

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/31/2017 08:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Sub Total	15	0
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
Sub Total	30	0
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	55	18
Total	100	18

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 5: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

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

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 Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (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 components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The applicant presents a well-developed evaluation plan. The plan is satisfactorily designed to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that meets What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations. A randomized controlled trial research study is planned to estimate program impacts on students within multiple schools (pg. 24). District-level staff will first group similar schools based on grade levels, demographic data, and test scores, then schools will be randomly assigned to the intervention or comparison group (pg. 25). Baseline equivalence will be sufficiently established at the school, teacher, and student level (pg. 26). The sample sizes and the minimum detectable effect size are suitable for effectively conducting the analyses (pg. 29).

The evaluation methods should reasonably provide performance data and information on replication strategies. The research questions are specifically written to respond to project short-, intermediate-, and long-term outcomes. Teachers will participate in surveys to share reflections of their instructional mindsets, attitudes, and practices (pg. 27); principals and teacher-leaders will be interviewed to learn about their perceptions of the training and coaching (pg. 28). Student-level data, including standardized test scores, attendance, and demographic data, will be collected and used in the analyses (pg. 27). An implementation analysis will be conducted to measure fidelity across the intervention schools and specifically targeting the summer trainings, beginning of the school year, and after the first year of implementation (pg. 27).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not fully describe how project attrition would be addressed. A brief statement is made that attrition was “not expected to present a problem;” however, an explanation as to why it would not be a problem was not provided. As a result, it was unclear whether attrition would affect the study results. Also, although mention of a proposed threshold to represent fidelity of program implementation was made (pgs. 29-30), a description for measurable thresholds, such as expected number for professional development sessions attended, was not presented (2 points not awarded).

Reader's Score: **18**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/31/2017 08:35 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 09:46 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Sub Total	15	0
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
Sub Total	30	0
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	55	18
Total	100	18

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 5: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

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:

na

Weaknesses:

na

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

Strengths:

na

Weaknesses:

na

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:

na

Weaknesses:

na

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 Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (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 components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The applicant's presentation of the RCT design, process for assignment to treatment and control conditions, outcome measures to be used for data, attention to potential confounding factors and attrition, is very strong. The design is appropriate for the purposes of the proposed project, and if well implemented, should be able to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

The applicant proposes a Turnaround Leadership Teams Strategy (TLTS) and will recruit, train, and support 15 leadership teams. These teams will "enact a successful school turnaround" at their respective schools. The applicant intends to study the impact of their innovation and demonstrate its replicability. They intend to demonstrate measurable improvements to school culture and achievement (abstract).

The applicant provides a table articulating each of the four project Goals with objectives, measures and outcomes (p 14 – 16). For example the first goal is to create a leadership pipeline. For this, the target outcome is that "at least 15 partner schools identified as low performing will launch a turnaround with leadership teams of 7 to 10 individuals" (p 14).

In addition to the table articulating goals with project outcomes, the applicant also provides a brief logic model showing the three primary project objectives along with the three primary outcomes. The outcomes are short-term, intermediate, and long-term. The intervention is to develop leaders and support them so that school success is achieved through a learner centered, collaborative, rigorous and data-driven vision of education. The outcomes include actual improve teacher practice and improve student outcomes (p6, also see Appendix G). The table and logic model demonstrate that the project's intended goals are appropriately aligned with objectives and outcomes. The outcomes are potentially

measurable.

The applicant proposes to include both formative and summative (p9) evaluations. For this purpose, a series of data types are to be collected. The applicant provides a convenient data collection table that shows the type of data to be collected with respect to variables and measures. This table also provides timeline information for data collection. The data collection is key to each of three research questions (p 27 – 28). The data to be collected includes administrative data in the form of student and teacher level. This data will provide baseline information as well as outcome information for the proposed impact study (p 28). Regarding student outcomes, this data is to include the student achievement scores in reading and math on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System. There are also to be teacher surveys. The applicant notes that these will be “tested for validity and reliability” and that “pre-tests and other techniques” will be used to ensure the validity of the instruments for the purpose of the project (p 28). There will also be a participant interview, program, and cost data. The discussion of data sources is comprehensive and appropriate for the purposes of the proposed intervention.

