



REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

Special Education Research Grants

CFDA Number: 84.324A

<u>COMPETITION ROUND</u>	Letter of Intent Due Date	Application Package Available	Application Due Date
	https://iesreview.ed.gov/	http://www.grants.gov/	http://www.grants.gov/
JUNE	April 21, 2011	April 21, 2011	June 23, 2011
SEPTEMBER	July 21, 2011	July 21, 2011	September 22, 2011

IES 2011

U.S. Department of Education

PART I GENERAL OVERVIEW	7
1. REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS	7
2. OVERVIEW	7
PART II RESEARCH GRANT TOPICS	11
3. CHANGES IN THE FY2012 REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS	11
4. REQUIREMENT TO FOCUS ON CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.....	11
5. EARLY INTERVENTION AND EARLY LEARNING IN SPECIAL EDUCATION	12
A. Purpose.....	12
B. Background	12
C. Specific Requirements	13
a. Submission to a specific goal	13
b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities	13
c. Content and sample requirements	13
6. READING, WRITING, AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT	14
A. Purpose.....	14
B. Background	14
C. Specific Requirements	15
a. Submission to a specific goal	15
b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities	15
c. Content and sample requirements	15
7. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION.....	15
A. Purpose.....	15
B. Background	15
C. Specific Requirements	16
a. Submission to a specific goal	16
b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities	17
c. Content and sample requirements	17
8. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES TO SUPPORT LEARNING	17
A. Purpose.....	17
B. Background	17
C. Specific Requirements	18
a. Submission to a specific goal	18
b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities	18
c. Content and sample requirements	18
9. TRANSITION OUTCOMES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION SECONDARY STUDENTS.....	19
A. Purpose.....	19
B. Background	19
C. Specific Requirements	20
a. Submission to specific goal	20
b. Focus on children with disabilities	20
c. Content and sample requirements	20
10. COGNITION AND STUDENT LEARNING IN SPECIAL EDUCATION	20
A. Purpose.....	20
B. Background	21
C. Specific Requirements	22
a. Submission to a specific goal	22
b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities	22
c. Content and sample requirements	22
d. Research setting requirements.....	22
e. Methods appropriate for Exploration and Development and Innovation studies	23
11. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS AND RELATED SERVICES PROVIDERS	23
A. Purpose.....	23
B. Background	24

C. Specific Requirements	25
a. Submission to a specific goal	25
b. Focus on children with disabilities	25
c. Content and sample requirements	25
12. SPECIAL EDUCATION POLICY, FINANCE, AND SYSTEMS	26
A. Purpose.....	26
B. Background	26
C. Specific Requirements	28
a. Submission to a specific goal	28
b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities	28
c. Content and sample requirements	28
13. AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDERS.....	28
A. Purpose.....	28
B. Background	29
C. Specific Requirements	29
a. Submission to a specific goal	29
b. Focus on children with disabilities	30
b. Content and sample requirements.....	30
14. TECHNOLOGY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION	30
A. Purpose.....	30
B. Background	30
C. Specific Requirements	31
a. Submission to a specific goal	31
b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities	31
c. Content and sample requirements	32
15. FAMILIES OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES	33
A. Purpose.....	33
B. Background	33
C. Specific Requirements	33
a. Submission to a specific goal	33
b. Focus on children with disabilities	34
c. Content and sample requirements	34
PART III REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSED RESEARCH	35
16. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSED RESEARCH	35
A. Basic Requirements.....	35
a. Resubmissions	35
b. Applying to a topic	35
c. Applying to multiple topics	35
d. Applying to a particular goal within a topic	36
e. Determining which goal is most appropriate for the proposed project.....	36
B. Requirements for Goal One: Exploration.....	36
a. Purpose of Exploration Projects.....	36
b. Significance of the project	37
c. Methodological requirements	38
(i) Research design	38
(ii) Sample	38
(iii) Data sources	38
(iv) Data analysis.....	39
d. Personnel	39
e. Resources.....	40
f. Additional considerations.....	40
g. Awards.....	40
C. Requirements for Goal Two: Development and Innovation	40
a. Purpose of Development and Innovation (Development/Innovation) Projects.....	40

b.	Significance of the project	41
(i)	Research aims.....	41
(ii)	Context for the proposed intervention.....	41
(iii)	Intervention, theory of change, and theoretical and empirical rationale	41
(iv)	Practical importance	42
(v)	Rationale justifying the importance of the proposed research	42
c.	Methodological requirements	42
(i)	Sample	42
(ii)	Iterative development process	43
(iii)	Feasibility of implementation	43
(iv)	Pilot study.....	43
(v)	Measures	44
d.	Personnel	44
e.	Resources.....	44
f.	Additional considerations.....	44
g.	Awards.....	45
D.	Requirements for Goal Three: Efficacy and Replication.....	45
a.	Purpose of Efficacy and Replication (Efficacy/Replication) Projects	45
b.	Significance of the project	46
(i)	Research aims.....	46
(ii)	Interventions are ready to be evaluated.....	46
(iii)	Theory of change	47
(iv)	Rationale for evaluating interventions that are already in wide use	47
(v)	Rationale for evaluating interventions that are not in wide use	48
c.	Methodological requirements	48
(i)	Sample	48
(ii)	Research design	48
(iii)	Power	49
(iv)	Measures	50
(v)	Fidelity of implementation of the intervention.....	50
(vi)	Comparison group.....	51
(vii)	Moderating and mediating variables	51
(viii)	Data analysis.....	52
(ix)	Requirements for single-case experimental designs	52
d.	Efficacy follow-up studies	54
(i)	Significance of efficacy follow-up studies.....	54
(ii)	Methodological requirements for efficacy follow-up studies	55
e.	Personnel	55
f.	Resources	56
g.	Additional considerations.....	56
h.	Awards.....	56
E.	Requirements for Goal Four: Scale-Up Evaluation.....	56
a.	Purpose of Scale-up Evaluation Projects	56
(i)	Routine implementation of the intervention.....	57
(ii)	Independent evaluation of the intervention	57
(iii)	Generating evidence that the intervention works under different conditions	57
(iv)	Understanding the organizational conditions needed to support the intervention	58
(v)	Determining the effects of selected moderators of the intervention	58
b.	Significance of the project	58
(i)	Research aims.....	58
(ii)	Description of the intervention	58
(iii)	Theory of change	59
(iv)	Strong evidence of educationally meaningful effects.....	59
(v)	Conditions of implementation	59

(vi) Importance of the proposed project.....	60
c. Methodological requirements	60
d. Scale-up follow-up studies	60
e. Personnel	60
f. Resources	61
g. Additional considerations	61
h. Awards.....	61
F. Requirements for Goal Five: Measurement.....	62
a. Purpose of Measurement Projects	62
b. Significance of the project	62
(i) Research aims.....	62
(ii) Theoretical and empirical rationale	62
(iii) Description of the assessment	63
(iv) Overall importance of the proposed research	63
c. Methodological requirements	63
d. Personnel	64
e. Resources.....	65
f. Additional considerations.....	65
g. Awards.....	65
PART IV GENERAL SUBMISSION AND REVIEW INFORMATION	66
17. MECHANISM OF SUPPORT	66
18. FUNDING AVAILABLE	66
19. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS	66
20. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS	66
21. DESIGNATION OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	67
22. LETTER OF INTENT	67
A. Content	67
B. Format and Page Limitation	68
23. MANDATORY SUBMISSION OF ELECTRONIC APPLICATIONS	68
24. APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS AND APPLICATION PACKAGE	68
A. Documents Needed to Prepare Applications.....	68
B. Date Application Package is Available on Grants.gov	68
C. Download Correct Application Package	69
a. CFDA number	69
b. Special Education Research Application Package	69
25. SUBMISSION PROCESS AND DEADLINE.....	69
26. APPLICATION CONTENT AND FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS.....	69
A. Overview.....	69
B. General Format Requirements	69
a. Page and margin specifications	69
b. Spacing of text.....	69
c. Type size (font size)	70
d. Graphs, diagrams, tables	70
C. Project Summary/Abstract	70
a. Submission	70
b. Page limitations and format requirements.....	70
c. Content	70
D. Project Narrative.....	71
a. Submission	71
b. Page limitations and format requirements.....	71
c. Format for citing references in text.....	71
d. Content	71
E. Appendix A (Optional)	71
a. Submission	71

b. Page limitations and format requirements.....	71
c. Content	71
F. Appendix B (Optional)	72
a. Submission	72
b. Page limitations and format requirements.....	72
c. Content	72
G. Appendix C (Optional).....	72
a. Submission	72
b. Page limitations and format requirements.....	72
c. Content	72
H. Bibliography and References Cited	72
a. Submission	72
b. Page limitations and format requirements.....	72
c. Content	72
27. APPLICATION PROCESSING	73
28. PEER REVIEW PROCESS	73
29. REVIEW CRITERIA FOR SCIENTIFIC MERIT	73
A. Significance	73
B. Research Plan	73
C. Personnel	73
D. Resources	73
30. RECEIPT AND START DATE SCHEDULE	74
A. Letter of Intent Receipt Dates.....	74
B. Application Deadline Dates	74
C. Earliest Anticipated Start Date	74
D. Latest Possible Start Date	74
31. AWARD DECISIONS.....	74
32. INQUIRIES MAY BE SENT TO	74
A. Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education	74
B. Reading, Writing, and Language Development.....	74
C. Mathematics and Science Education	74
D. Social and Behavioral Outcomes to Support Learning.....	75
E. Transition Outcomes for Special Education Secondary Students	75
F. Cognition and Student Learning in Special Education.....	75
G. Professional Development for Teachers and Related Services Providers.....	75
H. Special Education Policy, Finance, and Systems	75
I. Autism Spectrum Disorders	75
J. Technology for Special Education	76
K. Families of Children with Disabilities	76
33. PROGRAM AUTHORITY.....	76
34. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS	76
35. REFERENCES	76

PART I GENERAL OVERVIEW

1. REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

In this announcement, the Institute of Education Sciences (Institute) requests applications for research projects that will contribute to its special education research programs in Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education; Reading, Writing, and Language Development; Mathematics and Science Education; Social and Behavioral Outcomes to Support Learning; Transition Outcomes for Special Education Secondary Students; Cognition and Student Learning in Special Education; Professional Development for Teachers and Related Services Providers; Special Education Policy, Finance, and Systems; Autism Spectrum Disorders; Technology for Special Education; and Families of Children with Disabilities. For the FY2012 competition, the Institute will consider only applications that meet the requirements outlined below under *Part II Research Grant Topics* and *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*.

Separate funding announcements are available on the Institute's website that pertain to the other research and research training grant programs funded through the Institute's National Center for Special Education Research (<http://ncser.ed.gov>) and to the discretionary grant competitions funded through the Institute's National Center for Education Research (<http://ncer.ed.gov>). An overview of the Institute's research grant programs is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/funding/overview.asp>.

2. OVERVIEW

Through its Special Education Research grant program, the Institute supports research over a diverse set of child outcomes and for a range of purposes. The outcomes include school readiness, achievement in core academic content (reading, writing, mathematics, science), and behaviors that support learning in academic contexts for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities from prekindergarten through high school. Additional outcomes of interest include developmental outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and functional outcomes that improve educational results and transitions to employment, independent living, and postsecondary education for students with disabilities.

The work of the Institute is grounded in the principle that effective education research must address the interests and needs of education practitioners and policymakers, as well as students, parents and community members (see <http://ies.ed.gov/director/board/priorities.asp> for the Institute's priorities). To this end, the Institute encourages researchers to develop partnerships with stakeholder groups to advance the relevance of their work, the accessibility of their publications, and the usability of their findings for the day-to-day work of education practitioners and policymakers.

Applications submitted to the FY2012 competition must address a specific topic (e.g., Cognition and Student Learning in Special Education) and goal. The topics are described in Part II. A brief description of the research goals is presented below with the full description given in Part III. The research goals are designed to span the range from basic translational research to evaluation of the impact of interventions when the interventions are implemented under conditions of routine practice.

Project Goal

Exploration

The Institute solicits projects to explore the relations between education outcomes and malleable factors (i.e., factors that can be changed, such as child behaviors, teachers' practices, school management practices, and education programs and policies), as well as mediators or moderators of those relations. Exploring the relations between malleable factors and education outcomes is translational research; it is intended to inform the development of interventions (e.g., programs, practices, or policies) that can improve education outcomes or to identify the conditions that are associated with better implementation of interventions. Exploratory research can also be used to identify existing practices, programs, or policies that are associated with better education outcomes. The results from this work may either inform the development of interventions or lead to evaluations of

interventions to determine whether they are the actual cause of the better outcomes, as opposed to some other factor that has yet to be uncovered.

