



## Nevada Department of Education

### REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION (RFQ)

#### Expansion of Evidence-Based Interventions for School Transformation List

The deadline to submit qualifications to the  
2021 [UNLV Review of Evidence Based Providers](#) is  
5:00 PM (PST) on December 27, 2021

Providers already approved through the 2019/2020 UNLV process need not resubmit their information  
for review.

#### Timeline

Action	Date(s)
Submission deadline to the UNLV Website at <a href="#">UNLV REBS</a>	December 27, 2021
RFQ submission window	March 15, 2021 – December 27, 2021
Eligibility notification (rolling)	On-going
List shared with districts and schools	May 28, 2021 and January 31, 2022

For additional information, please contact the  
Nevada Department of Education (NDE) Office of Student and School Supports (OSSS):

Seng-Dao Yang Keo, Ed.L.D.  
Director, Office of Student and School Supports  
2080 E. Flamingo Ave. Suite 210, Las Vegas, NV 89119  
Phone: 702-486-6561 Email: [skeo@doe.nv.gov](mailto:skeo@doe.nv.gov)

Gabrielle Lamarre, Esq.  
Title I Director, Federal Liaison, and  
Assistant Director, Office of Student and School Supports  
2080 E. Flamingo Ave. Suite 210, Las Vegas, NV 89119  
Phone: 702-668-4309 Email: [glamarre@doe.nv.gov](mailto:glamarre@doe.nv.gov)

## Table of Contents

<b>REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION (RFQ)</b> .....	1
<b>Expansion of Evidence-Based Interventions for School Transformation List</b> .....	1
Timeline .....	1
<b>GLOSSARY OF TERMS</b> .....	3
<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	4
<b>RFQ OVERVIEW</b> .....	4
<b>RFQ OVERVIEW (continued)</b> .....	4
<b>RFQ OVERVIEW (continued)</b> .....	5
<b>ESSA EVIDENCE LEVELS</b> .....	7
Table 1: Summary of Study Criteria for Each ESSA Evidence Level .....	8
Level I: Strong Evidence (Randomized Controlled Trials) .....	9
Level II: Moderate Evidence (Quasi-Experimental Designs).....	9
Level III: Promising Evidence (Correlational Studies) .....	9
Level IV: Demonstrates a Rationale .....	10
<b>RFQ SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS</b> .....	10
Section A: General Information.....	10
<b>Consideration for ESSA Evidence Levels 1, 2, or 3</b> .....	13
<b>Criteria for ESSA Evidence Consideration</b> .....	15

## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

<b>Control group:</b>	The baseline group that does not receive the treatment in an experimental design.
<b>Effect size</b>	A quantitative measure of the magnitude of a relationship or research/evaluation finding. Used to quantify the impact of interventions on specific student outcomes.
<b>Intervention(s)</b>	Those treatments or strategies used to impact targeted outcomes. Often quantified via descriptive, correlational or experimental designs and metrics.
<b>Provider</b>	A person or company offering a service, also known as a vendor.
<b>Project evaluations</b>	Intended to determine if pre-defined project outcomes were achieved.
<b>Research</b>	Systematic investigation, including development, testing, evaluation, designed to contribute to generalizable knowledge (28 C.F.R. 46.102(d)).
<b>Statistical significance</b>	The probability that a research finding was not due to chance.
<b>Treatment group</b>	The group that receives the treatment in an experimental design.

## BACKGROUND

The purpose of this Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is to support the Nevada Department of Education's (NDE) core work of excellence and equity by expanding the number of providers currently on our Evidence-Based Interventions (EBIs) for School Transformation List. In partnership with districts and schools, through evidence-based interventions and continuous improvement, we can achieve our greatest aspirations: excellence and equity for all students in the Nevada education system. The NDE Office of Student and School Supports invite you to partner with us.