The impact of the proposed project is to be studied using a randomized controlled trial (RTC) study design in which treatment schools will be compared with control schools (p 13, 24). The study will address four research questions:

- (1) What is the impact of the TLTS model on student outcomes?
- (2) What is the impact of the TLTS program on teacher practices and outcomes?
- (3) How is the TLTS model implemented across schools, and to what extent is it implemented with fidelity? And
- (4) How cost-effective is the TLTS program? (Abstract, p9)

These questions are appropriate with respect to the goals of the proposed intervention (p 14 – 16). The data to be collected for answering these questions is described in a table articulated by the four research questions (p 27 – 28), as well as in the project logic model (Appendix G). The applicant discusses how the impact study will analyze data with respect to each of these four questions (p 28 – 29).

The superintendents in two participating districts will group their schools by grade span and “other characteristics, such as student demographics and school-level test scores” (p 25). The schools in these groups or blocks will subsequently be randomly assigned to treatment or control conditions. As shown in a diagram provided by the applicant (p6), schools are to be added over three years resulting in 16 different schools in each of the conditions (p 25).

Recognizing the possibility of confounding factors, the applicant reasonably argues that because the intervention is a whole-school model involving “multiple schools in the treatment and control” conditions, confounding factors are unlikely to be problematic (p 27). The applicant also recognizes the potential problem of attrition. However, the applicant argues that the study design addresses potential attrition. The study will have access to school level data allowing the study to account for any attrition in its impact model.

The measure for student achievement is to be the reading and math sections of the Georgia Milestones Assessment System (p 26). The applicant reports on the instruments validity and reliability. The study will have baseline data from this assessment system. The study will also ensure baseline equivalence on school, teacher, and other student characteristics. The applicant notes that the “final impact estimates will control for baseline characteristics, including any school, teacher, or student characteristics with statistically significant baseline differences, to improve precision of the impact estimates” (p 26).

The applicant discusses the power of the proposed study indicating that with 8000 students over 32 schools with 1440 teachers, the study design has sufficient power for reasonable detection of effects (p 29).

External evaluation agency is to be Mathematica Policy Research that has experience with What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards (p 24). The agency and the evaluators assignment by the agency have appropriate qualifications and expertise (p 24 – 25). The approximate cost of the external evaluation is 10% of the total grant request. This is a reasonable request given the scope of the evaluation and that typical evaluations run between 10 and 15% of the grant request.

To demonstrate replicability, the applicant intends to reach an additional 4 to 6 schools beyond Atlantic Public Schools and at least one additional LEA (p 15). The applicant describes a process by which the project will begin with a cohort of

TLTS school teams and later scale up by expanding to more teams (p 13 – 14), and that ultimately the multiple district design and the number of schools involved will demonstrate the replicability of the model (p 13). To facilitate replicability, the applicant proposes to make the project as visible as possible. To that end the project will make project information and findings “widely available to practitioners, school systems, policymakers, and program providers,” and that the project will use a blog for publicizing and updating “about developing leaders for high-need schools” (p 23). The applicant’s plans for scaling up can be expected to test the replicability of the proposed leadership model. The applicant’s plans for visibility can also be expected to make insights from the project widely available. These activities can be expected to provide guidance for others who might wish to replicate the leadership intervention.

The applicant describes appropriate methods for providing valid and reliable data on relevant outcomes as feedback to project personnel to enable the continuous improvement of the project, as well as for monitoring treatment implementation fidelity.

In addition to a summative impact study, the applicant also plans for a formative evaluation (p9). The project intends to hire a full-time staff member with expertise in evaluation and measurement who will monitor progress towards project goals. This person will collect relevant information on a quarterly basis and transmit that information to project personnel in a position to make program changes and improvement. The summative information will include input from the external evaluator (p 22 – 23). On a weekly basis data is to be summarized with respect to progress towards project goals. Periodic data is to be collected on performance measures. There is to be an ongoing effort to analyze and act on implementation data that will be used to refine the treatment.