Since the Institute established the goal structure for its Special Education Research grant program, approximately 7 percent of the funded projects have been exploratory projects.¹

Development and Innovation

The Institute supports projects to develop innovative education interventions – programs, practices, technology, policies – or to improve existing education interventions. To develop or improve education interventions requires an iterative process of designing, testing, revising, and testing to produce a product or system that functions in the way that the developer intends for it to function and that can be implemented in actual education delivery settings (e.g., schools). This iterative process, sometimes called a systems-engineering approach, is important for producing interventions that have the potential to be *potent* and *robust*.

Since the Institute established the goal structure for its Special Education Research grant program, about 53 percent of the funded projects have been development projects.¹

Efficacy and Replication

The vast majority of the education programs, practices, and policies that are implemented in U.S. schools have never been rigorously evaluated to determine if they are able to improve student learning (or other desired education outcomes) relative to any other education intervention. The Institute funds experimental and quasi-experimental research projects to evaluate the efficacy of newly developed and existing education programs, practices, and policies under limited conditions. Efficacy projects determine whether an intervention can have a positive impact on the outcomes of interest within a narrow or limited set of conditions – in particular, under conditions in which researchers are providing support for the proper implementation of the intervention.

Efficacy projects also provide an estimate of how *potent* the intervention is for producing the desired outcome. By potent, the Institute refers to the strength of the impact of the intervention. For example, suppose a district has students who are two years below grade-level expectations on reading assessments at the beginning of first grade and wants to have all students reading at grade level by the end of fourth grade. The district might look for reading interventions that are potent enough to produce 1.5 years of growth per year in first, second, third, and fourth grades. An extra half year of growth in each year could bring the students who are two years behind in first grade up to grade-level expectations by the end of fourth grade.

The utility of the intervention – the degree to which it is feasible and practical for implementation in schools – is a key aspect of efficacy evaluations. Interventions that are difficult to implement with fidelity under the supported conditions of an efficacy study are unlikely to be implemented well when the intervention is implemented under conditions of routine practice. In addition, the Institute expects efficacy projects to identify the conditions that are needed to support implementation of the intervention with high fidelity.

¹This percentage is based on all grants funded through the special education research competitions and does not include grants awarded under competitions for which the Institute's research goal structure did not apply (e.g., all Research & Development Center awards).

Since the Institute established the goal structure for its Special Education Research grant program, about 21 percent of the funded projects have been efficacy and replication projects.¹

Scale-up Evaluation

The Institute funds scale-up evaluations to determine whether or not an intervention is effective when it is implemented under conditions of routine implementation, that is, implementation that would happen if the district were to implement it on its own without special support from the developer or research team. Scale-up evaluations are conducted by evaluation teams, which are independent from the developer/distributor of the intervention.

Since the Institute established the goal structure for its Special Education Research grant program, about 1 percent of the funded projects have been scale-up evaluations.¹

Measurement

The Institute supports research to develop and validate measurement instruments that are intended for purposes such as screening, progress monitoring, and outcome assessments. Typically, the instruments are ones used by practitioners. For example, the Institute encourages the development and validation of formative assessments intended to provide teachers with information that can be used to inform subsequent instruction. However, the Institute also recognizes that there are circumstances in which an instrument needs to be developed that will primarily be used by researchers whose translational research will ultimately lead to improvements in education and special education practices. The Institute supports research to develop and validate such measurement instruments.

Since the Institute established the goal structure for its Special Education Research grant program, about 17 percent of the funded projects have been measurement projects.¹

The Institute's research programs are intended to cover the range of research, development, and evaluation activities necessary for building a scientific enterprise that can provide solutions to the education problems in our nation. Focusing on only one type of research activity will not produce the results that the nation seeks. We need *innovation and development* because we have not yet solved old problems (e.g., the achievement gap) and we continue to face new problems and opportunities (e.g., integrating new technologies, building on new findings on how students learn, addressing large groups of students new to the United States and moving to communities that have not worked with such students before). Innovation and development can lead to the design of potent and robust interventions that may be effective for improving education outcomes. However, development and innovation cannot stand-alone. On the front end, the work of creating more potent and more robust interventions benefits from exploratory research to uncover underlying processes and identify promising approaches to test. This research, although at times quite basic, is translational research that is intended to inform the development of new and more powerful interventions. On the back end, we need evaluations that test the effect of the interventions on their intended outcomes. Education has always produced new ideas, new innovations, and new approaches, but as in any field, new is not always better. Evaluations can tell us which programs and policies actually produce positive effects on education outcomes, which need more work to become more potent or more robust, and which should be discarded. Only appropriate empirical evaluation can identify those programs that do in fact improve student outcomes.

Finally, the Institute intends for its research programs to contribute to the generation of new knowledge and theories relevant to learning, instruction, and education systems. The goal structure of the Institute's research programs divides the research process into stages. Under the Exploration goal, researchers generate hypotheses about the components and processes involved in learning and instruction and in the operation of education systems. They develop models about how they think

systems function to bring about education outcomes. Under Development and Innovation, investigators build on prior theoretical and empirical work to propose a theory of change for a specific intervention. The intervention, in essence, is an instantiation of the theory. Efficacy and Replication trials test the impact of specific interventions under limited conditions. Scale-up evaluations assess the impact of specific interventions when implemented under conditions of routine practice. Both Efficacy and Scale-up evaluations constitute tests of the theory. Results from these studies should inform further theory development and refinement. Development and validation of assessments also contribute to theory development and theory testing. Taken together, work across the various goals should not only yield information on the practical benefits about the effects of specific interventions on education outcomes but also contribute to the bigger picture of scientific knowledge and theory on learning, instruction, and education systems.

PART II RESEARCH GRANT TOPICS

For FY2012, the Institute's National Center for Special Education Research is accepting applications for research grants on June 23, 2011, and September 22, 2011. In this section, the Institute describes the eleven research grant topics.

3. CHANGES IN THE FY2012 REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

The Institute has added two new research topics: Technology for Special Education and Families of Children with Disabilities. In addition, the Institute has modified requirements for Exploration, Efficacy/Replication, and Scale-up projects. A third appendix (Appendix C) has also been added so that applicants can include all letters of agreement.

The Institute strongly advises all applicants to carefully read through the requirements relevant to the proposed research regarding topics (Part II), research goals (Part III), and general submission information (Part IV).

4. REQUIREMENT TO FOCUS ON CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

For the purpose of Institute's special education research programs, a student with a disability is defined in Public Law 108-446, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA), as a child "(i) with mental retardation, hearing impairments (including deafness), speech or language impairments, visual impairments (including blindness), serious emotional disturbance (referred to in this title as 'emotional disturbance'), orthopedic impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities; and (ii) who, by reason thereof, needs special education and related services" (Part A, Sec. 602). An infant or toddler with a disability is defined in IDEA as, "an individual under 3 years of age who needs early intervention services because the individual (i) is experiencing developmental delays, as measured by appropriate diagnostic instruments and procedures in 1 or more of the areas of cognitive development, physical development, communication development, social or emotional development, and adaptive development; or (ii) has a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay" (Part C, Sec. 632).

The Institute encourages research on high-incidence and low-incidence disabilities.

Applicants to the Transition Outcomes for Special Education Secondary Students, Autism Spectrum Disorders, and Families of Children with Disabilities topics may study students with disabilities *only* and may not study students at risk for a disability.

For all other topics, applicants may propose to study children who are *at risk for developing disabilities*. Applicants proposing to study children at risk for developing disabilities should present research-based evidence of an association between risk factors in their proposed sample and the potential identification of specific disabilities. The determination of at-risk for disabilities status must be made on an *individual child basis* and may include, for example, factors used for moving children to higher tiers in a Response to Intervention model. *The method to be used for determining if a child is at risk for developing a specific disability should be made explicit in applications and should be completed as part of the sample selection process.* Evidence consisting only of general population characteristics (e.g., labeling children as "at risk for disabilities" because they are from low income families or are English learners) is *not* sufficient for this purpose. In addition, applicants should identify the disability or disability categories that the sampled children are at risk of developing.

Although the focus of the research must be on students with or at risk for disabilities, students without disabilities may be included in the sample (e.g., an inclusive classroom) if appropriate for the research

questions. For example, students without disabilities may be part of the comparison population or part of the research sample for assessment development and validation.

5. EARLY INTERVENTION AND EARLY LEARNING IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

Program Officer: Dr. Joan McLaughlin (202-219-1309; Joan.McLaughlin@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

Through its research program on Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education (Early Intervention), the Institute supports research that contributes to the improvement of developmental outcomes and school readiness of infants, toddlers, and young children (from birth through age 5) with disabilities or at risk for disabilities. The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of tools and strategies (e.g., assessment tools, curricula, programs, services, interventions) that have been documented to be effective for improving developmental outcomes or school readiness of infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities or at risk for disabilities.

B. Background

More than one million infants, toddlers, and young children (birth through five years old) receive early intervention or early childhood special education services under IDEA (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Relatively little rigorous research, however, has been conducted to evaluate the impact of early interventions or early childhood special education services for improving child outcomes (National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2000). Under the Early Intervention research program, the Institute supports research on early intervention practices, curricula, professional development, and systems-level programs and policies.

The Institute intends for its Early Intervention research program to support research on infants, toddlers, and young children with high- or low-incidence disabilities, or at risk for disabilities. Applicants may, for example, propose research on interventions intended to improve the articulation, expressive vocabulary, and word retrieval skills of toddlers with Prader-Willi Syndrome. As another example, applicants might propose to develop interventions designed to be delivered by physical or occupational therapists and intended to improve the gross motor skills (e.g., rolling, sitting, and crawling) and fine motor skills (e.g., reaching and grasping) of infants with disabilities. Interventions may also include training provided to parents to enable them to deliver interventions to their child.

Also appropriate under this topic is research on professional development programs intended to improve services to infants, toddlers, or young children with or at risk for disabilities, and thereby improve developmental outcomes or school readiness. Professional development programs may be for early intervention specialists, teachers, or related service providers. For example, an applicant might propose to evaluate a professional development training program for occupational therapists to improve self-care behaviors of toddlers with visual impairments.

Under the Early Intervention topic, the Institute encourages research on systemic interventions intended to directly or indirectly improve developmental outcomes or school readiness of infants, toddlers, or young children with or at risk for disabilities. Examples of systemic interventions include (a) programs to improve the development and implementation of Individualized Family Service Plans or preschoolers' Individualized Education Programs; (b) programs or procedures intended to better coordinate service delivery systems; (c) Response to Intervention approaches; and (d) interventions intended to improve collaboration among families, service providers, and educators and promote smooth transitions as children move from Early Intervention services to preschool settings.

The Institute supports a wide variety of research through the Early Intervention program, including exploratory research on malleable factors that are associated with better developmental and school readiness outcomes for infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities or at risk for disabilities, as well as research to develop and validate measurement instruments. For example, researchers may

propose to develop and validate measures that can be used not only for measuring infants' developmental outcomes, but also for determining program areas that need improvement and for providing data for accountability purposes.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Early Intervention research program, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluations *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the Early Intervention topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities

This research program is restricted to early intervention and special education research for infants, toddlers, or young children with disabilities or at risk for disabilities. Please adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

- Research must focus on infants, toddlers, or young children (preschool or prekindergarten children) with high- or low-incidence disabilities, or at risk for disabilities. For research that spans early childhood and the early elementary grades, the applicant may choose to submit the application to the Early Intervention program or may choose to submit the application under the appropriate content area (e.g., Reading, Writing, and Language Development; Mathematics and Science Education; Social and Behavioral Outcomes to Support Learning).
- Research must address either developmental outcomes pertaining to cognitive, communicative, linguistic, social, emotional, adaptive, functional or physical development or school readiness outcomes (i.e., reading, pre-reading, pre-writing, early mathematics, early science, or social-emotional skills that prepare young children for school).
- Interventions may be school-based interventions or may occur in other natural settings (e.g., home-based, child care settings) or may be systemic interventions.
- Interventions designed to provide direct services to infants, toddlers, or young children may be delivered by early intervention specialists, teachers, related service providers (e.g., speech-language pathologists, physical therapists), or parents. Professional development interventions may target professionals or paraprofessionals who provide services to infants, toddlers, or young children with disabilities or at risk for disabilities.
- Under the Measurement goal, assessments of the knowledge or performance of early intervention and early childhood special education practitioners, as well as assessments of the quality of early intervention/early childhood special education programs and systems must be related to measures of child outcomes.
- All applicants must include measures of child outcomes (e.g., developmental or school readiness outcomes).

