

SIG4 Proposal Review: Round 3 Protocol

Expert Panels

Each panel will comprise Florida Department of Education (FDOE) representation from a variety of perspectives. Panelists will be designated into one of two expert categories. A single panelist may not serve in more than one expert category.

- 1) **School Improvement:** All regional executive directors (REDs) are invited to participate, but a majority needs to be present, including the RED working directly with the district being reviewed, unless the RED is employed by that district.
- 2) **5Essentials and Grants:** Panelists have at least two years of expertise in one or more of the 5Essential domains (e.g., Bureau of Standards and Instructional Support, Division of Educator Quality, Bureau of Family and Community Outreach, Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services) or at least two years of expertise in federal grants (e.g., Bureau of Federal Educational Programs, Office of Grants Management, Title II staff, external grant reviewers); at least one panelist in this category must have direct experience working on grants with the district being reviewed, but shall not be employed by that district (i.e., in the case of external review).

Round 3 Review

Panelists will be provided with the proposal and all supporting documentation at least one week in advance of the scheduled meeting. Each panelist is expected to read the proposal in its entirety and scan documentation as needed prior to participating in the protocol outlined below.

The panel will meet at a scheduled date and time for 60 to 90 minutes per proposal. A time-keeper will ensure the protocol is followed:

- 10-20 minutes: Panel reviews summary slides, and “noticings” and “wonderings” from completed Round 2 forms (Appendix D)
- 10-15 minutes: Panel adds to the noticings and wonderings, and asks clarifying questions as needed pertaining to the competition or contents of the district’s proposal
- 10-15 minutes: Panel identifies themes for discussion, based on the highest-priority wonderings
- 20-30 minutes: Panel discusses identified themes
- 10 minutes: Before leaving the meeting, each panel member independently completes the Feedback Form (page 2 of this document), recording notes on points of strength, areas of concern, and potential interview questions; completed forms are collected by the Bureau of School Improvement (BSI)

SIG4 Proposal Review: Round 3 Protocol

Feedback Form

Each panelist must use this form to organize their feedback as they participate in the protocol. One form must be completed for each district proposal reviewed by the panelist.

Reviewer Name: _____

Size-alike Group: _____

District Name: _____

Expert Category: _____

| POINTS OF STRENGTH | AREAS OF CONCERN |
|--|------------------|
| | |
| POTENTIAL CONVERSATION PROMPTS FOR DISTRICT INTERVIEW <i>You may draft new questions or select from the bank of conversation prompts provided.</i> | |
| | |

SIG4 Proposal Review: Round 3 Protocol

Expert Panel Ratings

After reviews are completed for all districts within a size-alike category, each panelist will reflect upon their notes from the Feedback Form and independently rate each district in each look-for category, using a Likert scale; each panelist will also indicate whether an interview is recommended. The forms will be collected by BSI and ratings tallied using the following methodology.

1. Ratings for each of three statements below will be added together to form a reviewer score.
2. The reviewer scores for all panelists will be averaged together within each expert panel and multiplied by .50 to reflect the following weighting:
 - Average of reviewer scores from School Improvement Panel = 50% of total district score
 - Average of reviewer scores from 5Essentials and Grants Panel = 50% of total district score
3. The weighted scores will be added together to form the total district score. A rank order for each size-alike category will be established starting with the highest district score. A threshold will be determined for proceeding to round 4 based upon the number and quality of proposals, as well as the budget requests and available funds. The Round 4 recommendations for interviews may be used as a tiebreaker, if needed.

Reviewer Name: _____

Size-alike Group: _____

District Name: _____

Expert Category: _____

| RATINGS | | | |
|--|------------|---------|------------------|
| <i>Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, by circling one rating.</i> | | | |
| The district used data appropriately to inform intervention selection for each implementation site. | | | |
| 1-Strongly Disagree | 2-Disagree | 3-Agree | 4-Strongly Agree |
| The district has demonstrated capacity to implement the intervention(s) and is committed to building further capacity for sustainability. | | | |
| 1-Strongly Disagree | 2-Disagree | 3-Agree | 4-Strongly Agree |
| The district's plan and budget support attainment and sustainability of improved outcomes for all students. | | | |
| 1-Strongly Disagree | 2-Disagree | 3-Agree | 4-Strongly Agree |
| ROUND 4 RECOMMENDATION | | | |
| The district should move forward to Round 4 of the review process. | | | |
| <i>If "Yes" is selected, please ensure any potential conversation prompts are clearly noted on your feedback form.</i> | | | |
| <i>If "No" is selected, please ensure any areas of concern are clearly described on your feedback form.</i> | | | |
| YES | | NO | |