INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

WEBINAR:

EVALUATION OF STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND POLICIES: A NEW GRANT PROGRAM AT THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

MAY 28, 2009

+ + + + +

PROCEEDINGS

Slide One:
DR. RUBY: Good afternoon, everyone. I am Allen Ruby from the National Center for Education Research. I would like to talk to you today about a fairly new grant program called the Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies.

Before I start, let me do one little advertisement. We have three more webinars coming up. On Friday, we are going to do a review of our Reading for Understanding Research Initiative, and then next week on Tuesday, we will do a Grant Writing Workshop for Goal One Exploration Project, and then on Wednesday, we will do a Grant Writing Workshop for Research on the Education Workforce, which includes our Education Leadership, Teacher Quality, and Special Education Teacher Quality Grant Program.

Let me turn back now to this grant program. I say it is fairly new because we have only had one competition, which was held last October. Those grants have gone through the review process, but they haven't been released yet. They will be announced, probably, in June and July, and so we will have those next rounds coming up, next two rounds coming up, without folks being able to look at what was funded last round.

Slide Two:
Just to take a look at our agenda today, I wanted to give a little background on IES and the grant programs here—some of this will be directly relevant to the Evaluation of State and Local Policies and Programs Grant Program—and then go specifically into that grant program and the details of it.

Slide Three:
Just a bit on our organization structure. We have a director, newly appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, advised by a National Board, also appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and we have four centers.

You are probably familiar with the National Center for Education Statistics, which does large-scale surveys on United States education, provides the data to researchers like yourself, and does some analysis of that data. Then we have the National Center for Education Evaluation, which does large-scale evaluations of the educational interventions at the request of the Congress or other agencies that are within the Department of Education. Then the National Center for Education Research, which I belong to, and our sister center, the National Center for Special Education Research, and the two of us provide the source for grants to educational researchers.

Slide Four:
Our research objectives are threefold. First, to support the development and identification of educational interventions which you see as broadly defined as programs, practices, policies, and approaches that enhance academic achievement and, at the same time, identify those that do not. Thirdly, we're also looking at variations in the

effectiveness of such interventions. In a sense, it is looking at what works, what doesn't work, and what works for whom or works where, is the applied type of research that we do or support.

Slide Five:

As I said, we focused on what improves student achievement, and so our final outcomes of interest are focused on students. At the preschool level, we look at school readiness, which includes such things as prereading and writing, early math and science, and social development. And for the Education Research grants, that is really where we start, at preschool. For the Special Ed grants, we start much earlier. Once a child has been identified with a disability, the outcomes include their developmental outcome.

Then coming into K through 12, we are looking at academic outcomes in reading, writing, math, and science, also the behaviors and social skills that are required to be successful in school and to make the transition after school, high school graduation, and for schools with students with disabilities, the creation of functional skills for their independent living. When we move on to postsecondary, we are most focused on the outcomes of enrollment, persistence, and completion, and for adult education, we are looking at basic reading, writing, and math outcomes.

Slide Six:

What are the independent variables that most people look at in this type of research? We call these the “conditions of education.” They are most often the curriculum, instruction, assessment, quality of the education workforce, running from the teachers to principals to superintendents, and then systems-level programs and policies. That is sort of a catch-all. You can imagine developing a curriculum can be at a small level, down at the classroom or school level, or you could have something like the evaluation of a curriculum adopted across a district. That might be a system level.

And I should give you a reminder that you can e-mail in any questions at any time.

Slide Seven:

Our 2010 Research and Research Training Grant Programs are on this page, and you can see our main one is the Education Research and Special Education Research Grant Programs, and I put the numbers next to them. The code there is that a 305 stands for the National Center on Education Research, and a 324 stands for the National Center on Special Education Research.