The external evaluator will measure implementation fidelity and monitor program cost-effectiveness. The external evaluator will examine the early implementation for “obstacle and success factors” (p 27). Over the course of the project, the external evaluator will provide feedback on “program implementation data” that will include such things as candidate recruitment, school performance, student growth and outcome measures amongst other things (p 15).

The applicant provides timeline information with respect to evaluation (p 21 – 22) that suggests that the evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data with respect to the expected outcomes.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant provides a “measurable threshold for acceptable implementation,” which is that at least 15 partner schools will participate in forming leadership teams of 7 to 10 persons (p 14), the applicant does not provide a target level for student performance such as on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System. The applicant indicates that progress will be judged “against leading indicators such as student attendance, behavior interventions, cultural surveys” (p 15). The applicant intends to use comparative evaluation data to show improvement. However, the applicant does not indicate the level of positive improvement in student attendance and behavior would constitute program success. A stronger proposal would more thoroughly address measurable targets.

Reader's Score: 18

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/02/2017 09:46 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 06:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	35
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	
Sub Total	55	35
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 5: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

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 application creates a unique strategy to address the Absolute Priority 1: Supporting High-Need Students and the Absolute Priority 4: Improving Low-Performing Schools. On pages 1 and 2, the applicant provided compelling data that demonstrates a significant need for strong multi-tiered school leadership teams as a catalyst for turning around low-performing schools. On page 2 and 3, the applicant further included evidence that supports the idea of addressing leadership challenges through leadership teams. In Appendix B, the applicant included evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of a model that develops new teachers through teacher leader models. On page 5, the applicant also referenced a similar model for school principals, which showed great promise. By building on successes using similar models creates a compelling case that could have implications that have national significance. The logic model included on page 6 provides a clear plan for how the applicant intends to execute the project goals, objectives, and outcomes. The proposed strategies are consistent with the proven strategies used previously in the Pathway to Leadership in Urban Schools (PLUS) Residency. The use of proven strategies strengthens the application and represents an exceptional approach to the priority.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides information on page 9 that supports the need for turnaround models for low-performing schools throughout the nation. On page 10, the applicant references a "scaling target" to support and build capacity for

sustainability. Based on the information presented, there is no doubt that this model could have national implications that may reach the level of scale that is proposed.

According to the information provided on page 10, the applicant is experienced in managing projects of similar scale and recognizes the challenges associated with implementing such a model. Pages 10 – 12, the applicant provides a detailed plan for addressing barriers to include controlling expenses, managing personnel, and community engagement. The plan described is thoughtful with clear strategies to mitigate any known barriers. It is clear that the applicant has a thorough understanding of what's needed in order to fully execute this project.

On pages 13 and 14, the applicant describes working relationships with partner schools and districts that will increase the likelihood of the success of the project. Because of the extensive work history with multiple schools and districts across the nation, the applicant has specific understandings of the needs of these communities that increase the likelihood of the successful replication. On page 13, the applicant indicates that there is a plan to disseminate lessons and findings. The dissemination plan will be essential to ensure that best practices can be replicated in similar schools and districts.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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:

On pages 14 – 16, the applicant provided clear and measurable goals and objectives. The applicant includes information to show the tools that will be used to measure progress towards the goals. Because of the applicant's extensive experience, there is an increased likelihood that the goals can be achieved by the project.

The applicant included a thorough management plan on pages 16 – 22. The roles and responsibilities for key personnel are clearly defined and align with each team member's area of expertise. On page 18, the plan also contains roles and responsibilities for district leadership, which is helpful in understanding, how the various stakeholders will contribute to the project. The timeline included on pages 19 – 22 is detailed and aligns to the project goals and objectives. Included in the timeline are key milestones and tasks that further solidify a plan for managing each phase of the project including disseminating information and providing feedback for continuous improvement. This was very helpful in understanding how and when key personnel will execute each phase.

On pages 23 and 24, the applicant includes information to show how the project will disseminate information and share resources that can be replicated by similar schools and districts. If the project is successful it will be important to understand how the strategies can be sustained overtime to continue the work beyond the end of the grant.