To strengthen our support to districts and schools in identifying EBIs that align with our big bets and continuous improvement work, the NDE Office of Student and School Supports is welcoming submissions to this RFQ. Successful submissions identified as meeting the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) evidence-based criteria will be placed onto the EBIs for School Transformation List. Our Department's responsibilities include ensuring that districts and schools adhere to the requirements set forth in ESSA and state laws, as well as to program requirements of any federal and state funded programs and initiatives available to qualifying schools.

## RFQ OVERVIEW

This RFQ is different from a Request for Proposals (RFP). The NDE expects evidence-based providers to supply required information in order to determine the organization's qualifications for eligibility to be on the vetted EBIs for School Transformation List. This was formerly the School Improvement Program List created in April 2017 and was provided to districts as a resource to identify and match their schools' needs with evidence-based providers focused on two priorities: 1) school leadership development and capacity building; and 2) data informed decision-making. The State is not obligated to any evidence-based provider through this process.

**If your RFQ is approved for the EBIs for School Transformation List, schools and districts may select an intervention from this pre-approved list for school leadership development and/or data informed decision-making. The list will be distributed to districts and schools across the state for consideration for competitive grants. If what the qualified evidence-based provider is offering fits the unique needs of the school or district, the school or district will contract directly with the organization. The NDE may play a role in facilitating communications with districts/schools and providers to ensure coherence and alignment with district and school plans. However, the Department will not be a party in the contract.**

Please note that the EBIs for School Transformation List is not exhaustive. Evidence-based providers meeting the criteria defined by ESSA Evidence Levels 1, 2, 3, or 4—as adopted by the NDE—can still contract with districts and schools using funding awarded during the competitive grant process, even if they are not on the EBIs for School Transformation List. Please also note that being placed on this list in no way guarantees that a district or school will contract with a provider on the list. The list is solely a resource for districts and schools to use for reference and consideration purposes; and they will determine if they decide to contract with one or more providers on the list, depending on their needs. In addition, the list will be reviewed periodically and providers will need to be re-vetted for approval and inclusion on the list.

## RFQ OVERVIEW (continued)

NDE's EBIs for School Transformation List is being expanded and this RFQ is aimed at recognizing those evidence-based interventions that directly support schools and/or districts through professional development, training, or coaching. Currently, the particular areas of interest by NDE include, but are not limited to:

- Early Learning
- Equity
- Family Engagement
- Homeless and/or Foster Care for Youth
- Literacy
- Mentoring
- Neglected and/or Delinquent Youth,
- School Improvement
- School Leadership Continuum
- School Safety and Climate
- Social Emotional Learning
- Science Technology Engineering Arts Math (STEAM)
- Strategic Use of Human Capital and
- Teacher Recruitment, Induction, Mentoring, and Retention.

The NDE Office of Student and School Supports will only consider interventions that meet the following criteria:

1. Interventions aligned with Nevada's big bets: 1) developing and supporting school leaders; and/or 2) making data-informed decisions.
2. Interventions focused directly on supporting schools and/or districts through professional development, training, or coaching. This RFQ will not consider any curriculum.
3. Comprehensive EBIs and programs for School Leadership Development and Capacity Building examples include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - a. Increasing *district leadership success* and sustainability by creating a support system that is responsive to the needs of the district.
  - b. The implementation of evidence-based programs, delivery systems and mechanisms that support sustained improvement of *strong leadership*.
  - c. Job-embedded professional development related to strong leadership that will result in sustainable *increased leadership capacity*.
  - d. The implementation of evidence-based practices that result in the growth of *internal leadership capacity*.
  - e. Training and development on *data analysis of formative and summative assessments* to create school goals based on needs identified in data.
  - f. Training on teacher and staff observation and *feedback to measure improvements in instructional pedagogy* that contribute to school improvement.
  - g. The implementation of an educator career ladder system that provides incentives for teacher leadership and *accomplished teacher development* which results in *increases in teacher retention and school level leadership*.

