aligned with the roles and responsibilities on page e43. Ongoing formative feedback and surveys will be utilized to adjust project during the year 2 timeline. The application provides a cost effective approach to professional development as noted on page e46-e47. This feasible approach allows for school leaders, facilitators, teachers to begin a collaborative cadre of invested leaders trained in MFA.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 35

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

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

#### Strengths:

N/A- Scored by the Evaluation Reviewer.

#### Weaknesses:

N/A- Scored by the Evaluation Reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/02/2018 02:43 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 12:24 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	0
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Total</b>	100	18

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

#### Strengths:

N/A

#### Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.

#### Strengths:

N/A

#### Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
- (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

### Strengths:

N/A

### Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

### Strengths:

The applicant presents a very good evaluation plan. The evaluation methods are clearly designed to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. The evaluation features two randomized control trials (RCTs) whereby schools will be randomly assigned as treatment or comparison (pg. 23). Both sample size and effect sizes are sufficient to successfully run the rigorous 2-level and 3-level analyses (pgs. 24-26 and Appendix G4). The applicant presents an effective explanation on how any potential contamination and attrition will be handled by discussing the precautions the team will take with teachers and schools to minimize contamination of treatment (pg. 25) and what strategies will be used to protect against attrition (pg. 26).

The evaluation should provide solid guidance on effective strategies for replication. Because the study will use data from a large and diverse population of teachers and students, other districts will be able to use the findings because they can see themselves in that sample. The evaluation team will use a specific framework of scale to share project findings (pg. 28) so that the guidance is organized and useful for a variety of audiences. The applicant also indicates that resources have already been published to support local facilitators and that an online support environment will be available after the project's end (pg. 13).

Data from multiple sources will be collected and analyzed to inform the evaluation, including a teacher efficacy survey, classroom observations, and student math achievement. The key components of the project are adequately described and include the neurodevelopmental framework, video case studies, and teacher collaboration; the analyses will be mediated by lesson planning and classroom practices (pg. 29). The project outcomes are separated by teacher and student outcomes such as enhanced self-efficacy (teachers) and improved achievement and engagement in math (students). The measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation for facilitator and teacher participation are suitable for the project (pg. 30).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant is not specific in how impact of the project on students and teachers will be measured. In the project design (pg. 16), the outcomes are vaguely presented as "findings" without any clear benchmarks or specifications on how impact will be assessed. For example, it would have been meaningful if student math achievement was measured as a percentage increase from baseline to year-end.

**Reader's Score: 18**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/02/2018 12:24 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/03/2018 06:11 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

**Reader #4:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	0
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Total</b>	100	18

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

#### Strengths:

n/a

#### Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.

#### Strengths:

n/a

#### Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

### Strengths:

n/a

### Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

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

### Strengths:

The proposed external evaluator for the project has extensive expertise and experience to be able to effectively conduct an evaluation for a project of this scope and magnitude. In addition, the dedicated resources in the proposed budget are sufficient to comprehensively complete the proposed evaluation tasks.

The proposed two randomized control designs (p. 23-25) with schools randomly assigned to study conditions has the potential to produce evidence of the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations. Assurances are given regarding strategies to guard against overall and differential sample attrition for the study to meet the "without reservations" standard (p. 26). The evaluation includes appropriate estimations of power analysis for minimum detectable effect sizes (p. 25, Appendix G4) and multilevel models for analysis of research questions 1 - 5. (p. 26-27, Appendix G6).

The proposed evaluation includes a plan to provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings (p. 27-28) including a large and diverse sample (Appendix G2), moderator analyses to assess differential impacts, and cost-effectiveness analysis (Appendix G7).

The proposed evaluation has the potential to provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes for the proposed research questions (p. 28-29, Appendix G5).

**Weaknesses:**

A logic model is presented (p. 30) that includes inputs and moderating variables and teacher and student outcomes, but these outcomes do not include performance measures that contain measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation. Stating a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation of simply completing “attending 80% of the planning and briefing meetings” (p. 30) is inadequate. To strengthen the evaluation, measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation should be developed and tied to all measurable outcomes. Also, the logic model and narrative simply identifies key mediating variables for student outcomes as teachers’ lesson planning and classroom practices (p. 29-30) which is not well articulated.

**Reader's Score:** 18

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/03/2018 06:11 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 01:37 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

**Reader #5:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	30
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Management	35	35
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
<b>Total</b>	100	80

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Mid-Phase - 2: 84.411B

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Education Development Center, Inc. (U411B180037)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

### Strengths:

(1) The applicant provides sufficient data showing the magnitude and severity of the problems to be addressed by the proposed Math for All (MFA) project. MFA is designed to help general and special education teachers in Grades K–5 to personalize rigorous mathematics instruction for a wide range of learners, including students who are low performing, and students with disabilities. Disturbing data are evident in the comprehensive breakdown of percentages of risk factors for all targeted K-5 schools, including pupil-teacher ratio, I.E.P., low income, race, below proficiency in math grade 5 (pp. e 176 – e 178). These data clearly show the magnitude of the problem in target population of 51,200 high-need students. In addition,, only 40% of all 4th graders and 34% all 8th graders scored at the proficient of higher level in math 2017 NAEP; 25% of 4th graders and 18% of 8th graders are low income students; and 16% of 4th graders and 9% of 8th graders are students with disabilities (p. e 28).