6. READING, WRITING, AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Program Officer: Dr. Kristen Lauer (202-219-0377; Kristen.Lauer@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

Through its Reading, Writing, and Language Development (Reading/Language) special education research program, the Institute intends to contribute to the improvement of reading, writing, and language skills for students with or at risk for disabilities. The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of tools and strategies (e.g., assessments, instructional approaches) that have been documented to be effective for improving reading, writing, or language outcomes for students with or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12.

B. Background

Students with disabilities do not attain the same performance thresholds as their peers on a range of language, reading, and writing outcome measures. For example, the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicates that 62 percent of eighth graders with disabilities who participated in the assessment scored below the basic level in reading achievement in contrast to 21 percent of eighth graders without disabilities. Reading below the basic level means that when reading grade-appropriate text, these students cannot extract the general meaning of text, make obvious connections between the text and their own experiences, or make simple inferences from the text. In other words, approximately two-thirds of eighth graders with disabilities who take the NAEP do not understand what they have read. In writing, a similar picture emerges. On the 2007 NAEP writing assessment, 45 percent of Grade 8 students with disabilities who participated in the assessment scored below the basic level in contrast to 8 percent of students without disabilities. The NAEP results make clear the substantial gap in reading and writing skills between students with and without disabilities.

The Institute intends for its Reading/Language special education research program to support research to increase our understanding of the development of reading, writing, and language in students with disabilities, or at risk for disabilities, and, ultimately, to improve reading, writing, and language outcomes for students with disabilities, or at risk for disabilities, from kindergarten through Grade 12. The types of projects that are appropriate for this program are illustrated by, but not limited to, the examples provided below.

Under the Reading/Language research program, the Institute supports research on interventions for students with high- or low- incidence disabilities that are delivered to the student by teachers, related service providers, or other school personnel. For example, an applicant might propose to adapt an existing comprehensive reading curriculum for students with hearing impairments or to develop instructional strategies for improving language/communication skills of students with significant intellectual disabilities. As another example, applicants could consider developing instructional approaches or strategies for improving reading comprehension that could be incorporated into instruction in content courses (e.g., history, science) for middle- or high-school students with learning disabilities. Under the Reading/Language research program, the Institute also accepts applications on interventions that could be used as a tier in a Response to Intervention model. For example, a researcher might propose to evaluate a secondary-tier language intervention that is delivered by speech/language therapists.

The Institute encourages the development and validation of assessments for purposes such as screening, progress monitoring, or evaluating outcomes in reading, writing, or language. For example, applicants could compare the relative predictive validity of short-term dynamic assessments versus progress monitoring instruments. The Institute is particularly interested in the development and validation of assessment instruments that are designed for use by practitioners.

The Institute encourages researchers to explore malleable factors (e.g., instructional practices, curricula, children's behaviors or skills) that are associated with better reading, writing, or language outcomes for

students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities, as well as mediators or moderators of the relations between these factors and student outcomes, *for the purpose of identifying potential targets of intervention*. This is translational research intended to inform development of innovative interventions to improve reading, writing, or language outcomes for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Reading/Language research program, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluations *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the Reading/Language topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer listed in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities. Please adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

- Research must focus on children with high- or low-incidence disabilities, or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12. For research that spans early childhood and the early elementary grades, the applicant may choose to submit the application to the Early Intervention program or may choose to submit the application to the Reading/Language program.
- Research must address reading, pre-reading, writing, pre-writing, or language outcomes.
- Interventions must be for use in schools, alternative school settings, or supplemental education services as defined in Section 1116(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.
- Interventions may be delivered by teachers, related service providers, or other instructional staff.
- All applicants must include child outcome measures of reading, pre-reading, writing, pre-writing, or language.

7. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

Program Officer: Dr. Rob Ochsendorf (202-219-2234; Robert.Ochsendorf@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

The Institute intends for its Mathematics and Science Education (Math/Science) program to improve mathematics and science outcomes for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12. The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of tools and strategies (e.g., assessments, instructional approaches) that have been demonstrated to be effective for improving mathematics and science learning and achievement for students with or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12.

B. Background

Students with disabilities lag behind their peers without disabilities in both mathematics and science achievement. For example, in the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

mathematics assessment, 64 percent of Grade 8 students with disabilities who participated in the assessment scored below the basic level compared to 23 percent of students without disabilities. In the 2009 NAEP science assessment, 69 percent of Grade 8 students with disabilities who participated in the assessment scored below the basic level in the science assessment compared to 33 percent of Grade 8 students without disabilities.

Through the Math/Science program, the Institute encourages researchers to contribute to knowledge and theory about the development of mathematics or science knowledge and skills among children with disabilities. Researchers may, for example, examine underlying developmental processes by studying malleable factors (e.g., instructional practices, curricula, children's behaviors or skills) that are associated with better mathematics or science outcomes for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities, as well as mediators or moderators of the relations between these factors and student outcomes, *for the purpose of identifying potential targets of intervention*.

Through this program, the Institute is primarily interested in research that addresses core mathematics and science content (e.g., Mathematics: addition/subtraction, fractions, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, calculus; Science: physical science, earth science, life science). The Institute recognizes that instruction in mathematics and science is shaped by theories that vary in their implications regarding, for example, the importance of active student construction of knowledge through discovery- or inquiry-based learning, and the need for direct and explicit instruction for concept and skill development. The Institute does **not** limit research to any particular framework, and is interested in proposals to develop or test different theoretically-based approaches for teaching mathematics or science to students with disabilities.

Interventions appropriate for research under this program are interventions for students with high- or low-incidence disabilities that are delivered to the student by teachers or other school staff. For example, a number of interventions (e.g., Nemeth code tutorials for students or teachers, embossed graphics for presenting visual information, captioned media) have been developed to make mathematics or science content more accessible for students with blindness, visual impairments, deafness, or hearing impairments. Relatively little systematic research has been conducted on the impact of interventions such as these, and the Institute encourages researchers to propose projects to conduct rigorous research on the effect of such interventions on learning outcomes for students with disabilities. Under the Math/Science special education research program, the Institute accepts applications on interventions that could be used as a tier in a Response to Intervention model.

In addition, the Institute invites proposals to develop and/or validate mathematics and science measurement tools for classroom assessments to be used for instructional purposes (e.g., progress monitoring). To improve mathematics and science skills, instruction may need to be tailored to the sources of difficulty that individual students experience. An ideal learning environment might involve regular and frequent assessment of skills and the possibility of individualized instruction for students based on the particular source of their difficulties.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Math/Science research program, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluations *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the Math/Science topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly advises potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer listed in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities. Please adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

- Research must focus on children with high- or low-incidence disabilities, or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12. For research that spans early childhood and the early elementary grades, the applicant may choose to submit the application to the Early Intervention program or may choose to submit the application to the Math/Science program.
- Research must address mathematics, early mathematics, science, or early science outcomes.
- Interventions must be for use in schools, alternative school settings, or supplemental education services as defined in Section 1116(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.
- Interventions may be delivered by teachers, related service providers, or other instructional staff.
- All applicants must include measures of mathematics, early mathematics, science, or early science outcomes.

8. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES TO SUPPORT LEARNING

Program Officer: Dr. Jacquelyn Buckley (202-219-2130; Jacquelyn.Buckley@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

The purpose of the Social and Behavioral Outcomes to Support Learning (Social/Behavioral) research grant program is to contribute to the prevention or amelioration of behavior problems in students with or at risk for disabilities and concomitantly, improve their academic outcomes. The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of tools and strategies (e.g., assessments, interventions) that have been documented to be effective for preventing behavior problems and improving the behavioral, emotional, social skills, and likewise, the academic performance of students with or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12.

B. Background

Behavior problems continue to be a concern for school staff and parents of students with disabilities. Research on the efficacy of behavioral interventions and supports designed to manage, control, and prevent a range of behavior and antisocial problems (e.g., social skills deficits, violence toward peers or adults, self-injury, noncompliance, bullying, withdrawal, truancy) in a range of settings (e.g., school, general and special education classrooms, home, work, community) is historically robust. However, much remains to be done to understand and advance the application, scalability, and sustainability of these behavioral interventions and supports in school settings, particularly in alternative settings such as alternative schools or juvenile justice settings.

Under the Social/Behavioral research program, the Institute supports research on interventions to improve social or behavioral outcomes for students with high- or low-incidence disabilities, or at risk for disabilities. Examples of interventions appropriate for development or evaluation under the Social/Behavioral research program include (a) programs or practices designed to improve students' social and behavioral skills for succeeding in school and/or reduce student anti-social behavior, (e.g. aggression, delinquency, bullying), and (b) schoolwide or classroom behavior management programs. For example, researchers may evaluate a classroom-based program to decrease problem behaviors (e.g., aggression, disruption) and increase appropriate behaviors (e.g., positive social interactions) for students with autism in inclusive classrooms. The program might include specific classroom management

strategies for the teacher along with specific behavior skills for a student with autism taught by a paraprofessional. As another example, a program may be developed to improve social skills and peer relations among students with learning disabilities and their peers.

The Institute encourages research that integrates the disciplines of special education and mental health with the goal of preventing behavior problems and improving the academic outcomes for students with disabilities. Considerable work focusing on interventions that are aimed at preventing or ameliorating behavior disorders in children and youth has been conducted in the areas of developmental psychopathology, prevention research, and children's mental health services. Much of this work focuses on improving social and behavioral functioning in schools and other community settings, yet there has been relatively little systematic effort to bridge these efforts with prevention and intervention research in special education. The Institute also encourages researchers to consider, for example, tailoring programs developed in children's mental health aimed at preventing behavior and mental health disorders (e.g., conduct disorder) and evaluating the impact of those programs on *school-based behavior and academic outcomes*, including referral and classification for special education.

In addition to research on social/behavioral interventions and measures, the Institute supports research to explore the relations between malleable factors (i.e., things that can be changed, such as student competencies and education practices) and education outcomes to identify *potential targets of intervention*. Under the Social/Behavioral research program, malleable factors may be underlying competencies (e.g., self-regulation) that are correlated with social, emotional, or behavioral outcomes in the classroom. In addition, malleable factors appropriate for the Social/Behavioral research program include behavior management strategies, as well as interventions for improving the social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes that are associated with academic learning for children with disabilities or at risk for disabilities.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Social/Behavioral research program, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluations *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the Social/Behavioral topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities. Please adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

- Research must focus on children with high- or low-incidence disabilities, or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12. For research that spans early childhood and the early elementary grades, the applicant may choose to submit the application to the Early Intervention program or may choose to submit the application to the Social/Behavioral program.
- Research must address social, emotional, or behavioral outcomes that support learning.
- Interventions must be school-based interventions (i.e., programs must be coordinated through the school or district). However, the delivery of the intervention may occur in other settings (e.g., home settings, residential treatment programs).

- Interventions may be delivered by teachers, school psychologists, related service providers, other school-based or school-affiliated staff (e.g., clinical psychologists working with a school district), or parents.
- All applicants must include measures of students' education outcomes. By education outcomes, the Institute means those measures of learning and achievement that are important to parents, teachers, and school administrators (e.g., grades, achievement test scores, graduation rates, percentage of time spent in the general education environment).

9. TRANSITION OUTCOMES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION SECONDARY STUDENTS

Program Officer: Dr. Amanda Hoffman, (202-208-1177; Amanda.Hoffman@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

The purpose of the research program on Transition Outcomes for Special Education Secondary Students (Transition) is to contribute to the improvement of transition outcomes of secondary students with disabilities. Transition outcomes include the behavioral, social, communicative, functional, occupational, and academic skills that enable young adults with disabilities to obtain and hold meaningful employment, live independently, and obtain further training and education (e.g., postsecondary education, vocational education programs). The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of tools and strategies (e.g., assessments, intervention programs) that have been documented to be effective in improving transition outcomes for secondary students with disabilities.

B. Background

Education practitioners and policymakers face considerable challenges in improving transition outcomes for secondary students with disabilities. According to recent reports from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (Wagner, Newman, Cameto, & Levine, 2006; Newman, Wagner, Cameto, & Knokey, 2009), a study of a nationally representative sample of adolescents across the disability categories, 6 to 8 times as many students with disabilities than students without disabilities scored more than two standard deviations below the mean (i.e., scores below 70) on measures of academic performance. Among those individuals who were up to four years out of high school, about 20 percent had dropped out prior to receiving a diploma. In addition, a substantial minority experienced social and behavioral problems (e.g., 21 percent reported having been in a physical fight in the past year; 28 percent had been arrested); Individuals with disabilities were also significantly less likely to attend postsecondary education (45 percent) than were individuals without disabilities (53 percent). In addition, about 15 percent of youth with disabilities were not engaged in their community either through postsecondary education, job training, or employment.