## RFQ OVERVIEW (continued)

- h. The implementation of *apprenticeships and cascading mentorship models* to provide support for novice and developing educators which promote increases in *teacher retention and longevity*.
  - i. The development and implementation of a *scaffolded induction process* that provides diverse opportunities for new teachers to learn and practice skills vital for teacher effectiveness.
  - j. Research by school districts of barriers to principal retention in high needs schools and implementation of strategies that improve *factors that sustain and reward school leadership in hard to staff schools*.
  - k. Professional learning communities (PLCs) The use of *PLCs to focus on school improvement* and the impact of this collaboration on the data that drives school improvement.
4. Comprehensive services for Data Informed Decision-Making and Data Informed Instructional Practices could include, but is not limited to, the following:
- a. Training to collect and analyze data as a core component of conducting a comprehensive school needs assessment, strategically matching root causes from the needs assessment with appropriate EBIs, and developing a holistic and comprehensive school performance plan that integrates the selected evidence-based interventions for implementation;
  - b. Data literacy training for teachers and administrators to access, interpret and use both summative and formative data to guide instruction, goals and targets;
  - c. Data collection training for teachers in the use of assessments, both formal and informal, to elicit evidence regarding student acquisition and/or mastery of a particular skill or body of knowledge;
  - d. Assist schools in developing and implementing data systems and a systematic approach that points the way and sustains a culture of data practices;
  - e. Training to embed a continuous improvement cycle that provides time for teacher collaboration and ongoing professional development on the use of data to inform instruction and school improvement over time;
  - f. Support and training for school leaders to analyze and utilize data in ways that strengthen system level coherence and inform their thinking and actions as system level leaders (e.g., aligning school performance plans to district performance plans and state plans);
  - g. Targeted data collection, literacy, and/or analysis for a content area or specific focus (e.g., early literacy, mathematics, social emotional learning, before school and after school programs, etc.);
  - h. Provide support and training to understand rigorous (and what is credible) educational research and evidence; identify appropriate evidence-based interventions that strongly match school needs, context, and demographics; strategically select and prioritize high leverage evidence-based interventions based on limited resources; and implement evidence-based interventions with fidelity; and
  - i. Provide support and training to collect and use data in order to monitor the impact of evidence-based interventions and make strategic adjustments to strengthen school improvement and continuous improvement.

RFQ submissions will be consistently reviewed by expertly trained education researchers and evaluators from the University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV). NDE will notify providers regarding the results of their RFQ submission. All decisions from NDE are final.

If the implementation of an intervention by a provider meets the criteria for ESSA Evidence Levels 1, 2, or 3, as demonstrated within the submitted RFQ to NDE, the provider’s identified name and EBIs will be added to the current NDE EBIs for School Transformation List. Interventions that are deemed meeting ESSA Evidence Level 4 will be placed on the vetted Demonstrates a Rationale List—they will not be listed on the vetted Evidence-Based Interventions for School Transformation List. These interventions meeting ESSA Evidence Level 4 criteria may qualify for some of the competitive grants: Title IVA, Title IVB, Turnaround, and College and Career Readiness. However, they will not be prioritized for Title I 1003 (a) funding.

## **ESSA EVIDENCE LEVELS**

***Based on the requirements of ESSA, only the program and service offerings that meet the following evidence-based criteria regarding school leadership programs and services and/or data-driven decision-making programs and services will be considered.***

ESSA sec. 8101 (21) defines four levels of evidence: Level 1 (strong evidence, experimental studies); Level 2 (moderate evidence, quasi-experimental designs; Level 3 (promising evidence, correlational studies); and Level 4 (demonstrates a rationale). Table 1 provides a summary of recommended study criteria for “evidence-based strategies and interventions”.

**Definition for Specific Activities Funded Under ESSA** – When used with respect to interventions or improvement activities or strategies funded under section 1003 [Title I], the term “evidence-based” means a State, local educational agency, or school activity, strategy, or intervention that meets the following requirements:

- (i) Demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes. Studies that will receive primary consideration are those that show both a) statistical significance *and* b) favorable effect sizes.