The first line includes many of the grant topics you are probably familiar with, running from teacher quality, to math and science, to reading and writing, about 14 topics in Education Research. Then we have our Postdoctoral Training Research Grant Programs, both for regular education and special education, and then we have our National Research and Development Centers, which vary by year. You need to look at those Requests for Applications to see which ones we are holding this year. And then we have a fairly new one on Statistical and Research Methodology in Education. We have a brand-new one this year on Reading for Understanding, looking at how to develop and improve comprehension, reading comprehension, and then this one I want to talk about today, the Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies.

Slide Eight:

The purpose of this grant program. It came about because much of our work has been generated by researchers in universities and research institutions, and so, at the same time, we knew that states and districts were trying a number of new interventions. They had to address specific issues and problems they were dealing with, and they couldn't wait for research to make choices, but, at the same time, they often were not evaluating what they were doing. The main purpose was to take advantage of these interventions that states and districts are trying out that haven't been evaluated in the past and so to use them as an opportunity to create greater findings on what type of interventions work or do not work.

At the same time, there are a couple other underlying purposes of this grant program. One is to try to get states and districts more involved in evaluation of their program and more involved in using the results of such evaluations in their decisionmaking, and also focusing the research community to be more interested in what the states and districts are doing and, thirdly, trying to create a partnership between the two. For those states and districts that may not have the capability of doing rigorous evaluation, teaming them up with universities and research institutions to provide them with that support, and, of course, the resulting work would hopefully be of use not only to the specific states and districts but also to other states and districts confronting some of the same situations.

Slide Nine:

The one key question is what do we mean by a state and local program or policy that is the focus of this grant program? Well, the goal is that this is not something coming from outside the state and district that the state and district is allowing to use. It is not something developed in a university or research institution and the state says, sure, you can try it in a small number of schools to see if it works. It is really something that the state or district says we are now going to implement this state or districtwide, and it is going to be selected by the state or district, and while it may not be implemented by the state or district—that may mean they may turn it over to some other organization to implement it—it will be overseen by the state or the district education agency. It is also not a policy or program that is going to be implemented by another state agency, which is a health agency or something of that sort. It really is coming out of the education agency of the state or the district.

Its purpose is geared at improving student achievement. I talked about the outcomes of interest discussed earlier, such as readiness for schooling or academic success in English, math, science, or high school graduation, outcomes of that nature, but, of course, it can be affecting these through some intermediate outcomes that are expected or known to affect outcomes of interest. The focus might be on increasing teacher quality or school quality with the expected next impact of increasing student achievement.

The focus is on preK to high school for this grant program, and there can be some work in postsecondary, but the focus there must be addressing access for the traditionally underserved population.

Slide Ten:

These programs or policies have to be fully developed. There is no time or funds built into this grant program for development of a program or policy or its implementation to support either of those. They have to be ready to go. That means they either are already in place or it is quite clear that they are fully developed and will be put in place in the immediate future.

There can be some idea of mid-course corrections—that is, if this evaluation finds something that could be improved, that that could be done and the evaluation could continue from there—but, again, the money is not for supporting the development that might result in those mid-course corrections.

In these applications, it is important to provide evidence that the program or policy is fully developed or that it will be ready to go by the start date of the grant.

Slide Eleven:

It is important that these programs or policies are widely implemented across the state or across the district. The idea here is that they will be on a sufficient scale that we can make generalizations of their impact and that they will be tried across a variety of conditions to allow for subgroup and moderator analysis. That doesn't necessarily mean every school has to use them. It may be focused on a certain subpopulation of school. Let's say a school serving “x” percentage of students who receive school lunch or “x” percentage of students serving minority populations, but you still want to have enough schools involved that we can do a rigorous analysis and get the conclusions that we have confidence in.

Secondly, they have to be implemented under typical conditions. This is very similar to if a state or a district adopted a new curriculum or a new teaching program. There isn't anything additional being provided by the developer that then would be normally used in such an adoption.