The Institute's Transition program is intended to address the challenges for improving the transition outcomes of secondary students with high- or low-incidence disabilities and to contribute to our knowledge and theory about development of students with disabilities as they transition out of secondary education.

Under this topic, the Institute is particularly interested in applications to develop or evaluate interventions intended to improve students' transition from high school to work settings, independent living, or further education and training. For example, an applicant might propose to develop a work-related intervention including school and workplace components that is intended to improve transition into employment for students with significant intellectual disabilities. In addition, the Institute invites applications to develop and validate instruments designed to assess behaviors and skills that are related to successful transitions from school to work, independent-living, or further education. For example, an applicant could propose to develop and validate an instrument to assess specific behaviors and functional skills (e.g., social interaction and communication skills, motor skills, and personal living skills) that are predictive of successful transition to employment for students with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to specific goal

For the Transition research program, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluations *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the Transition topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer listed in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for students with disabilities. Applicants proposing to study students at risk for developing disabilities are *not* eligible to submit to the Transition research program. Please adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

- Research must address transition outcomes. By transition outcomes, the Institute means those behavioral, social, communicative, functional, occupational, and basic academic skills that enable young adults with disabilities to obtain and hold meaningful employment, live independently, and obtain further training and education (e.g., vocational education programs). By basic academic skills, the Institute refers to functional literacy and math skills (e.g., adding and subtracting whole numbers or fractions, as well as calculations involving money or time).
- Research must address secondary students with high- or low-incidence disabilities. By secondary students, the Institute means students in middle or high school. Projects may study students with disabilities at the post-secondary levels (e.g., students no longer eligible for services under IDEA due to graduation or age-out) only if the purpose is to improve services and interventions at the secondary level (e.g., collect data from high school students and recent high school graduates to inform the development of a school-based or community-based transition program for high school students with disabilities).
- Eligible intervention programs are those that are school-based alone, school-based with a home component or community-based component, alternate school settings, or community-based programs that primarily serve individuals receiving IDEA services.
- All applicants must include measures of students' transition outcomes.

10. COGNITION AND STUDENT LEARNING IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

Program Officer: Dr. Amy Sussman (202-219-2126; Amy.Sussman@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

The purpose of the research program on Cognition and Student Learning in Special Education (Cognition) is to improve developmental outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities or at risk for disabilities and learning for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities. The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of tools and strategies (e.g., instructional approaches, computer tutors) that are based on principles of learning and information processing gained from cognitive science and that have been documented to be effective for improving developmental outcomes for infants and toddlers with or at risk for disabilities and learning for students with or at risk for disabilities in preschool through Grade 12.

B. Background

The most important outcome of education is student learning. Recent advances in understanding learning have come from the cognitive sciences, including cognitive and developmental psychology, but these advances have not been widely or systematically tapped in education in general, and in special education in particular (for examples, see Carver & Klahr, 2001). Through the Cognition research program, the Institute intends to establish a scientific foundation for learning and development in special education by building on the theoretical and empirical advances that have been gained through the cognitive sciences and applying them to special education practice. The purpose of this research is to improve developmental outcomes for infants and toddlers with or at risk for disabilities and learning and academic outcomes for students with or at risk for disabilities.

Authentic education settings are often quite different from the laboratory. Contrasted with learning in laboratory settings, learning in everyday instructional settings typically involves content of greater complexity and scope, delivered over much longer periods of time, with much greater variability in delivery, and with far more distractions and competitors for student time and effort. Moreover, the parameters that have defined "learning" in laboratory experiments are often not the same as what defines learning in school. For example, in laboratory experiments, learning is typically defined as having occurred if individuals can recall an item a few minutes or hours after presentation; rarely are individuals asked to recall items days, weeks, or months after presentation. In school, however, students are expected to remember information presented in September the following May, and to be able to use that information in subsequent years. Students in school are expected to learn sets of related concepts and facts, and to build on that knowledge over time. Before some principles of learning generated from research in cognitive science can be applied to instruction in classroom settings, we need to understand if the principles generalize beyond well-controlled laboratory settings to the complex cognitive and social conditions of the classroom.

Under the Cognition program, the Institute will support research that utilizes cognitive science to develop, implement, and evaluate approaches that are intended to improve teaching and learning for children with high- or low-incidence disabilities. For example, a researcher might develop a set of guidelines for teachers on how to modify text characteristics (e.g., length of sentences, organization of text) intended to minimize working memory demands for science textbooks that will improve the ability of students with reading disabilities to attend to and distinguish main ideas from extraneous details. As another illustration, a research team might adapt the display and presentation of visual materials in a math curriculum in ways that are intended to optimize visual attention and/or visuo-spatial processing in order to improve mathematics skills in elementary age students who are deaf and hard of hearing. As a final example, an applicant might propose to conduct an initial evaluation of whether an intervention intending to improve executive function skills enhances school readiness skills in preschoolers with intellectual disability.

The Institute also funds projects designed to explore the cognitive processes underlying the acquisition of developmental skills for infants and toddlers with or at risk for disabilities, and communication, language, reading, writing, mathematics knowledge and skills, science knowledge and skills, or general study skills for children with or at risk for disabilities. This is translational research that is ultimately intended to inform the development of innovative interventions to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Such studies might include short-term longitudinal studies in which the objective is to identify the component skills that are (a) highly correlated with child outcomes and (b) can be improved, accelerated, or advanced through intervention. In order for applications to be competitive, the researcher should make explicit the hypothesized link between the underlying cognitive process and improving developmental outcomes or academic achievement. That is, it is not sufficient to propose research to simply examine cognitive processes. The objective here is to gain a better understanding of which processes and skills are predictive of subsequent proficiency in developmental skills, communication, language, reading, writing, mathematics, science, or study skills that would allow researchers to develop interventions (e.g., curricula or instructional approaches) that target these processes and ultimately result

in improving developmental outcomes or academic achievement. For example, a researcher might propose to measure early narrative discourse skills or speech and language perception skills of students who are deaf or hard of hearing and correlate differences in the emergence of these skills with measures of reading skills such as phonological awareness, decoding, and knowledge of print concepts. Strong applications would include a rationale that justifies the plausibility of developing interventions that might improve the targeted underlying skills. The Institute strongly encourages cognitive scientists to collaborate with special education researchers who understand the variation in learner characteristics and teaching and learning in the context of authentic education settings.

Exploration projects could also examine the underlying processes that explain learning problems (difficulties) that occur in authentic education settings. In these cases, researchers might begin by identifying a constellation of observed behaviors indicating a developmental or academic learning problem, and then propose a research plan to systematically explore possible causal explanations for that problem. For example, students with learning disabilities in mathematics may struggle with mastering their basic mathematics facts (e.g., addition, multiplication), and repeated practice does not appear to improve students' mastery of these facts. For an Exploration project, the researchers could propose to explore whether the difficulty arises from conceptual and/or procedural mathematics knowledge. If the initial experiments indicate that students' difficulties arise due to procedural mathematics knowledge, the research team could further examine if deficiencies in the retrieval of procedural knowledge are explained by attentional mechanisms or phonological working memory. As with all Exploration proposals, strong applications would include a rationale that justifies the plausibility of developing interventions that might improve the targeted underlying skills.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Cognition and Student Learning in Special Education research program, applicants must submit under one of four research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Measurement. The Institute does *not* accept applications under the Scale-up goal for the Cognition program. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the Cognition and Student Learning in Special Education topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for infants, toddlers, young children, or students with or at risk for disabilities. Please adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Students with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

- Research must focus on developmental outcomes or child outcomes in communication, language, reading, pre-reading, writing, pre-writing, mathematics, early mathematics, science, early science, or study skills.
- Research must focus on infants or toddlers with high- or low-incidence disabilities, or at risk for disabilities, or on children with high- or low-incidence disabilities or at risk for disabilities from preschool through Grade 12.

d. Research setting requirements

Under the Exploration and Measurement goals, the research may be conducted in laboratory and/or authentic education settings. Under Exploration, laboratory research with college students is allowable

provided that within the award period the researcher also examines the relation between the malleable factors and outcomes with the student population of interest.

Under the Development and Innovation goal, the *majority* of the proposed work should be conducted in authentic education settings (e.g., service delivery setting, elementary school classrooms, distance learning or online education delivery modes); however, some work may be conducted in laboratory settings. Laboratory and classroom research with college students may be proposed as a means to identifying underlying principles or testing critical components of an intervention that is being developed. However, within the award period, the interventions must be tested for use with the student population for which the intervention is intended. These student populations along with the content requirements are described above in *Section 10.C.c Content and sample requirements*.

The Efficacy and Replication goal is appropriate for applicants proposing to evaluate fully developed interventions. The Institute does **not** support laboratory research under the Efficacy and Replication goal. Interventions that are ready to be evaluated through efficacy trials must be fully developed and ready to be implemented in authentic education settings.

e. Methods appropriate for Exploration and Development and Innovation studies

Under Exploration and Development/Innovation, the research may involve small laboratory or classroom-based experiments to test hypotheses regarding the cognitive processes involved in a particular learning task.

11. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS AND RELATED SERVICES PROVIDERS

Program Officer: Dr. Rob Ochsendorf (202-219-2234; Robert.Ochsendorf@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

The purpose of the Institute's research program on Professional Development for Teachers and Related Services Providers (Professional Development) is to identify effective strategies for improving the performance of current teachers, other instructional personnel, and related services providers in ways that increase reading, writing, language, mathematics, science, social, behavioral, or secondary transition outcomes, as well as functional skills that improve the educational outcomes of students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12.² Long-term outcomes of the Professional Development program will be an array of tools and strategies (e.g., in-service programs, teacher supports, and assessments) that have been demonstrated to be effective for improving and assessing performance of teachers, related services providers, and other instructional personnel in ways that are linked to improvements in student outcomes.

By "professional development," the Institute refers to in-service training and supports (e.g., information resources) for current special education teachers, general education teachers who teach students with disabilities, related services providers, or other instructional personnel. Under this program, the Institute does not provide support for development of or research on professional certificate programs and other training programs intended to give non-special education teachers or personnel certification in special education or related services. By "teachers, related services providers, and other instructional personnel," the Institute refers to special education teachers, general education teachers, paraprofessionals, teacher consultants and specialists, related services providers, and other personnel involved in the instruction and school support of students with or at risk for disabilities.

² Applicants interested in professional development for teachers and other personnel who work with infants, toddlers, and preschool children should see the Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education topic.

B. Background

Most students with disabilities (96%) are educated in school buildings attended by their peers without disabilities, and more than half of all students with disabilities (52%) are educated in the general education classroom for most of the school day (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). Thus, general and special educators share educational responsibilities for students with disabilities. In a survey conducted in 2000, only 32 percent of the public school teachers who taught students with disabilities indicated that they were very well prepared to address the needs of these students. Of the teachers surveyed, 49 percent had received professional development during the previous year on addressing the needs of students with disabilities, and 53 percent of the teachers who received this training said it improved their teaching moderately or a lot (Parsad, Lewis, & Farris, 2001). Through the Professional Development research program, the Institute funds research to improve professional development activities for special education teachers and general education teachers of students with disabilities.

In addition to instruction provided by general and special education teachers, the provision of related services is an integral part of a free and appropriate public education for students served under Part B of IDEA. In the most recent wave of data from the Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.), 31 percent of elementary special education students received speech or language therapy; 8 percent received occupational therapy; 4 percent received social work services; and 2 percent received audiology services. Through the Professional Development research program, the Institute supports research to improve related services for students with disabilities. As an illustration, an applicant might propose to evaluate a professional development program intended to improve instructional practices of occupational therapists targeting fine motor skills and writing outcomes. The occupational therapists could be randomly assigned to receive the intervention program or to a business-as-usual control condition (e.g., whatever professional development training is typically provided by the district). In this design, the research would test whether the practices of the occupational therapists changed, as well as whether the intervention indirectly improved students' fine motor skills and writing outcomes.

The Institute recognizes that a variety of personnel other than teachers and related services providers may have responsibility for providing instruction or services to students with or at risk for disabilities. These personnel include for example paraprofessionals, instructional aides, remedial teachers, one-on-one aides, student job coaches, media and technology specialists, and behavior coaches. Through the Professional Development program, the Institute also supports research on professional development programs for other instructional personnel who instruct or provide services to students with or at risk for disabilities.

Under the Professional Development program, the Institute supports research relevant to students with high-incidence or low-incidence disabilities. For example, an applicant might propose to develop an in-service training program designed to improve the ability of special educators to assess and monitor skill levels of learners with visual impairments in order to help educators select instructional strategies depending on the student's progress in acquiring knowledge and skills.