NDE OSSS will prioritize for funding those interventions and programs that meet ESSA Evidence Levels 1 (Strong), 2 (Moderate), or 3 (Promising), when appropriate Table I provides a summary of study criteria for each ESSA evidence level. Following Table I, we have included additional information about each of the ESSA Evidence Levels based on guidance from the U.S. Department of Education and leading national non-profits assisting state education agencies and local education agencies in ESSA implementation, particularly on the levels of evidence requirements.

**Table 1: Summary of Study Criteria for Each ESSA Evidence Level**

Criteria	Strong Evidence	Moderate Evidence	Promising Evidence	Demonstrates a Rationale
<b>Study Design</b>	Experimental Study	Quasi-experimental study	Correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias	Provides a well-specific <i>logic model</i> informed by research or evaluation
<b>WWC Standard</b>	Meets WWC Evidence Standards without reservations (or is the equivalent quality)	Meets WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations (or is the equivalent quality)	N/A	N/A
<b>Favorable Effects</b>	Shows a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome	Shows a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome	Shows a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome	Relevant research or an <i>evaluation</i> that suggests that the intervention is likely to improve a student outcome or other relevant outcome
<b>Other Effects</b>	Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence from other findings in studies that meet WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations (or are the equivalent quality)	Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence from other findings in studies that meet WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations (or are the equivalent quality)	Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence from other findings in studies that meet WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations (or are the equivalent quality)	An effort to study the effects of the intervention, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, will happen as part of the intervention or is underway elsewhere
<b>Sample Size and Overlap</b>	Includes a large sample and a multi-site sample, overlapping with populations and settings proposed to receive the intervention	Includes a large sample and a multisite sample, overlapping with populations or settings proposed to receive the intervention	N/A	N/A

Source: Adopted from the U.S. Department of Education, Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/guidanceuseinvestment.pdf>.

### **Level I: Strong Evidence (Randomized Controlled Trials)**

There must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study (i.e., randomized controlled trial or RCT) on the intervention. Thus, it must meet *What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Evidence Standards* “without reservations” (i.e., the observed effect was caused by the intervention) or is another type of study that has the capacity to make causal inferences. An RCT is an experimental study that compares outcomes between the treatment and control groups. In the context of K-12 education, for example, this type of study employs random assignment of students, teachers, classrooms, schools, or districts for both the treatment and control groups. Randomization is what makes it an experimental study, which affords researchers the ability to generalize the findings to the broader population. An RCT is “well-designed and well-implemented” when the comparability of the two groups are not compromised by issues like sample attrition, changes in group status after randomization, and investigator manipulation. Additionally, to provide strong evidence, the following criteria must be met:

- Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome;
- Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on the same intervention in other studies that meet *WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations* or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences;
- Have a large sample (i.e., 350 single analysis units or 50 or more groups that contain of 10 or more single analysis units) and a multi-site sample (i.e., more than one site); and
- Have a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) AND settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the intervention.

### **Level II: Moderate Evidence (Quasi-Experimental Designs)**

There must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental design (QED) study on the intervention. A QED lacks random assignment of participants to the treatment and control groups. However, it attempts to approximate an experimental study by identifying a comparison group that is similar to the treatment group in important respects. Similar to an RCT it compares the outcomes of both groups. There are two common types of QEDs: a *nonequivalent group design*, which attempts to match or statistically control differences between the two groups, and a *regression discontinuity design* (RDD), which uses a cutoff or threshold above or below the intervention. A study is “well-designed and well-implemented” if it meets *WWC Evidence Standards with reservations* or is of the equivalent quality for making causal inferences. Additionally, the following criteria must be met:

- Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome;
- Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that intervention from other findings in studies that meet *WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations* or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences;
- Have a large sample and a multi-site sample; and
- Have a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) OR settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the intervention.