Slide Twelve:

The program or policy should be a substantial modification of existing practice. Now, that may mean within the state or the district of their existing practice, or if this is something that has been going on for awhile in the state or the district, in comparison to what is going on to normal practice in other states or districts, so, again, the idea that other states or districts could learn from an evaluation of their state or district's program. In addition, it should not have been rigorously evaluated already, and it should be something adoptable by other states and districts.

Slide Thirteen:

The main part of the application is the Research Narrative, which is broken into four sections: the significance; the research plan; the personnel; and the resources. These are the focus of the peer review. When the peer reviewers get together, they score each of these sections separately, and then they come up with an overall score. It is important to address each one of these well in the application. The Research Narrative, as noted, is 25 pages, single spaced.

Slide Fourteen:

Starting with the significance, the significance of the work, an important step is to describe the program or policy in detail. It is likely that peer reviewers may not be familiar with the actual program or policy. They may be familiar with the type of program or policy and its purpose, but they may not know about it, about this specific one. You want to detail all the components, be very clear how it will be implemented, who is responsible for implementing it, and what outcomes are expected to be affected by it.

Slide Fifteen:

It also should provide a theory of change, sort of the rationale for the program; how and why is this policy or program expected to improve student achievements; what will it indirectly change and then what will it directly change. This helps to suggest what needs to be measured and how it should be measured, and it is very useful in these cases to provide graphics such as logic models or flow charts that, in a very small space, give an idea of what is going to be affected and why it should have the impact you expect it to have, and then, of course, describing the outcomes to be affected, student achievement and the intervening outcomes.

Now, there may be cases where the program or policy is having an effect fairly upstream of student achievement. For example, you might consider a program to improve principal's roles and instructions might take three, maybe four years, to affect the principals and to affect the teacher's instruction, then to affect the student outcome. If you feel that you are not going to get within the five years of the life of the grant you may not get as much of an impact on student outcomes as you had hoped to, you can argue that the indirect impact—well, I should say the direct impact on teacher's instructions will come out by the end of the project, and that these are really the main outcomes you are looking at, as long as you can argue that in the literature there is evidence that effects on these outcomes have been linked to effects on student outcomes as well.

That is just in case it is too long and that the time frame is not long enough for you to believe that it will have an impact on student outcomes, but you can effect an intermediate outcome within the time period that is known to affect student outcomes. You can make that argument here when describing the outcome.

Slide Sixteen:

Another step will be to describe how this intervention is different from current program or policy. It is very important to describe what your comparison group will or has received in the past and that the treatment that is being provided is substantially different and then argue why this treatment should lead to improvement and increased student achievement versus current business as usual, and I will keep coming back to the comparison group because that is an issue that often crops up in Education Research: what is the comparison group receiving?

Slide Seventeen:

As noted earlier, you need to show that the intervention is widely implemented, either today or in the near future; when the grant will start; that it is of sufficient scale; that it will occur among a variety of conditions that are taking place under typical implementation conditions. And if you are talking about a future intervention, it is very important to provide evidence that it is going to be implemented in the near future, that there are laws in place, that there's funds in place to implement this, that there may be authorities or new agencies to implement or oversee it, and there are personnel in place to make sure that it is implemented.

And then you want to show the feasibility of implementation, again, that it is fully developed, that the supports are in place. If it is going to be a new program that is going to be implemented, you can use evidence from other districts or states that have implemented something like it, so that you can argue, look, these other places have successfully implemented it and that gives us assurance that it will be implemented here.

And then describing the source and provide evidence of availability of funding for implementation. These all grow out of some problems that have occurred in past Education Research, where people want to evaluate a program, and the grant starts, the project starts, and then, all of a sudden, implementation doesn't occur, and so the evaluation can't be done. The peer reviewers are more skeptical today than they were five years ago on large-scale evaluations, and they want more evidence that implementation will actually take place.