On page 15 of the application, the applicant addresses goal 3 of sustaining strategies that are embedded in the TLTS project. The applicant providing a plan for disseminating information through the use of a applicant blog. Additionally, there are plans to share information at educational conferences and other modalities. By sharing the outcomes and evaluation of the project with other educational practitioners, there is an increased likelihood that the positive outcomes will influence approaches to staffing leadership teams.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this section.

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 Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (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 components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

This section reviewed by different reviewer.

Weaknesses:

This section reviewed by different reviewer.

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/02/2017 06:26 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 10:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	35
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	
Sub Total	55	35
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 5: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

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: Makes a strong case for the magnitude of the problem to be addressed on pp. 1-4: Barely one in ten fourth graders are proficient or better in reading or math compared to a third of all fourth graders across the district. The graduation rate is 61.7% - ten points behind that of Atlanta Public Schools (APS) students overall and 18 points behind the national average. Moreover, the high concentration of struggling schools in APS, which has 4% of the state's schools, but 17% of the lowest performing schools, presents an outsized challenge for district leaders.

#2: The core of the project is attracting and sustaining leaders with the skill sets needed for turnaround of high needs schools and this is a significant national challenge in the field of education. Information and research in this part of the application establishes that there is a lack of strong school leadership to respond to the urgent needs of schools that are performing below levels. Unique programs like TNTP propose to respond to this issue through the model they have created.

#3: TNTP will recruit, select, train and support 15 leadership teams made up of experienced school leaders, new-to-leadership residents and teacher-leaders, who will work together to propel radical school turnaround of the identified high-needs schools; TNTP proposes a unique approach and structured model. The program called Pathway to Leadership in Urban Schools (PLUS) will create new school leaders and teacher leaders who are capable of turning around high need, low-performing schools. The project will identify and develop leaders creating high-functioning leadership teams in Atlanta Public Schools and in schools from a second Local Education Agency in the region with similarly low-performing schools, providing them with cohesive supports to ensure they are effective at improving student outcomes.

Pointed out that there is little research focused on successful team structures or how schools effectively share responsibilities across teams. In recent years, an increased number of school leader residencies have led to an interesting residual effect that points to the promise of such team

Weaknesses:

None identified

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**

Strengths:

Clearly, there are challenges with effective educational leadership as evidenced by research provided on page 9. The applicant has done work in a number of states around the country promoting the TNTP model of distributed leadership for radical school turnaround in places like Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina and Pennsylvania. Now the project proposes to expand to Georgia working with Atlanta Public Schools.

Cost and stakeholder engagement are both discussed as a barriers to scale on pp. 10-11. TNTP has a multifaceted approach to reducing the financial cost of bringing leadership to districts that includes: (1) long-term planning for the sustainability of the project; (2) incorporating cost-effective practices made possible by our own infrastructure; and (3) building capacity to sustain the work

Replication: After refining TLTS (Turnaround Leadership Teams Strategy) as part of the EIR program, the applicant intends to leverage a network and reputation to expand to more districts. They assert that the demand and appropriate funding streams exist to support scaling their model both within districts (i.e., eventually turning around multiple school sites) and nationally (i.e., supported by our plans to disseminate lessons and findings).

TNTP will draw on relevant expertise earned from operating large-scale talent recruitment programs in partnerships with districts all over the country for nearly 20 years. Their rigorous Teaching Fellows and TNTP Academy programs, previously supported by a 2010 i3 Validation grant, prepare candidates to teach shortage subjects in challenging school environments. pp.13-14.

Weaknesses:

None identified

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:

Applicant provides thorough explanation of all four factors for project design.

- Clear and specific, as well as measurable goals—table on pp.14-16.
- Management plan provides responsibilities for all key project personnel explaining their qualifications and how they will support the project in Table C1 and C2 on p. 17.
- There is a breakdown of project milestones goal by goal.
- Feedback Loop: full-time staff member specializing in program evaluation and measurement will oversee progress on goals. There will be a staff member who collects information on a quarterly basis, raises specific challenges, highlights and trends to TNTP senior management. If goals are off track, project leaders must present an intervention plan designed to improve.
- The applicant shares a number of strategies on pp. 23-24 that will allow for continuation of the project beyond the end of the grant. Specific data will be collected such as teacher and principal evaluations, retention and student achievement data. During and after the grant, TNTP will ensure that results from these evaluations will be made widely available to practitioners, school systems, policymakers, and program providers. Atlanta Public Schools and TNTP will present new knowledge shared through the program. The project will continue to add to the existing body of knowledge and continue the project through replication.