Research on professional development interventions should consider both the content of the programs (i.e., what is it that personnel are expected to learn) as well as the delivery of the content (e.g., coaches, online resources, workshops). Very little research exists that allows for clear causal interpretations of the effect of specific professional development programs or for knowing which elements of professional development programs (e.g., coaching) are critical or relatively more important than others. There are many plausible hypotheses to explain why a professional development program might change the instructional practices of teachers, for example, but not have an effect on student outcomes. One hypothesis is that although teachers' behaviors changed, the instructional practices were not implemented with sufficient precision to affect learning. This explanation suggests that the delivery of the content (e.g., coaching) needs to be improved. On the other hand, another possible explanation is that the instructional practices that were the target of the professional development program were not ones that would improve student learning even if they were implemented as intended (i.e., with high

fidelity). This explanation suggests that the *content* of the program needs to be changed. The Institute encourages researchers to test different delivery modes using content (e.g., instructional practices or intervening strategies) that has already been shown to be effective for improving student outcomes. In all instances, the Institute encourages researchers to design studies that will provide evidence to help rule out competing hypotheses.

In addition to research on professional development programs, the Institute supports research on the development of practical assessments of subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and instructional skills – such as measures that might be used by school administrators to provide feedback to teachers or other service providers and improve the quality of classroom instruction – and validation of these assessments (or existing assessments) against measures of student outcomes. Ideally, assessments of pedagogical knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and instructional skills would not only be highly correlated with student outcomes, but also be practical to administer and cost-effective. The Institute is interested in proposals to develop and validate new assessments, as well as proposals to validate existing assessments of pedagogical knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and instructional skills against measures of student outcomes.

The Institute also encourages researchers to explore the relations between malleable factors (e.g., teachers' skills or knowledge, professional development experiences) and student outcomes, as well as mediators or moderators of the relations between these factors and student outcomes, *for the purpose of identifying potential targets for intervention*. For example, researchers might propose to collect detailed, quantifiable measures of teacher practices (e.g., types of instruction, frequency, duration, under what circumstances) and professional development experiences, and then use these data in conjunction with children's ability levels to predict subsequent child outcomes. The objective here is to identify the specific practices and strategies employed by teachers that are associated with the most positive student outcomes and to describe the conditions under which they are acquired and used. Researchers who can successfully identify strong correlates of student performance can use this information as the basis for developing a professional development intervention.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Professional Development research program, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluations *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the Professional Development topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for students with disabilities or depending on the topic, students at risk for developing disabilities. See content and sample requirements below. Please also adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

- Research must be relevant to working with students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12. If related service outcomes are the outcomes of interest, then the research must be relevant to students *with* disabilities only. If secondary transition outcomes are the student outcomes of interest, then the research must be relevant to secondary (middle or high school) students *with* disabilities only. Applicants interested in professional development for

prekindergarten teachers or related services providers should apply to the Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education research program. If the research spans prekindergarten and early elementary grades, applicants may apply under either topic.

- Research must address one or more of the following child outcomes: cognitive, communication, language, speech, reading, pre-reading, writing, pre-writing, mathematics, early mathematics, science, early science, study skills, social skills, emotional and behavioral skills, adaptive skills, functional skills, or secondary transitional skills.
- Eligible interventions are professional development training, tools or other supports (e.g., information resources) for teachers, related services providers, and other instructional personnel or service providers. Professional development refers to in-service training, tools and other supports, and must be for current personnel. Pre-service training of prospective teachers, related services providers, or other instructional personnel is not eligible for support under this research program. In addition, the Institute does not provide support for development of or research on professional certificate programs and other training programs intended to give non-special education teachers or personnel certification in special education or related services.
- Related services that are eligible to be studied under this research program are the following, as defined in §300.34 of the Part B regulations to the 2004 reauthorization of IDEA: speech-language pathology and audiology services, interpreting services, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, counseling services, including rehabilitation counseling, orientation and mobility services, and social work services in schools. Applicants interested in parent training should apply to the Families of Children with Disabilities research program.
- Interventions must be school-based interventions (i.e., programs must be coordinated through the school or district).
- Applicants focused primarily on curriculum or instructional practices that also include a professional development component are more appropriately directed to the Reading/Language or Math/Science topics.
- All applicants must include measures of child outcomes as well as measures of the behaviors of the teachers, related services providers, or other instructional personnel or service providers that are the target of the professional development.

12. SPECIAL EDUCATION POLICY, FINANCE, AND SYSTEMS

Program Officer: Dr. Amanda Hoffman, (202-208-1177; Amanda.Hoffman@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

Through the research program on Special Education Policy, Finance, and Systems (Policy/Systems), the Institute intends to contribute to the improvement of education for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities. The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of systems-level practices and policies that have been documented to be effective for improving the education or intervention environment and thereby improving outcomes for students with or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12.³

B. Background

Intervention and education for students with disabilities typically requires the coordination of a variety of programs and services. Little rigorous research has examined either a direct causal relation or indirect associations between student outcomes and various systemic or organizational strategies. Through the Policy/Systems program, the Institute supports research to improve outcomes for students with

³ Applicants interested in research on policies and systems related to services provided to infants, toddlers, and preschool children should refer to the Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education topic.

disabilities or at risk for disabilities by identifying systemic processes, procedures, and programs that may be directly or indirectly linked to student outcomes. That is, rather than focusing on improving student outcomes by changing curricula or student-level intervention approaches, researchers will conduct research on systems-level procedures and policies that are intended to improve the management, coordination, and implementation of systemic programs and services in ways that directly enhance the overall intervention or education environment, and indirectly improve student outcomes. The types of projects that are appropriate for this program are illustrated by, but not limited to, the examples provided below.

The Institute encourages researchers to develop innovative interventions, modify existing interventions, or rigorously evaluate fully developed interventions. Interventions appropriate for research under this program are policies or systemic interventions that are intended to improve student outcomes either directly or indirectly by improving the intervention or education environment for students with high- or low-incidence disabilities or students at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12³. For example, an applicant might propose to compare the efficacy of a school-wide, simultaneous Response to Intervention (RtI) system in which students are placed into a secondary or tertiary intervention based on beginning of the year universal screening performance to a school-wide, sequential RtI system in which students are placed into a secondary or tertiary intervention only after they have demonstrated a lack of progress in the previous tier. Under the Policy/Systems research program, applicants interested in RtI research must focus on the design and implementation of RtI approaches and not on the development of the secondary or tertiary interventions themselves. Applicants who are interested in developing only secondary or tertiary interventions for RtI systems should apply under the applicable content topic (e.g., Reading, Writing, and Language Development or Mathematics and Science Education).

The Institute also encourages research to evaluate the effects of policies that are intended to improve special education services. For example, an applicant might propose to evaluate the effect of offering annual financial bonuses on the recruitment and retention of special education teachers in hard-to-staff schools. As another example, a researcher might propose to evaluate the effect of policies intended to promote collaboration among IEP team members and increase time and resources available for instruction of students with disabilities.

The Institute also welcomes research on outcome assessments used for large-scale accountability purposes. For example, an applicant might propose to develop and validate new regular or alternate assessments or to modify and validate existing regular or alternate assessments for students with disabilities. This work might include research on the reliability and validity of different test accommodations for students with disabilities, approaches for designing accountability assessments to be more accessible to students with disabilities, use of individual student growth models for accountability purposes with students with disabilities, and methods for integrating large-scale assessments with IEP development, instruction, progress monitoring, and other systemic elements in order to help students with disabilities meet academic standards. Also appropriate for the Policy/Systems research program are applications to assess implementation of systemic practices or policies and validate such measures against student outcomes.

The Institute encourages research that explores meaningful links among special education financing, allocation of resources, and improvements in student outcomes. For example, a researcher might investigate the relationships among census-based or resource-based formulas, the allocation of resources and services as documented on students' Individualized Education Programs, and improvements in academic outcomes. The researcher might also explore other factors influencing the relationship among financing, resource allocation, and student outcomes, such as school- or district- size, or students' disability categories or students' individual skills or needs.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Policy/Systems research program, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluations *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the Policy/Systems topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for students with disabilities or at risk for disabilities. Please adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

Under the Policy/Systems program:

- Applicants must address policies, systemic interventions, or assessments relevant to the education of students with or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12.
- Applicants interested in policies, systemic interventions, or assessments relevant to early childhood should apply to the Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education research program. For research that spans early childhood and the early elementary grades, the applicant may choose to submit the application to the Early Intervention program or may choose to submit the application to the Policy/Systems program.
- The Institute recognizes that, in general, Policy/Systems interventions are designed to change directly the teaching and learning environment and indirectly affect student learning and achievement. Applicants, however, must include measures of student outcomes (e.g., graduation, achievement tests, grades, secondary transition and behavioral outcomes).
- Under the Measurement goal, assessments that can be used to evaluate implementation of systemic practices or policies must be validated against measures of student outcomes.

13. AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDERS

Program Officer: Dr. Amy Sussman (202-219-2126; Amy.Sussman@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

The purpose of the Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) research program is to contribute to the improvement of developmental, cognitive, communicative, academic, social, behavioral, and functional outcomes of students identified with autism spectrum disorder from preschool through Grade 12. The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of comprehensive programs and assessments (i.e., designed to address multiple outcomes) that have been documented to be effective for improving the developmental, cognitive, communicative, academic, social, behavioral, and functional outcomes of students identified with ASD from preschool through Grade 12⁴.

⁴ Applicants interested in research on families of infants, toddlers, and preschool children should refer to the Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education topic.

B. Background

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2009), one in 110 children is classified as having an autism spectrum disorder (ASD). This prevalence creates an extraordinary demand on schools to provide interventions that meet the educational needs of students identified with ASD.

Furthermore, the highly variable cognitive and behavioral phenotype associated with ASD creates a significant challenge in developing and implementing effective interventions that address the range of developmental and academic needs of students with ASD. Compounding the problem is that few interventions to date have been manualized (Lord et al., 2005) or implemented and evaluated in a preschool or school-based setting.

Through the ASD research program, the Institute supports research on the development, implementation, and evaluation of *comprehensive school-based interventions* intended to improve developmental, cognitive, communicative, academic, social, behavioral, and functional outcomes of students identified with ASD. By comprehensive intervention, the Institute means an intervention that is designed to address multiple outcomes, which include two or more of the following categories: developmental, cognitive, communicative, academic, behavioral, or functional outcomes.

The Institute encourages researchers to develop innovative, modify existing, or rigorously evaluate fully-developed *comprehensive school-based interventions*. For example, applicants might consider developing an integrated literacy and social skill intervention designed to be delivered by teachers for students in kindergarten through third grade with ASD and intended to improve academic, social, and communication outcomes. As another example, applicants might consider evaluating which training approach is most effective in teaching parents the instructional strategies and approaches for the home-based component of a comprehensive preschool intervention for students with ASD. The Institute would also like to encourage applicants to develop or evaluate instructional approaches or strategies appropriate for students in middle and high school with ASD that will improve communication, behavior, and adaptive skills across academic and vocational instruction.

The Institute encourages researchers to explore malleable factors (e.g., intervention practices, child competencies) relevant to comprehensive preschool or school-based programs for children with ASD that are associated with better developmental, cognitive, communicative, academic, social, behavioral, and functional outcomes for students identified with ASD, as well as mediators or moderators of the relations between these factors and student outcomes, *for the purpose of identifying potential targets of intervention*.

In addition, the Institute encourages researchers to develop and validate new, or validate existing, developmental, cognitive, communicative, academic, social, behavioral, and functional measures or measurement systems designed to monitor progress and/or evaluate outcomes, particularly generalization and maintenance, for students identified with ASD.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Autism Spectrum Disorders research program, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluation *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the ASD topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program

officer in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for students with disabilities. Applicants proposing to study students at risk for disabilities are *not* eligible to submit to the Autism research program. Please adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

b. Content and sample requirements

Under the Autism Spectrum Disorders research program:

- Research must address students with identified ASD at any grade level from preschool through Grade 12.
- Research must be relevant to comprehensive interventions and **must** address in a coordinated fashion *multiple* outcomes, which include two or more of the following categories: developmental, cognitive, communicative, academic, social, behavioral, or functional outcomes.
- Applications under the Measurement goal must address two or more of the following outcomes: developmental, cognitive, communicative, academic, social, behavioral, or functional skills.
- Interventions must be preschool interventions, school-based interventions, preschool interventions that are integrated with home-based or clinic-based interventions, or school-based interventions that are integrated with home-based or clinic-based interventions.
- Interventions may be designed to be delivered by teachers alone or in combination with other professionals (e.g., related service providers, clinic-based staff), paraprofessionals, or parents.
- Applicants wishing to develop an intervention that focuses on a single outcome such as language skills or social skills, or that focuses on students at risk for disabilities, must apply to the appropriate topic area competition (e.g., Reading, Writing, and Language Development; Social and Behavioral Outcomes to Support Learning; Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education).