Slide Eighteen:

The next section you will be looking at is the research plan. You start off with your research questions and hypotheses. Describe the sample you will be using. Again, what is your sampling universe? Is it all elementary schools in a district or a state? Is it all types of schools serving a certain student population or a sampling of all certain types of teachers with certain credentials? And how you will select some of this universe; what kind of inclusion and exclusion rules you will use; and why are they justified; and very important, how you will try to reduce attrition? Again, this is an outcome from past research that evaluations over—long-term evaluations often run into a problem that they have so much attrition that sometimes their results are—the confidence in their results is reduced. It is important to describe up front not only how you hope to reduce them but, when we get to the analysis section, how you will address attrition in the analysis.

Slide Nineteen:

As noted in the Request for Applications, randomized control trials are preferred, and if you can do this, then you should note the unit of randomization, the reason for it, the process for random assignment that was used, and it is important here to separate the implementers from the random assignment process, so that there is no concern that those implementing will have some bias when they actually do the assignment of units to the treatment and control.

We know there is great resistance among states and districts to assigning some students to intervention and not allowing other students to receive it. There can be use of staggered roll-outs. For example, an intervention may roll out over three years and you randomly assign it to schools, and so the schools in the first year receive the intervention. Then the schools in the second and third year receive it in those years, and then those second and third schools can be the control group for the first-year group.

Also, there can be variation in treatment designs where schools receive different forms of the intervention, and, therefore, they can be compared against one another. That way, everyone gets something so that you can't be criticized for holding off an intervention from some schools or some students.

Slide Twenty:

If you can't use a randomized control trial, which is understandable in many cases, and the peer review panels realize that, the first point is to say why you can't use one. Just clearly state that the state or the district rejects the use of it in this case for the following reasons or there is something about the way the intervention works that does not allow the use of such a trial or something along those lines, but clearly put that in the application.

And then try to select an alternative that does the best at minimizing the selection bias or modeling the selection bias, so, for example, a regression discontinuity design or a comparative interrupted time series design or some other similar quasi-experimental design, and several of these are discussed in the Request for Applications and citations of some of the literature that you can take a look at and are available in the Request for Applications as well.

Slide Twenty-one:

A very important issue is clearly stating what is the power of your analysis. The panel will look closely enough to see if you have a sample large enough that we will have confidence that if there are any impacts there, we will be able to identify them, and so it is very important to clearly show how you did the power analysis, what method you used, and to include not only the power analysis for your main analysis, but, if you are doing any important subgroup analyses, show that too because that has been a problem in the past where the panel sees a power analysis for the main analysis and then wonders, though, since it is a subgroup, is there enough power for the subgroup analyses?

And there should be enough information in there, so that the panel can check the power calculations. There will be someone on the panel who will do that or will try to do that, and it is a great relief or a great increase in confidence when that person reports to the panel that the power calculations are correct.

Slide Twenty-two:

You want to describe in detail the outcome measures that you will be using, the outcomes of interest, and in this case, the focus will be on outcomes that are relevant to the states, to the districts, to the schools, to the parents. These may be things found in the district or state administrative data, such as student test scores, student attendance rates, high school graduation rates, school performance on adequate yearly progress measures or the like or on state assessments or the like. This doesn't preclude using research to develop outcomes, but the focus is really not on these. And then you should discuss the reliability, validity, and appropriateness of the outcome measures, and they should be linked back to your theory of change.

Slide Twenty-three:

Fidelity of implementation is an important analysis to put into your research plan: what measures will you use, and how reliable and valid are they? Describe how they will be implemented. It is very important to identify fidelity in both the treatment and the control group. This often occurs when a program or policy shows no impact. We want to know whether that is because it was not implemented well, or in some cases, it is because the control group is implementing something similar, but not exactly the same, or because maybe the program or policy doesn't work. Knowing what is going on in the control group as it compares to what is being done in the intervention group is important.

Some of this work can be done as a secondary data analysis with historical data. If an intervention has been ongoing for many years and you want to look backwards, the fidelity of implementation research doesn't have to be done as long as you document that we don't have the data to go back and look at that. And in the case where you are doing both retrospective and prospective studies, so something may have gone on for a few years and you are going to follow it to the future, you need to make the decision, is it valuable to do a fidelity of implementation study on the future?