Weaknesses:

None identified

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 Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (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 components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:**Weaknesses:**

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/02/2017 10:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 08:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	30
Sub Total	30	30
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	35
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	55	35
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 5: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: TNTP, Inc. (U411B170003)

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 proposed project focuses on providing strong effective leaders to face the challenges found in High Poverty Low Performing schools by implementing an effective Turnaround Leadership Teams Strategy (abstract). The applicant proposes a fully developed Significance of the project. The applicant built a strong case for the severity of the problems facing the target student population which is 11,563 K-12 students in Atlanta, Georgia. These students attend schools which rank in the bottom 5% of schools in the entire state of Georgia. 95% of the students are economically disadvantaged minorities with a graduation rate of 61.7% which is 10 points lower than the national average graduation rate (p. 1). Additionally, the applicant provided ample research (pages 2-5) outlining the magnitude of need for strong leaders as well as the pressures leaders face nationwide as evidenced by 2013 Brach, Hanushek, & Rivkin finding that schools serving predominately poor children are less likely to be led by an effective leader (p 2). Further, the demand for capable leaders far outweighs the supply in districts with high concentrations of struggling schools where the work is intense and isolating (2). The applicant will build on their previous success by slightly modifying the PLUS Leadership residency to provide three leadership pathways to produce multi-tiered leadership to meet the challenges and positively impact student achievement in High Poverty Low Performing Schools.

Weaknesses:

There are no areas of weakness in this section of the proposal.

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents a fully-developed response for the Strategy to Scale Criterion by first calling attention to the fact that over 14,000 public schools nationwide qualify as persistently low performing (p. 9). Thus establishing the demand for expansion of previously effective Turn Around Leadership Strategy to produce effective innovative teacher leaders who will provide peer coaching and model instruction within their schools (p. 7). Thus, stretching the local supply of leadership talent across the country (p. 9). The applicant has set a scaling target to directly support an estimated 11,563 students during the life of the grant with the stated intent to build capacity to sustain the work post-grant (p.10). Additionally, the proposal effectively identifies barriers and proposes solutions (p. 10-12). The proposal has a foundation of proven success (teaching fellows in 25 states p. 10) with a clear well-defined program designed to take into account economics, time, and central capacity thus ensuring feasibility of successful replication (p. 13).

Weaknesses:

There are no areas of weakness in this section of the proposal

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:

The applicant has a well-developed Project Design and Management Plan. The proposal contains clear and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes in Table C-1 (p. 14-15). Tables C-2 and C-3 have a detailed explanation of Team member's roles and responsibilities (p. 17). Thus positively indicating the level of planning and the strength of the leadership framework to ensure project objectives/outcomes will be accomplished. Additionally, Table C4 contains the Year by Year Project Scope and Table C-5 contains the Implementation Timeline and Milestones with Key Team Members listed, again evidencing the level of structural support for accomplishing project goals (p. 18-22). The applicant will employ a full time staff member specializing in program evaluation and measurement to oversee progress on goals (p. 22). This staff member along with Mathematica's independent study will ensure that effective continuous improvement occur by ensuring that real-time, data driven course corrections are immediate thereby positively impacting student achievement (p. 22-23). Finally, the applicant will incorporate the project design with up to date insights about developing leaders for high-need schools in a blog for Atlanta Public School and by presenting the Turnaround Leadership Teams Strategy (TLTS) program at education sector conferences (p. 23). Finally, the applicant plans to develop and share the knowledge necessary for others to replicate successful program elements (p. 23).

Weaknesses:

There are no areas of weakness in this section of the proposal

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 Evidence Standards without reservations.

(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 components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 08:04 PM