### **Level III: Promising Evidence (Correlational Studies)**

There must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias on the intervention. This type of study is designed to examine the strength of the relationship (not the causal relationship) between an intervention and a student outcome by comparing two similar groups. A study is “well-designed and well-implemented” if it uses sampling

and/or analytic methods to reduce or account for differences between the intervention and comparison groups. These types of studies cannot meet *WWC Evidence Standards*. Additionally, other criteria must be met:

- Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome; and
- Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that intervention from findings in studies that meet *WWC Evidence Standards* with or without reservations or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.

#### **Level IV: Demonstrates a Rationale**

The intervention study must include:

- A well-specified logic model (a.k.a., a theory of action / conceptual framework that identifies key components of the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice which often includes the inputs, outputs, and outcomes/impact) that is informed by research or an evaluation that suggests how the intervention is likely to improve relevant outcomes; and
- An effort to study the effects of the intervention, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, that will happen as part of the intervention or is underway elsewhere (e.g., this could mean another SEA, LEA, or research organization is studying the intervention elsewhere), to inform stakeholders about the success of that intervention.

### **RFQ SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS**

Providers must submit their qualifications, as outlined in each section below, electronically to <http://rebscoe.education.unlv.edu/>. **All submitted RFQ components must be: (1) in PDF or Word format, (2) compliant under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards for Accessible Design, being accessible to people with disabilities, and (3) no more than 20 MB in total digital size to be considered for approval to be added to the NDE EBIs for School Transformation List.** This RFQ will not consider any submissions addressing curriculum. Please note that all information listed below must be provided and all instructions followed in order for any organization to be considered for inclusion on the list. We strongly encourage you to read through this proposal very carefully to ensure all requirements are met before your organization submits. Providers already approved through the 2019/2020 UNLV process need not resubmit their information for review.

#### **Section A: General Information**

##### **Provider Information**

Legal name of company/organization:

Name of provider to appear on list:

Street address:

City, state, and zip code:

Website address:

Phone number:

Provider type (please identify as “non-profit” or “for profit”):

##### **Contact Person Information**

Name:

Title:

Street address:

City, state, and zip code:

Phone number:  
Email address:

**Conflict of Interest Disclosure**

Is the provider, or any member of provider’s organization, currently employed in any capacity by any public school district or public charter school in Nevada, or serves in a decision-making capacity for any public school district or public charter in Nevada (i.e. school board member)? Please answer “yes” or “no.”

If yes, please list the school(s)/district(s) that provider, or members of provider’s organization, are employed by or serve and in what capacity or position.

**Focus of Intervention**

Succinctly identify the intervention under the appropriate category of School Leadership Development or Data Informed-Decision-Making in Table 2. If there are multiple interventions with separate qualifying evidence of effectiveness, please list them all in distinct bullets.

**Table 2: Intervention Summary**

<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Example</b>
School Leadership Development and Capacity Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Example: Creating a support system to ensure school and district leadership success and sustainability</i></li></ul>
Data Informed Decision-Making and Data Informed Instructional Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Example: Development of an analytic portal that offers timely, reliable, and relevant data for school level personnel.</i></li></ul>

**Section B: Provider Background, Budget, and Scope of Work**

1. Provide a brief company background/history.
2. Provide a sample scope of work and estimated budget for a full school year of implementation. Please do this for two years of implementation (i.e., scope of work for two full school years and estimated budget for the first and second year of implementation). Specifically, indicate the anticipated number and types of engagement every month between your organization and the school and/or district. The estimated budget should be for only one school. In addition, please specify if there are any cost savings for multiple schools.
3. If your organization has multiple interventions, each with distinct evidence demonstrating effectiveness (e.g., one intervention focused on school leadership development with supporting evidence and the other focused specifically on data informed decision-making with supporting evidence), you may want to provide separate scopes of work and estimated budgets for two years of implementation, unless this is not applicable.
4. **School Leadership Development and Capacity Building**  
If applicable, please describe your organization’s comprehensive services for *school leadership development* and how implementation will result in dramatic, documented, and sustainable improvement for underperforming schools. By school leadership, we mean principals, other school administrators (particularly those in the principle pipeline), teacher leaders, and district leadership (particularly principal supervisors). Below in Section B, providers will be required to

share peer-reviewed articles or third-party evaluations as evidence of their effectiveness in implementing an evidence-based intervention.