If you are only following one or two years in the future and the majority of the analysis is looking backwards, it may not be appropriate to do a fidelity of implementation study. On the other hand, if you are doing the past plus four years into the future, it may be very appropriate. You need to make that decision and then justify the reasons for it.

Slide Twenty-four:

Back to the comparison group again, just putting more information on this: who makes up the comparison group; how are they similar or different from the treatment group; what do they receive in place of the treatment? Again, did they receive anything that is similar to the intervention and how much did they receive? And, finally, how is contamination between the treatment and the control group being avoided?

But, on the other hand, in many cases, contamination has not been found to be a major issue. That raises the question do you need to do school-level randomization? Just because, getting back to the power issue, if you can do classroom randomization or community randomization, it gives you much greater power at a much lower cost, and so something to consider is if you think contamination is not going to be a big issue, make that point, go to a lower level of randomization and save money, or increase the power of the analysis.

Slide Twenty-five:

I discussed your mediating and moderating variables; how these may explain differential impacts of the intervention on different types of students. These should be identified in your theory of change and describe how they will be measured in both the treatment and the control group.

Slide Twenty-six:

And then detail your data analysis procedure. As I will note later on, our reviewers are a combination of content and methodological experts. You want to be very clear on what data analysis procedures you will be using. In your quantitative ones, describe your physical procedures, show the models that you will be using and the software you will be using to analyze it. For qualitative, do something very similar, describe the methods you will be using and how you will interpret the data. Link back to how these are based on your designs. Discuss the additional analyses you will be doing to look at the mediators, moderators, and fidelity, and, of course, because students are often nested in classrooms and schools, discuss how you will address this type of clustering.

Slide Twenty-seven:

Finally, there is also a cost-feasibility analysis. This is really just to identify the financial cost of the intervention. It should be detailed enough so that another state or district can make a decision on whether they can afford such an intervention, but, at the same time, we are not requiring anything like a cost-effectiveness or a cost-benefit analysis. This can be done if you would like to do it. It is not preventing that, but it is not a requirement of the application.

I am going to move on to personnel now. If you have any questions about the research plan or its significance, please feel free to send those in.

Slide Twenty-eight:

What is very important when you write the personnel section is to show that you have people with the expertise to do everything I just discussed. You want people with the expertise in the content area, in the actual intervention itself, in the design, in implementing the design and working with schools, and doing the analysis of the data.

And so, for states and districts that may not have all these personnel with such expertise, we really do ask you to consider partnering with a research organization or a university that has this expertise. That will make your application that much stronger. The peer reviewers will be looking for this connection, and it is actually important to make this connection in the personnel section.

At the same time, if a research organization has taken the lead on some of this because of their expertise, it is very important to show that the state and district personnel have a role in this evaluation because that is part of the purpose of this grant program. One thing we ask is that the state and district person who is responsible for the intervention, they should be on the team, and other state and local personnel should be on the team as well, but at least that lead person who is on the team shows that the state or the district is aware of the evaluation and is aware that they have put their most important person on this evaluation. They don't need to have a large time commitment in the project itself. Just show that they are on the team, so that they will be included in team meetings and in the discussions of how the evaluation should be done.

Slide Twenty-nine:

Then the last section is the resources section, again, not only showing the personnel have the ability to do this work, but the institution has the capacity to carry out the evaluation, so there are the support mechanisms in place at the institutions to do the work, that the key decisionmakers in the states and districts understand and support the evaluation. This can be shown, one, by having them on the team and, two, having detailed letters of support from all the actors, and when I say detailed, the more detailed, the better.

If you have a state person on and they spell out in detail what the state's role in this evaluation will be, that they intend to implement this intervention, that they will allow access to the data and to the school or that they will be providing some sort of fidelity support, whatever role they are going to have, they state it, and the same with the research institutions as well. Again, trying, though, to keep a separation, so it is clear that those persons and possibly those parts of the state implementing the intervention are not taking part in the evaluation and its design, so that there is a clear separation, and there would be no conflict of interest.