(2) The applicant provides relevant research describing the national significance of the proposed Math for All (MFA) project. Research shows that teacher quality is the single most powerful influence on student learning; yet, teachers are often not well prepared to implement standards-based mathematics education with the heterogeneous groups of students in general education classrooms, including students with disabilities and students with different capabilities and needs. This finding is disturbing since math proficiency is closely linked to student success in high school and beyond. Equally troubling is the findings from a national survey of science and mathematics teachers, where researchers found that less than half (42%) of the elementary school math teachers felt well prepare; and only 20% of PD and training for teachers meets the definition of high-quality professional learning (pp. e 28 – e 30).

(3) The applicant well describes how the proposed Math for All (MFA) project represents a unique approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition. MFA builds on a neuro-developmental framework for learning and is designed to assist schools and districts in improving the mathematics achievement of K–5 students who have diverse strengths and needs. This exceptional framework for learning, which has been piloted and field-tested with more than 500 teachers from urban, suburban, or rural school districts, teaches teams of general and special education teachers how to collaboratively plan and personalize mathematics lessons to support the achievement of all students (pp. e 27- e 32).

### Weaknesses:

- (1) None noted
- (2) None noted
- (3) None noted

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

**1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**
- (2) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**
- (3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.**

**Strengths:**

- (1) The applicant demonstrates that there is an unmet demand for the Math for All (MFA) project that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application. Despite the \$18 billion spent annually on teacher training, researchers show that the demand for evidence-based professional development approaches is lacking in mathematics, a high accountability subject for students. The MFA project is a feasible solution to this unmet need because it features a framework for scale which includes the training of local staff developers and teacher leaders as facilitators of the program; inclusion of school leaders in the professional development for facilitators and teachers, and the integration of MFA into the existing PD structures that are part of teachers' regular work schedules (pp. e 32 – e 34).
- (2) The applicant clearly identifies specific strategies that address barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application. There are 3 significant barriers to scaling up, including using program developers to implement the training; the lack of school leader involvement; and training outside of teachers' regular work hours. To address these barriers, the applicant will use a well thought out systems-based approach, including training local MFA facilitators, which builds ongoing relationships with teachers and schools; including school leaders in the MFA training to foster collaboration and support; and embedding MFA into teachers' regular work schedules, which allows teachers to experience the MFA training as a school-based initiative (pp. e 34 – e 38).
- (3) The applicant provides a clear description of the feasibility of successful replication of the proposed MFA project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations. Key strategies supporting replication include providing support to local facilitators in the implementation of MFA with the published resources, a facilitator institute, and additional resources (e.g., online support environment, models for adapting MFA to different school contexts with integrity). These strategies will empower teachers and LEAs to continue to host the online support environment and offer MFA facilitator training to support staff developers across the state and the U.S. Findings from program evaluations will help practitioners make decisions about MFA components to scale up or student populations to target. Embedding MFA training within teachers' work schedules will help contain costs; and partnerships with intermediary organizations will contribute to sustainability of the regional infrastructure for MFA and support its continued expansion (pp. e 38 – e 39).

**Weaknesses:**

- (1) None noted
- (2) None noted

(3) None noted

**Reader's Score: 30**

### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan**

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

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

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

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

**(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.**

#### **Strengths:**

(1) The applicant provides a detailed description of clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed MFA project. By objective, the applicant describes project activities; identifies appropriate measures; and specifies outcomes. These components clearly link to the overall project goal to implement, test, and refine strategies for regionally expanding MFA in a variety of settings and with diverse high-need populations in the state, and to build local capacity and infrastructure to support the sustainability and continued expansion of the program after the project ends. (pp. e 39 – e 41).

(2) The applicant provides a strategic 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. The project will be led by Education Development Center (EDC), which will oversee all project activities and EDC staff will serve as the implementation team. The applicant provides an organization chart (p. e 43) which depicts the relationships between the organizations and describes roles, experience, and primary responsibilities of key personnel (p. e 45). The applicant provides a clear description of major milestones; a realistic, year to year timeline; and specifies personnel responsible for each project activity (p. e 44).

(3) The applicant describes viable procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. Several sources of feedback will inform the continuous improvement, including ongoing formative data (e.g., session feedback surveys, observations during training sessions); annual interviews with a sample of stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, facilitators); data from the impact evaluation with two cohorts of participants; and input from an external advisory board. An effective continuous improvement strategy is the ongoing review of results from formative data by the project's leadership team during monthly project meetings to discuss implications of emergent findings for improving the project's materials, activities, and procedures, and evaluation results to inform the refinement of the MFA components (pp. e 45 – e 47).

(4) The applicant provides a feasible approach to ensuring the potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant. When the MFA project ends, the school district partners and intermediary organizations will have a cadre of trained MFA facilitators, invested school leaders, access to model schools and support networks, and a cost-effective model for job-embedded professional development, which will help ensure the depth sustainability of MFA practices. In addition, findings from this project will guide the ongoing refinement of the MFA resources and inform work with other school districts and classes in teacher education. A practical strategy which supports sustainability is maintaining and supporting the online environments and collaborative forums for MFA facilitators, school leaders, and teachers, which will also integrate them into work with other

school districts. Findings from this project also will inform future research for further scaling up of MFA (pp. e 46 – e 47).

**Weaknesses:**

- (1) None noted
- (2) None noted
- (3) None noted
- (4) None noted

**Reader's Score: 35**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/02/2018 01:37 PM