14. TECHNOLOGY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

Program Officer: Dr. Rob Ochsendorf (202-219-2234; Robert.Ochsendorf@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

Through its research program on Technology for Special Education (Technology), the Institute supports research on education technology tools that are designed to improve outcomes for infants, toddlers, preschool children, and students from kindergarten through Grade 12 with or at risk for disabilities. The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of education technology tools that have been documented to be effective for improving outcomes for children with or at risk for disabilities.

B. Background

Through the Technology research program, the Institute supports research on a wide-array of special education technology products that are intended (a) to improve reading, writing, mathematics, and

science outcomes or general study skills for students with or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12; (b) to improve developmental outcomes or school readiness for infants, toddlers, preschoolers with or at risk for disabilities; (c) to assess student learning; (d) to improve social and behavioral, functional and adaptive outcomes for students with or at risk for disabilities from prekindergarten through Grade 12; and (d) to improve transition outcomes for secondary students with disabilities. Under the Institute's Technology research program, researchers are invited to propose rigorous research projects to develop innovative education technology tools or evaluate existing education technology products. The Institute also encourages proposals to develop and validate education technology measurement tools to be used for instructional purposes (e.g., progress monitoring). Through the Technology program, the Institute is interested in proposals to develop and evaluate new products, as well as proposals to evaluate the effects of existing products (including commercially available products) on student outcomes.

The Institute encourages development of innovative technology for students with disabilities. For example, the Institute encourages further development of technology-based interventions, such as simulations, multimedia, and virtual reality, to support students with physical disabilities as they experiment with science concepts or to support students with disabilities in learning science and mathematics (e.g., supported electronic text). The Institute is also interested in research to develop technology to improve social cognition (e.g., facial recognition) in students with autism spectrum disorders. Applicants may also be interested in developing technology-based assessments that provide teachers with real-time assessment data to inform subsequent instruction.

Also appropriate under this topic is research on technology to improve professional development of teachers, related services providers, or other instructional personnel who work with students with or at risk for disabilities. For example, applicants may be interested in developing technology-based programs (e.g., interactive media-enhanced online modules) that provide teachers with information about instructional approaches and strategies intended to promote reading comprehension skills of students in middle school.

Competitive applications will have a strong rationale for the developmental appropriateness of the product's user-interface design for the targeted students as well as a strong theoretical, pedagogical, and empirical justification for the scope and sequence of the content. The Institute strongly encourages applicants interested in applying to this program to assemble research teams that collectively have expertise in special education or early intervention, the development of advanced technology, instructional design, the targeted content domain (e.g., reading, mathematics), and implementation of rigorous experimental and quasi-experimental program evaluations.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Technology research program, applicants must submit under one of four goals: Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluation *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to applications to the Technology topic are described.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer listed in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with or at risk for disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for students with or at risk for disabilities. Please adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

Under the Technology program:

- Research must focus on children with high- or low-incidence disabilities, or at risk for disabilities from infancy through Grade 12.
- Education technology products may be for direct use by children with or at risk for disabilities or by teachers, related services providers, other instructional personnel, or parents who work with these children.
- Applicants must propose education technology that is intended for use in school-based or center-based programs (i.e., programs must be coordinated through the school or district or child care center). However, the delivery of the technology may occur in other settings (e.g., home settings, residential treatment programs).
- Education technology for use with or by students from prekindergarten through Grade 12 must be interventions or assessments to be used in schools, alternative school settings, or supplemental education services as defined in Section 1116(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.
- Technology products for use with infants, toddlers, and prekindergarten children must address either developmental outcomes pertaining to cognitive, communicative, linguistic, social, emotional, adaptive, functional or physical development, or school readiness outcomes (i.e., reading, pre-reading, pre-writing, early mathematics, early science, or social-emotional skills that prepare young children for school).
- Education technology to enhance *social, emotional, or behavioral* outcomes must be intended to improve those outcomes in ways that will support learning.
- Education technology to enhance *study skills* must target students with or at risk for disabilities at any level from kindergarten through Grade 12.
- Education technology for transition outcomes must target secondary students with disabilities. By secondary students, the Institute means students in middle or high school. Transition outcomes are those basic academic, behavioral, social, communicative, functional and occupational skills that enable young adults with disabilities to obtain and hold meaningful employment, live independently, and obtain further training and education (e.g., vocational education programs). By basic academic skills, the Institute refers to functional literacy and math skills (e.g., adding and subtracting whole numbers or fractions, as well as calculations involving money or time).
- Education technology for *professional development* training may be for teachers, related services providers, and other instructional personnel who work with infants, toddlers, young children, or students in kindergarten through grade 12 who have or are at risk for disabilities. Professional development refers to in-service training, tools and other supports, and must be for current personnel. Pre-service training of prospective teachers, related services providers, or other instructional personnel is not eligible for support under this research program.
- Education technology *assessments* may target reading, pre-reading, writing, pre-writing, mathematics, early mathematics, science, early science, or social behavioral skills for students with or at risk for disabilities from prekindergarten through Grade 12, or study skills for students with or at risk for disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12. Education technology assessments focused on developing or validating only the use of technology, and not an academic, behavior, or study skills area above are not allowed.
- All applicants must include measures of relevant student outcomes (e.g., reading, mathematics, social skills, achievement test scores, graduation rates, percentage of time spent in the general education environment).

15. FAMILIES OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Program Officer: Dr. Amy Sussman (202-219-2126; Amy.Sussman@ed.gov)

A. Purpose

The purpose of the research program on Families of Children with Disabilities (Families) is to identify effective strategies for improving family involvement in the education of their child with a disability and family support of their child with a disability in ways that ultimately improve educational or transition outcomes for students with disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12⁵.

The long-term outcome of this program will be an array of tools and strategies (e.g., assessment tools, programs, services, interventions) that have been documented to be effective for improving family involvement and support of children with disabilities in ways that ultimately improve educational or transition outcomes of students with disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12.

B. Background

There is a long-standing belief that parent involvement in education and strong family–school partnerships are critical for achieving optimal developmental outcomes and educational success for students with disabilities (e.g., Booth & Dunn, 1996; Dunst & Wolery, 1997; as cited in Dunst, 2002). Legislation supports this thesis; the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandates parental rights and involvement in their child’s education. As active members of their child’s Individualized Education Program (IEP) team, parents act in partnership with school personnel in planning and making educational decisions about their child with a disability.

Little is known, however, about effective ways for supporting the involvement of parents of children with disabilities in ways that improve the educational, social, behavioral, functional, or transition outcomes of children with disabilities. There are few rigorous empirical studies examining the extent to which increased family involvement in a child’s education leads to better student educational outcomes. Where there have been rigorous evaluations, further replication and analyses are needed to understand for whom and under what conditions the interventions work. Similarly, relatively little rigorous research has been conducted on approaches for enabling parents to intervene with their child in ways that support or coordinate with interventions that the child receives at school.

The Institute intends for its Families research program to support research on families of students with disabilities from kindergarten through Grade 12 with high- or low-incidence disabilities. Applicants may, for example, propose research on interventions intended to improve parents' involvement in their child's education, or strategies for enabling parents to intervene with their child at home in ways that coordinate with or support interventions delivered to the child at school. The Institute also encourages research on ways to improve teachers' abilities to work with and support families who have a child with a disability. Interventions may also include training provided to parents to enable them to deliver interventions to their child.

C. Specific Requirements

a. Submission to a specific goal

For the Families research program, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluation *or* Measurement. More details on the requirements for each goal are listed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research*. Here, specific requirements that apply to the Families topic are described.

⁵ Applicants interested in research on families of infants, toddlers, and preschool children should refer to the Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education topic.

Applicants should read carefully the requirements for each goal and the examples of appropriate projects under each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

b. Focus on children with disabilities

This research program is restricted to special education research for students with disabilities. Applicants proposing to study students at risk for developing disabilities are *not* eligible to submit to the Families research program. Please also adhere to the requirements described in *Part II Section 4 Requirement to Focus on Children with Disabilities*.

c. Content and sample requirements

- Research must focus on children in kindergarten through Grade 12 who have high- or low-incidence disabilities. Applicants interested in research on families of infants, toddlers, and preschool children should refer to the Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education topic.
- Interventions must be school-based interventions (i.e., programs must be coordinated through the school or district). However, the delivery of the intervention may occur in other settings (e.g., home).
- Research must address either educational or transition outcomes. By education outcomes, the Institute means those measures of learning and achievement that are important to parents, teachers, and school administrators (e.g., grades, achievement test scores, graduation rates, percentage of time spent in the general education environment, goals identified on students' IEPs). By transition outcomes, the Institute means those behavioral, social, communicative, functional, occupational, and basic academic skills that enable young adults with disabilities to obtain and hold meaningful employment, live independently, and obtain further training and education (e.g., vocational education programs).
- Interventions that target parents directly must be interventions that are intended to support students' educational or transition outcomes.
- All applicants must include measures of the child outcomes that are intended to be improved.

PART III REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSED RESEARCH

16. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSED RESEARCH

A. Basic Requirements

a. Resubmissions

Applicants who intend to revise and resubmit a proposal that was submitted to one of the Institute's previous competitions but that was not funded must indicate on the application form that their FY2012 proposal is a revised proposal and include the application number of the previous application (an 11-character alphanumeric identifier beginning "R324" or "R305"). The prior reviews will be sent to this year's reviewers along with the resubmitted proposal. Applicants should indicate the revisions that were made to the proposal on the basis of the prior reviews using no more than 3 pages of Appendix A. Applicants who revise and resubmit a proposal should be aware that the FY2012 application will be reviewed according to the FY2012 Request for Applications.

Applicants who have submitted a somewhat similar proposal in the past but are submitting the current proposal as a new proposal must indicate on the application form that their FY2012 proposal is a new proposal. Applicants should provide a rationale explaining why the current proposal should be considered to be a "new" proposal rather than a "revised" proposal at the beginning of Appendix A using no more than 3 pages. Without such an explanation, if the Institute determines that the current proposal is similar to a previously unfunded proposal, the Institute may send the reviews of the prior unfunded proposal to this year's reviewers along with the current proposal.

b. Applying to a topic

Applicants must submit their proposal to one of the specific topics described in *Part II Research Grant Topics*. *If applicants do not identify the specific topic under which their proposal should be considered on the SF-424 Form (Item 4b) of the Application Package*, the Institute may reject the proposal as non-compliant with the requirements of this Request for Applications.

The Institute recognizes that there are times when an application may fit under more than one topic. For example, a proposal to develop technology to support the development of writing skills could fit under Technology for Special Education, as well as under the Reading, Writing, and Language Development topic. As long as the application meets the specific requirements listed for a research topic, the applicant may choose to submit to that topic.

c. Applying to multiple topics

Applicants may submit proposals to more than one of the Institute's FY2012 competitions or topics. In addition, within a particular competition or topic, applicants may submit multiple proposals. However, applicants may submit a given proposal only once (i.e., applicants may not submit the same proposal or similar proposals to multiple topics or to multiple goals in the same topic or to multiple competitions). If the Institute determines prior to panel review that an applicant has submitted the same proposal or similar proposals to multiple topics within or across competitions and the proposal is judged to be compliant and responsive to the submission rules and requirements described in the Request for Applications, the Institute will select one version of the application to be reviewed by the appropriate scientific review panel. If the Institute determines after panel review that an applicant has submitted the same proposal or similar proposals to multiple topics within or across competitions and if the proposal is determined to be worthy of funding, the Institute will select the topic under which the proposal will be funded.

Applicants who submit a proposal for the June 23, 2011 deadline may not submit the same or a similar proposal to the September 22, 2011 deadline.

d. Applying to a particular goal within a topic

For the FY2012 Special Education Research Grants Programs, applicants must submit under one of the five research goals: Exploration *or* Development and Innovation *or* Efficacy and Replication *or* Scale-up Evaluations *or* Measurement. Each goal has specific requirements that are described in the following section. *If applicants do not identify the specific goal under which their proposal should be considered on the SF-424 Form (Item 4b) of the Application Package, the Institute may reject the proposal as non-compliant with the requirements of this Request for Applications.*

e. Determining which goal is most appropriate for the proposed project

Applicants should read carefully the purpose and requirements for each goal. The Institute strongly encourages potential applicants to contact the relevant program officer listed in *Section 32* if they have any questions regarding the appropriateness of a particular project for submission under a specific goal.