Again, that takes care of the personnel and the resources section. If you have any questions on those, please send them in.

Slide Thirty:

Moving directly to the grant information, a typical grant is $500,000 to $1.2 million a year. That is direct and indirect for up to five years, for a total of up to $6 million. One point is if you are at the maximum, you don't have to do $1.2 million strictly per year. For example, if you are doing a large-scale survey in one year, you could go over the $1.2 million that year, and in the next year, if you are focusing more on the analysis, you could drop, then, down below the $1.2 million, just as long as the total comes out, that the average comes out to $1.2 million.

You can ask for less or more. The key point, though, is to justify the budget, and I wouldn't propose just how the panels react. I wouldn't suggest too much larger over the maximum just because there will be some skepticism about how much more is necessary, but if it is obvious that you need five or ten percent more to make it work right, I would suggest putting that in and then justifying it.

And the same point, if you need to go lower, if you are doing a smaller intervention, as long as you are at the level where it is an important intervention and you will have enough, a sample size large enough to address all the questions, then you could ask for more as well, but the point is asking for less will not make it more likely for you to be funded. The key point is that how much you are asking for is linked to what you are asking to do, on what you are proposing to do.

Another major point is no funds can be used for implementation. All the funds have to be used just for the evaluation. We are having two competitions this year. The due dates for your application will be June 25th and October 1st. They are both due by 4:30, Eastern Standard Time, and I stress that because we have had people in the past whose applications have come in at 4:32 or 4:33, and they have been rejected for that reason. The earliest expected start date for the June 25th deadline is March 1, 2010, and for the October 1st deadline, it would be July 1, 2010.

Going back to that 4:30, I have been asked to stress the point that it is 4:30 and no seconds, and that is all accounted for by the computer, the government computer, not by your computer. Again, just because of some bad, bad things we have had in the past, where we were not happy to see these things not considered, and the applicants, of course, were not happy.

Slide Thirty-one:

To apply for the grant, we ask for a Letter of Intent. It is requested; it is not required. But, one, it helps the program officer determine if you are applying to the right grant, because there are other grants that may be more relevant to your work, it gives us the opportunity to take a look at that, and it also helps our Office of Standards and Review, which is responsible for the peer review process, to identify potential reviewers who are expert in the area you will be working in.

Now, the due date for the Letter of Intent for our June 25th application deadline has passed, but, if you would like to, you could still send me a paragraph on what you intend to do, and I can give you some feedback on it.

For the October 1st deadline, the Letter of Intent due date is August 3, 2009, and that is submitted electronically, and the address for that is in the Request for Application.

The Request for Application itself is at our website here, outlined in blue, and you can see that. Going to that site, you will see all our Requests for Applications, and you will want to pick out this one, the Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies.

We have also posted this year for the first time an Application Submission Guide that will help you with the application process.

Slide Thirty-two:

The reason for that is that all government grants are applied through Grants.gov. It is not specific to our program. It is more of a generic application process, and so there are some difficulties with it.

We ask that you register ahead of time, the application at Grants.gov, and the Application Package will be posted at Grants.gov. It has already been posted for the June 25th deadline, and to avoid confusion, the package for the October 1st deadline won't be posted until August 3rd. When you go onto Grants.gov, you want to download the correct Application Package, and this is the code. 84.305E2010-1 would be for the June deadline, and -2 would be for the October deadline. And to search for this, it is easier to search by application number. First search by 84.305. Then a list of those will come up, and then you select the 84.305E2010.

There is a Help Line at Grants.gov you can call, but, again, we suggest that you start a fair amount of time before the deadline just in case you run into any problem.