5. **Data-Driven Decision Making and Using Data to Inform Instruction**

If applicable, please describe your organization’s comprehensive services for *data-driven decision making* and how implementation will result in dramatic, documented, and sustainable improvement for underperforming schools. Below in Section B, providers will be required to share peer-reviewed articles or third-party evaluations as evidence of their effectiveness in implementing an evidence-based intervention.

**Section C: Previous Evidence of Effectiveness and Impact**

In this section, your organization must provide documentation to demonstrate evidence of effectiveness. The documentation must meet ESSA evidence-based criteria, as described above.

**Previous Evidence of Effectiveness and Impact**

- *Consideration for ESSA Evidence Levels 1, 2, or 3*

In meeting ESSA evidence-based requirements for effectiveness, the provider must demonstrate their effectiveness to support either school leadership development or data-driven decision making. Supporting evidence should be, at a minimum, one peer-reviewed published article/manuscript that shows favorable evidence of effectiveness or an external report conducted by a third-party evaluator that evaluates the effectiveness of the intervention implemented by the provider. By third party, we mean an evaluator outside of your organization. In addition, the peer-reviewed article or the evaluation report needs to focus on the organization’s implementation of the intervention. Properly cite or attach articles or evaluation reports in the Appendices. Figures such as tables, charts, graphs, etc. can be included in the Appendices at the end of the RFQ. Do not send books, merchandise, or samples.

- *Consideration for ESSA Evidence Level 4*

Interventions meeting ESSA Evidence Level 4 provide opportunities for our Nevada education system. First, this is an opportunity for innovation. Several local organizations and school systems are implementing interventions that have been informed by evidence and education research, but which may not have been rigorously evaluated for effectiveness, or may have been evaluated but have not yet met the ESSA criteria for demonstrating effectiveness. Second, this is an opportunity to build local capacity. Organizations implementing interventions that meet ESSA Evidence Level 4 should collect data and evidence to inform their progress monitoring and then make any adjustments needed to strengthen school improvement work. The expectation is also that interventions will be rigorously evaluated so there is clarity on whether the intervention is highly effective, or not, in order to inform professional learning and continuous improvement. Our hope is that interventions meeting ESSA Evidence Level 4 will move toward meeting the standards and criteria for ESSA Evidence Levels 1, 2, or 3—one intention of the ESSA Evidence requirements.

### Consideration for ESSA Evidence Levels 1, 2, or 3

Criteria	Directions	Response
<b>Supporting evidence</b>	<p>Provide at least one peer-reviewed article/study or positive evaluation conducted by an external evaluator. The peer-reviewed journal article/study or external evaluation must demonstrate the impact of the intervention implemented by your organization. The evaluation must be rigorous and conducted by a reputable third-party evaluator.</p> <p>Be sure to cite the article/study in APA format, if it is publicly accessible. If not, you must attach the study in the Appendix.</p>	<p>Is this a peer-reviewed article/study or an external evaluation?</p> <p>Citation or Appendix:</p>
<b>Intervention</b>	Describe the intervention.	Brief description of the intervention:
<b>ESSA Evidence Level</b>	Identify the ESSA Evidence Level of the intervention.	<p>ESSA Level 1: Strong (RCT/experimental) _____</p> <p>ESSA Level 2: Moderate (quasi-experimental) _____</p> <p>ESSA Level 3: Promising (correlational) _____</p>
<b>Treatment group</b>	Describe the treatment group (e.g., sample size, any issues regarding attrition or investigator manipulation, etc.).	<p>Sample size:</p> <p>Description:</p>
<b>Control / Comparison group</b>	Describe the control/comparison group (e.g., sample size, any issues regarding attrition or investigator manipulation, etc.).	Sample size:

Criteria	Directions	Response
		Description:
<b>Statistical significance</b>	Describe at least one statistical significance of the intervention. Indicate its p-value. Indicate page number(s) of the statistical significance in the peer-reviewed journal article or evaluation.	Describe significance:  p-value:  Page number(s):
<b>Effect Size</b>	Describe at least one positive effect of the intervention. Indicate page number(s) of the effect size(s) in the peer-reviewed journal article or evaluation.	Describe positive effect:  Effect size:  Page number(s):
<b>Outcome(s)</b>	Describe the intended outcome(s) of the intervention and how the outcome was met as a result of the intervention.	
<b>Student population</b>	Geographic (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban)	
	Race/Ethnicity of Student Population	
	Social Economic Status of Student Population	
	Grade Levels	
	Specific subgroups (e.g., English Learner, special education student, etc.)	

## Criteria for ESSA Evidence Consideration

Criteria	Directions	Response
<p><b>Supporting evidence</b></p>	<p>An effort to study the effects of the intervention, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, that will happen as part of the intervention or is underway elsewhere (e.g., this could mean another SEA, LEA, or research organization is studying the intervention elsewhere), to inform stakeholders about the success of that intervention.</p> <p>Provide any one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Peer-reviewed research study conducted by another organization or institution that has implemented the intervention your organization is proposing; <i>or</i></li> <li>2. An external evaluation that does not meet the requirements for ESSA Evidence Levels 1, 2, or 3; <i>or</i></li> <li>3. An internal evaluation, which does not meet the requirements for ESSA Evidence Levels 1, 2, or 3.</li> </ol> <p>Cite the study in APA format. Attach or provide hyperlink to the study.</p>	<p>Circle one: Peer reviewed article / External evaluation / Internal evaluation</p> <p>Citation:</p>
<p><b>Intervention</b></p>	<p>Describe the intervention and the rationale for promising based on evidence. Particular areas of interest by NDE include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Learning,</li> <li>• Equity,</li> </ul>	<p>School leadership</p> <p>Data informed decision-making</p>

Criteria	Directions	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family Engagement,</li> <li>• Homeless and/or Foster Care Youth,</li> <li>• Literacy,</li> <li>• Mentoring,</li> <li>• Neglected and/or Delinquent Youth,</li> <li>• School Improvement,</li> <li>• School Leadership Continuum,</li> <li>• School Safety and Climate,</li> <li>• Social Emotional Learning,</li> <li>• STEAM,</li> <li>• Strategic use of Human Capital, and</li> <li>• Teacher Recruitment, Induction, Mentoring, and Retention.</li> </ul>	Description of the intervention and the rationale for promising based on evidence:
<b>Statistical Significance</b> (if applicable)	Describe at least one statistical significance, if applicable. Indicate page number(s) of the statistical significance in the peer-reviewed journal article or evaluation.	Describe statistical significance:  Page number(s):
<b>Effect Size</b> (if applicable)	Describe at least one positive effect of the intervention, if applicable. Indicate page number(s) of the effect size(s) in the peer-reviewed journal article or evaluation.	Describe positive effect:  Page number(s):
<b>Progress Monitoring</b>	<p>Describe how your organization would <b>monitor progress</b> of the intervention to meet relevant outcomes. (This might be found in either the internal or external evaluation report).</p> <p>Describe how your organization would make an effort to study the <b>effects</b> of the proposed intervention. (This might be found in either the internal or external evaluation report)</p>	<p>Describe progress monitoring:</p> <p>Describe an effort to study the effects:</p>

Criteria	Directions	Response
<b>Student population</b>	Geographic (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban)	
	Race/Ethnicity of Student Population	
	Social Economic Status of Student Population	
	Grade Levels	
	Specific subgroups (e.g., English Learner, special education student, etc.)	

**Resource Links:**