B. Requirements for Goal One: Exploration

Because the requirements for Exploration projects are essentially the same across the Institute's standing research grant programs, a generic description is used in the funding announcement. Consequently, the examples provided may not apply to a particular topic.

a. Purpose of Exploration Projects

Through all of its research programs that include the Exploration goal, the Institute is interested in the (a) exploration of the association between education outcomes and malleable factors and (b) exploration of factors and conditions that may mediate or moderate the relations between malleable factors and education outcomes.

By *malleable factors*, the Institute means factors that can be changed such as children's behaviors, teachers' practices, education programs, school or district management practices, or education policies. The Institute is interested in those malleable factors that are under the control of the education system. For example, young children's self-regulation is positively correlated with later academic achievement (Duncan et al., 2007). Self-regulation is malleable and has the potential to be influenced by interventions that are under the control of the education system (e.g., teacher practices or classroom programs designed to enhance children's self-regulation). On the other hand, community health care interventions may be associated with education outcomes and are potentially malleable, but they are not under the control of the education system. Malleable factors such as children's behaviors or teachers' practices are potential targets of interventions. Malleable factors can also be education interventions (e.g., education programs, widely used curricula or instructional approaches, management practices, or policies) intended to achieve desired education outcomes as these can be changed.

One purpose of Exploration projects is to explore the underlying processes that may be operating to enhance or inhibit learning outcomes. To the extent that such processes are malleable, information about the underlying processes gained from Exploration projects could be used to inform the development of interventions in a subsequent Development and Innovation project.

Exploration projects can also be conducted in order to identify various school practices, aspects of school climate, instructional management systems, uses of assessment results, parent and community relationships, organizational characteristics, etc. that are associated with positive education outcomes. These findings could then be used to identify potential components of more systematic, programmatic interventions to be developed in a subsequent Development and Innovation project.

A third purpose of Exploration projects is to examine the relationship between education interventions and education outcomes in order to identify interventions that are associated with better education outcomes. For example, in a state using five different elementary mathematics curricula, a secondary data analysis could be conducted to identify which of the five curricula are associated with better

mathematics achievement than the others. This information could inform the selection of curricula to be rigorously tested in a subsequent efficacy evaluation under an Efficacy and Replication project.

Another purpose of Exploration projects is to examine mediators or moderators of education interventions for the purpose of informing the modification of existing education interventions or development of new interventions in a subsequent Development and Innovation project. For example, children's level of competence on a particular skill may moderate the relation between an education program and education outcomes. Examining moderators of education interventions may help identify the conditions under which interventions are associated with better outcomes or the subgroups for which a particular intervention is associated with better outcomes.

A variety of methodological approaches are appropriate under the Exploration goal including, but not limited to, original data collection with appropriate statistical analyses and secondary data analyses of existing data sets. Also appropriate are meta-analyses that go beyond a simple identification of the mean effect of interventions and are designed to determine, for example, moderators of the effects, such as teasing apart the effects of (a) specific types of intervention within the broad intervention category that is the focus of the meta-analysis (e.g., Graham & Perin, 2007), (b) variations of a particular intervention (e.g., Cepeda, Pashler, Vul, Wixted & Rohrer, 2006), (c) age or grade level subgroups (e.g., Wilson, Lipsey, & Derzon, 2003), and (d) the intervention for relevant population subgroups (e.g., Wilson et al., 2003). Meta-analyses of correlational relationships can be used to identify mediators that are most strongly associated with outcomes (e.g., Fan & Chen, 2001; La Paro & Pianta, 2000).⁶

Exploration projects are intended to *generate* hypotheses regarding the potential causal relations between malleable factors and education outcomes, contribute to theories of change for education interventions, and contribute to the development and identification of potentially beneficial interventions. In contrast, the purpose of Efficacy and Replication and Scale-up Evaluation projects, as described below, is to *test* causal hypotheses about the effects of fully developed interventions on education outcomes. Applicants interested in determining the effect of an intervention on education outcomes should apply to the Efficacy and Replication or Scale-up Evaluation goal. In addition, applicants seeking to develop or complete the development of an intervention should seek funding under the Development and Innovation goal, as described below, rather than proposing a project to develop and examine an intervention under the Exploration goal. In sum, under the Exploration goal the Institute does not accept applications to (a) examine non-malleable factors, (b) explore malleable factors or interventions that are not under the control of the education system, (c) develop education interventions, or (d) test the effect of education interventions or draw conclusions about their effect beyond noting the presence of associations.

At the end of an Exploration project to examine underlying processes or to explore mediators and moderators of education interventions, the researcher should be able to use the results to generate a well-explicated theory of action that can be used to inform the development or modification of an intervention under the Development and Innovation goal. At the end of an Exploration project to examine associations between school practices, organization, climate, etc. and student outcomes, the researcher should be able to use the results to develop a systematic programmatic approach to implementing the factors identified as strongly associated with positive student outcomes under the Development and Innovation goal. At the end of an Exploration project to examine an intervention, the researcher should be able to use the results, if they show a strong association between the intervention and student outcomes, to support a subsequent application for an efficacy evaluation of the intervention under the Efficacy and Replication goal.

b. Significance of the project

To address the significance of the project, applicants should clearly describe (a) the aims of the research project, including hypotheses and research questions to be addressed; (b) the theoretical and empirical

⁶ For further information, please see W. R. Shadish (1996). Meta-analyses and the exploration of causal mediating processes: A primer of examples, methods, and issues. *Psychological Methods*, 1 (1), 47-65.

rationale for the study; (c) an explanation of the practical importance of the variables (malleable factors, mediators, moderators) that will be examined; and (d) a compelling rationale justifying the importance of the proposed research, which may include input from education stakeholders such as practitioners and policymakers. For projects examining an education intervention the discussion should also detail the intervention to be studied, explain why an Exploration project is being proposed rather than a rigorous evaluation under an Efficacy and Replication project and justify the potential value of the findings of the study. In essence, applicants should use the Significance section to advance an argument explaining why the proposed research project should be funded.

c. Methodological requirements

For all applications, including those submitted under the Exploration goal, the proposed research design must be appropriate for answering the research questions or hypotheses that are posed.

(i) Research design

Applicants must provide a detailed research design and show how the proposed design is appropriate for fulfilling the aims of project. Applicants examining an education intervention should not propose designs upon which strong causal claims for the impact of the intervention can be based (such designs are appropriate for the Efficacy and Replication and Scale-up Evaluation goals). For example, applicants examining an education intervention should not propose designs that meet the standards of the Institute's What Works Clearinghouse (<http://whatworks.ed.gov>) for providing strong evidence of an intervention's effectiveness (e.g., well-designed randomized control trials and regression discontinuity designs). Applicants examining an intervention may propose designs that provide "possible" evidence under those standards (e.g., closely matched comparisons) and should refrain from attributing causal inference to these designs.

(ii) Sample

Applicants should give thoughtful consideration to the sample that is chosen and its relation to addressing the overall aims of the project (e.g., what population the sample represents). Applicants should define, as completely as possible, the sample to be selected and sampling procedures for the proposed study, including justification for exclusion and inclusion criteria. Where applicable, applicants should describe strategies to increase the likelihood that participants will remain in the study over the course of the study (i.e., reduce attrition in longitudinal studies). Applicants should demonstrate that with the proposed sample they will have sufficient power to address the proposed research questions.

(iii) Data sources

Applicants proposing secondary data analyses should describe clearly the data set(s) to be used in the investigation including information on sample characteristics, variables to be used, and ability to ensure access to the data set if the applicant does not already have access to it. The data set should be described in sufficient detail so that reviewers will be able to judge whether or not the proposed analyses may be conducted with the data set. If multiple data sets will be linked to conduct analyses, applicants should provide sufficient detail for reviewers to be able to judge the feasibility of the linking plan. If the applicant does not currently have access to the data sets needed for the study, the applicant should provide sufficient documentation (e.g., letters of agreement) to assure reviewers that access can be obtained and the project can be carried out in a timely fashion. The applicant should describe the primary outcome measures to be used, including their reliability and validity, and the response rate or amount of missing data for these measures. Applicants should provide sufficient information on the construct validity of the proposed measures. For example, if the applicant proposes to use a state data set from which the primary outcome measure will be performance on a reading or mathematics achievement measure, the applicant should detail the standardized measure from which the reading or mathematics scores are derived so that reviewers can judge the adequacy of the measures for addressing the proposed hypotheses or questions.

Applicants proposing meta-analysis should describe clearly the criteria for including or excluding studies and their rationale, the search procedures for ensuring that a high proportion of the eligible published and unpublished studies will be located and retrieved, the coding scheme and procedures that will be used to extract data from the respective studies, and the procedures for ensuring the reliability of the coding. The applicant should demonstrate that sufficient numbers of studies are available to support the meta-analysis and that the relevant information is reported frequently enough and in a form that allows an adequate data set to be constructed. The effect size statistics to be used should be clearly defined along with the associated weighting function, procedures for handling outliers, and any adjustments to be applied (e.g., reliability corrections). The procedures planned for examining and dealing with effect size heterogeneity should be described, especially the approach to be used to conduct moderator analyses. Applicants should indicate the type of statistical models used and provide a rationale for the choice of models.

Applicants may propose an Exploration project in which the primary focus is on the collection and analysis of original data. The applicant should carefully describe the measures (including reliability and validity), procedures proposed for the primary data collection, and the design of the study. If observational data are collected, applicants should describe how the data would be collected (e.g., procedures for maintaining inter-observer reliability), coded, and quantified to allow quantitative analyses predicting the relation between what was observed and the outcomes of interest.

Applicants may also propose to collect original data as a supplement to be used with the analysis of an existing data set in order to answer the question of interest. In such cases, applicants should describe the sample and how the sample is related to or links to the proposed data set, the measures to be used (including information on the reliability and validity of the proposed instruments), and data collection procedures.

(iv) Data analysis

The applicant must include detailed descriptions of data analysis procedures. Because predictor variables relevant to education outcomes (e.g., student, teacher, or district characteristics) often covary, investigators should utilize the most appropriate analytic techniques to isolate the possible effects of variables of interest. Analytic strategies should allow investigators to examine mediators and moderators of programs and practices, as appropriate. The relation between hypotheses, measures, and independent and dependent variables should be well specified. Strong applications will include an explicit discussion of how exclusion from testing, or missing data, will be handled within the statistical analyses. Strong applications will propose an approach for comparing hypotheses or models of relationships among variables and include sensitivity tests to assess the influence of key procedural or analytic decisions on the results.

d. Personnel

Competitive applicants will have research teams that collectively demonstrate expertise in the relevant content domain, the methodological expertise required for conducting this proposed study and, if applicable, for working with schools or other education agencies. In the project narrative, applicants should briefly describe the qualifications, roles, responsibilities, and percent of time to be devoted to the project for key personnel. Reviewers will also consider the applicant's track record for disseminating research findings in peer-reviewed scientific journals.

If aspects of the proposed project will be conducted by another organization (e.g., measurement development, data collection, data analysis), that organization must be included in the application and the personnel responsible for that work should be described in this section.

e. Resources

In competitive proposals, applicants will describe having access to institutional resources that adequately support research activities and, if applicable, access to data sets, schools, or other resources necessary to conduct the proposed research.

f. Additional considerations

Applicants who have received previous research grants from the Institute should describe the results and outcomes of prior or currently held awards (e.g., findings, publications).

g. Awards

For applicants proposing to do primarily secondary data analysis or meta-analysis, typical awards are \$100,000 to \$300,000 (total cost = direct + indirect costs) per year for up to 2 years. The maximum duration of the award is 2 years and the maximum award for a 2-year project is \$700,000 (total cost).

Applicants proposing to do primary data collection may request up to 4 years but must justify the need for the number of years requested. Typical awards for such projects are \$100,000 to \$400,000 (total cost = direct + indirect costs) per year. The maximum duration of the award is 4 years and the maximum award for a 4-year project is \$1,600,000 (total cost).

In all cases, the size of the award depends on the scope of the project.

C. Requirements for Goal Two: Development and Innovation

Because the requirements for Development and Innovation projects are essentially the same across the Institute's standing research grant programs, a generic description is used in the funding announcement. Consequently, the examples provided may not apply to a particular topic.

a. Purpose of Development and Innovation (Development/Innovation) Projects

Through all of its research programs that include the Development/Innovation goal, the Institute intends to support development of and innovation in education interventions—curricula, instructional approaches, technology, school practices, programs, and policies. The Institute stresses that Development/Innovation applications are about development and *not* about demonstrations of the efficacy of an intervention. Under the Development/Innovation goal, the Institute does *not* support applications that propose to allocate substantial resources for testing the effect of the proposed intervention. For example, under Development/Innovation, the Institute does not intend to support applications in which the researcher proposes to spend one year developing the intervention and the second and third years testing the effect of the intervention in a significant number of classrooms or schools. Instead, applicants who have an intervention that could be tested for efficacy should apply to the Efficacy and Replication goal.