Slide Thirty-three:

Your application will be peer-reviewed. First, it will be looked at for compliance. Did you address the four sections that I talked through and are you addressing a state and local policy? Again, that is a good reason to send me a letter of—to send in a Letter of Intent or send me an e-mail, just so I can make sure that you are obviously—your topic area is obviously in compliance.

Then the applications are then assigned to a review panel. Two or three members of the review panel will conduct a primary review of the application, and if they score it high enough, it will then go to the full panel and be reviewed at a panel meeting.

One of those reviewers will be a content person who has knowledge about the substantial area that your intervention is taking place in. One person will be a methodologist. You need to write for those types of people, and then the panel, though, contains both people with different content and methodology expertise. In a sense, you are writing for both specialists in your content area and methodology area, but you are also writing for more generalists with a strong background in education, but they may not know your specific policy or program or the method that you are using.

Just some tips on your application. It is often useful to have an introductory paragraph that gives you, that provides the reader with a quick introduction to the intervention and your evaluation of it so they can sort of keep that in their mind as they read through the whole application. Just a very quick initial paragraph, an introductory paragraph on what you will be doing.

You want to be very clear on your description of the intervention. Some of these interventions are quite complicated with multiple components and multiple implementers, so trying to organize in a way that is clear to somebody who has no idea about the intervention at all, and sometimes graphics are useful for that.

It is often useful to have both a content and methods person read through the entire application. Sometimes applications are put together by different people with different backgrounds, and they don't flow or, in some cases, they may even contradict. Different sections may be contradictory. Having one type of person read through the whole thing can avoid those problems.

In the personnel section, it is very important to link each person's expertise to their role in the project. Rather than just saying so-and-so is an expert in survey methodology, it is good to then say "and will be responsible for the fidelity of implementation of surveys done." That looks very clear to the reviewers that you have the people for every component of your study.

Slide Thirty-four:

And then notification. All applicants will receive e-mail notification on the status of it, and they will receive copies of the reviewer comments. As you can imagine, we don't have—like some other agencies, we don't say resubmit and not resubmit. Anyone can resubmit any application, and it often is the case that people get funded on their resubmission. Once you get the reviewer comments, it is very worthwhile to discuss with the program officer the strengths and weaknesses from the review and the possibility of resubmitting for the next round.

Slide Thirty-five:

And finally, I will just put up some of the websites. Again, just our overall website, if you want to know more about us; our funding site, where the application is available at Grants.gov; and my own e-mail and phone number. If you have any questions or comments you would like to ask me after this webinar, please feel free to do this.

If you have any other questions—there is one question asking about the level of specificity of the cost-feasibility analysis. Again, it has got to be specific to the point that another district or another state can come in and say here is the intervention; here is what I have to spend to do this intervention, annually, let's say; and you may want to say over the life of a five-year project or a 10-year project, here is the initial investment, and here is the annual expenditures on that.

It is a fairly detailed thing, and it is very useful in that case to have the state or the district financial office involved to help work that out with you, as well as perhaps, if you are working with a research institution, having a finance person take part in that.

Non-core subjects like physical—the question is ***"How will a non-core subject like physical education be considered?"***

Again, you have to address the outcomes that I identified. If you can make the link between physical education and either the academic outcome, such as math, reading, or science or high school graduation or behaviors that support academic outcome, then you could make an application. However, if your outcome was a non-core subject, it wouldn't be compliant with the Request for Applications and probably wouldn't be accepted.

Are there any other questions folks would like to send in? If not, I would like to thank—oh, there is another question coming in. ***"Is the program cost information supposed to be included in the proposed work gathered?"***

It is supposed to be gathered over the cost of the study. In the proposal, you would lay out your plan for gathering the information. Now, on the other hand, if this is a historical one and it has already been gathered, you could note that and say it is available and provide a summary of it if you had this data, but the idea is that you are proposing your design for gathering this information.

The PowerPoints and the transcript of this session will be available online soon, and there will be some slides on how to submit the application. And again, if you have any questions afterward, you can e-mail or contact me at this phone number.

Once again, thanks for your participation. Take care.