From the Institute's standpoint, a funded development project would be successful if at the end of the development award, the investigators had a well-specified theory of change for the intervention, a detailed description of what it means for the intervention to be operating as intended, a fully developed version of the proposed intervention (including prototypes of all materials and products necessary for implementation of the intervention in authentic education delivery settings), fidelity measures to assess the implementation of the intervention, data addressing the feasibility of its implementation in an authentic education delivery setting, and pilot data addressing the promise of the intervention for generating the intended beneficial outcomes.

At the end of a Development/Innovation project, researchers should have a clear detailed description of the intervention and its key components, evidence that the intervention can be successfully implemented in an authentic education delivery setting, and evidence of the promise of the intervention for achieving its intended outcomes, which can be used in support of a subsequent application for an Efficacy/Replication proposal. Feasibility of implementation might be addressed, for example, with

observational and survey data on the use of the fully developed intervention in a few test sites in authentic education delivery settings like those for which the intervention is intended. Applicants are in a stronger position to apply for Efficacy/Replication grants when evidence of the promise of the intervention is addressed by comparing changes in outcomes in the intervention group with changes in outcomes in a comparison group of convenience (i.e., collecting pretest and posttest data in the intervention and comparison groups). Evidence of the promise of the intervention could also be obtained using single-subject experimental designs (see *Section III.D.c.ix Requirements for single-case experimental designs*). The Institute anticipates that investigators with successful development projects would submit proposals to subsequent competitions for Efficacy/Replication awards. The data on feasibility of implementation and pilot data on the promise of positive outcomes to be collected under a Development/Innovation award are intended to help the Institute and its reviewers determine whether it would be appropriate to fund a subsequent proposal to examine the efficacy of the intervention.

b. Significance of the project

Under Development/Innovation, the Institute invites applications to develop new interventions or further develop interventions that are in the early stages of development (e.g., those that do not have an entire program or product ready to evaluate). It is important for applicants to provide a strong rationale to support the development of the proposed intervention. In essence, applicants are answering two questions. First, why is the proposed intervention likely to produce better student outcomes relative to current education practices? Second, what is the overall importance of the proposed project?

Applicants address the significance of their proposal by describing (i) the aims of the research project; (ii) the context for the proposed intervention; (iii) the intervention (e.g., features, components), including its theory of change and the theoretical and empirical support for the proposed intervention; (iv) the practical importance of the intervention; and (v) a compelling rationale justifying the importance of the proposed research, which may include input from education stakeholders such as practitioners and policymakers.

(i) Research aims

Applicants should clearly describe the aims of the research project.

(ii) Context for the proposed intervention

In strong applications, researchers provide context for the proposed intervention by including data on, or reviewing research describing, the attributes of typical existing practices. What is the practical problem that the intervention is intended to address? Researchers should also demonstrate an understanding of how or why the shortcomings of current practice contribute to the rationale for the proposed intervention. In addition, researchers should provide some context for understanding how much of a change the proposed intervention is intended to achieve. For example, suppose a researcher proposes to develop an intervention that is intended to improve student learning over the course of a semester for students who are performing one year below grade-level expectations. The researcher might consider (a) how much learning one would typically expect to occur over an academic year and (b) how much learning one would need each quarter or semester to bring the students up to grade-level expectations by the end of the academic year.

(iii) Intervention, theory of change, and theoretical and empirical rationale

Applicants should clearly describe the intervention and the theory of change for the intervention. Applicants should identify the *key* components of the intervention (i.e., the active ingredients that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the intended results) and describe how they relate to each other temporally (or operationally), pedagogically, and theoretically (e.g., why A leads to B). Applicants should provide a strong theoretical and empirical justification for the design and sequencing of the features or components of the intervention. When applicants clearly describe the theory of change that guides the intervention and the specific features making up the intervention, reviewers are better able to evaluate (a) the relation between the intervention and

its theoretical and empirical foundation (e.g., is the proposed intervention a reasonable operationalization of the theory?) and (b) the relation between the intervention and the outcome measures (e.g., do the proposed measures tap the constructs that the intervention is intended to address?).

Applicants should explain *why* the proposed intervention is likely to produce substantially better student outcomes relative to current practice. Applicants should contrast the proposed intervention to typical existing practices. A comparison of the proposed intervention with typical practice helps reviewers determine if the proposed intervention has the potential to produce substantially better student outcomes because it is sufficiently different from current practices and has "active ingredients" that appear on the basis of theoretical or empirical reasons to be powerful agents for improving the outcomes of interest.

(iv) Practical importance

In the rationale to support the proposed intervention, applicants should address the *practical* importance of the proposed intervention. For example, when the proposed intervention is fully developed, will it have the potential to improve student outcomes in educationally meaningful increments if it were implemented over the course of a semester or school year? Would the proposed intervention be both affordable for and easily implemented by schools (e.g., it would not involve major adjustments to normal school schedules)?

(v) Rationale justifying the importance of the proposed research

As described in *Sections 16.C.b.i* through *16.C.b.iv*, the applicant should describe and justify the development of the proposed intervention. All of this information lends support to the applicant's argument for the importance of the proposed project. In addition, applicants should provide a compelling rationale explaining why the proposed research is important to fund. In essence, why is this project a good idea?

c. Methodological requirements

For all applications, including those submitted under Development/Innovation, the proposed research design must be appropriate for answering the research questions or hypotheses that are posed.

The primary purpose of Development/Innovation projects is the development of interventions. For Development/Innovation projects, applicants must clearly address the sample, the proposed methods for developing the intervention, methods for testing the feasibility of implementation of the prototype in an authentic education delivery setting, and methods for assessing the promise of the intervention for achieving the desired outcomes in a pilot study.

Strong applications include clear descriptions of the development activities so that reviewers will understand (a) what will be developed, (b) how it will be developed, and (c) when the development will take place. Applicants should describe what they would measure or observe to determine whether the intervention is working as intended when they are testing the feasibility of successive versions of the intervention. Strong applications will include plans to develop a set of fidelity of implementation measures that could be used if the intervention were evaluated in an efficacy trial.

(i) Sample

Applicants should give thoughtful consideration to the sample that is chosen and its relation to addressing the overall aims of the project (e.g., do the samples include individuals who represent the intended end-user of the intervention?). The applicant should define, as completely as possible, the samples and settings that will be used to iteratively develop the intervention, assess the feasibility of the intervention when implemented in an authentic education delivery setting, and assess the promise of the intervention in the pilot study.

(ii) Iterative development process

A major objective of Development/Innovation projects is to refine and improve upon the initial version of the intervention by implementing it (or components of it), observing its functioning, and making necessary adjustments in the design of the intervention so that it functions more as intended. Development requires a systematic process for creating and refining the intervention. Applicants should describe the systematic, iterative development process to be used in the design and refinement of the proposed intervention and plans for acquiring evidence about the operation of the intervention according to the theory of change that they describe. The number of times a component or intervention is revised, implemented, observed, and revised depends on the complexity of the intervention and its implementation. Applicants should explain (a) how they define "operating as intended" for the proposed intervention; (b) what data they will collect to determine how the intervention (or component) is operating; (c) how they will use the data they collect to revise the intervention; and (d) what criteria they will use to determine if the intervention (or component) operates as intended.

A timeline that delineates the iterative process of drafting and revising the intervention (e.g., features or components of the intervention, procedures, training activities, and materials) is a helpful way of showing reviewers how research activities will feed into subsequent development (refinement) activities. A variety of methodological strategies may be employed during this phase. For Development/Innovation projects, reviewers need to understand the iterative development process to be used in the design and refinement of the proposed intervention.

(iii) Feasibility of implementation

By the end of a Development/Innovation project, investigators should have a fully developed intervention and data that address the feasibility of implementing the intervention in authentic education delivery settings. Feasibility of implementation might be addressed, for example, with evidence demonstrating that the intervention can be implemented with fidelity in a few authentic education delivery settings that represent the type of settings (e.g., classrooms) for which the intervention is intended. Feasibility should be demonstrated on a small sample of users (e.g., teachers, students) who are like those for whom the product is intended and should show that they can utilize or implement the intervention in the way that the developer intends the intervention to be implemented.

(iv) Pilot study

By the end of a Development/Innovation project, the Institute also expects investigators to have evidence of the promise of the intervention for achieving the intended outcomes. Such data are intended to be used in support of a subsequent proposal to evaluate the effect of the intervention under an Efficacy/Replication grant (see Efficacy/Replication requirements under *Rationale for evaluating interventions that are not in wide use, Section 16.D.b.v*). A number of approaches may be used to assess the promise of the intervention. For example, an applicant might propose a small quasi-experimental study incorporating a comparison group with pretest and posttest data. Evidence of the promise of the intervention could also be obtained using single-subject experimental designs. Demonstration of the promise of the intervention does *not* need to be through a randomized controlled trial. However, applicants should be aware that reviewers are generally more convinced of the promise of the intervention for achieving the desired outcomes when the effect of the intervention on intended outcomes is compared to change in the intended outcomes over a comparable period for some other group.

Whatever pilot study is proposed, applicants should be aware that no more than 30 percent of the funds may be used to support the collection of pilot data regarding the promise of the fully developed intervention and that the pilot study is *not* intended to be a test of the efficacy of the intervention.

(v) Measures

Applicants should clearly describe procedures for collecting data. Applicants should include information on the psychometric properties of the measures that will be used (e.g., where appropriate, information on reliability and validity of instruments). Development/Innovation projects typically include the collection of process data to help the researcher refine the intervention and provide insight into the feasibility and usability of the proposed intervention in authentic education delivery settings. Applicants should clearly describe (a) what needs to be observed to determine if the intervention is operating as intended, (b) how those observations will be collected, and (c) how the data will be coded. Observational, survey, or qualitative methodologies are encouraged to enrich understanding of the operation of the intervention.

The Institute recognizes that there may be a need for some measurement development to be conducted in Development/Innovation projects (e.g., fidelity measures, measures of outcomes that may be aligned with the proposed intervention). In such cases, applicants should detail how those measures will be developed and validated.

d. Personnel

Competitive applicants will have research teams that collectively demonstrate expertise in the relevant content domain, the methodological expertise required for conducting the proposed research, and experience working with schools or other education agencies. In the project narrative, applicants should briefly describe the qualifications, roles, responsibilities, and percent of time to be devoted to the project for key personnel. Reviewers will also consider the applicant's track record for disseminating research findings in peer-reviewed scientific journals.

If aspects of the proposed project will be conducted by another organization (e.g., measurement development, data collection, data analysis), that organization must be included in the application and the personnel responsible for that work should be described in this section.

An applicant may be or may involve *for-profit entities* in the project. Involvement of the commercial developer or distributor must not jeopardize the objectivity of the research.

e. Resources

In competitive proposals, applicants will describe having access to institutional resources that adequately support research activities, access to schools in which to conduct the research, and access to school or district data, as appropriate.

f. Additional considerations

Applicants who have received previous research grants from the Institute should describe the results and outcomes of prior or currently held awards (e.g., findings, publications).

In addition, the Institute expects any developed interventions (whether supported by the Institute or other organization) with promise of potential efficacy to move to an efficacy evaluation. However, there are situations in which researchers may appropriately apply for a second development award to further develop or extend an intervention that was the focus of a previous development project, prior to the intervention being evaluated through an efficacy evaluation. Applicants applying for a second development award to further develop an intervention should (a) justify the need for a second development award, (b) describe the results and outcomes of prior or currently held awards to support the development of the intervention (e.g., evidence that the intervention in its current form shows promise for improving education outcomes), and (c) indicate whether what was developed has been (or is being) evaluated for efficacy (Efficacy/Replication project) and, if results are available, what the results of those efficacy evaluations have been. A stronger argument for a second development award to extend or further develop an intervention can be made when the researcher has data showing that the intervention in its current form has strong potential for improving education outcomes.

Applicants who have previously received a development award and are applying for a grant to develop a *new* intervention should indicate whether the first intervention has been evaluated for efficacy (by themselves or another research team) and describe results, if available. Applications from researchers who have previously received an award to develop an intervention are strengthened when the researchers can demonstrate that their previous intervention improves, or shows promise for improving, education outcomes.

g. Awards

Typical awards for Development and Innovation projects will range from \$150,000 to \$400,000 (total cost = direct + indirect costs) per year for up to 3 years. The maximum duration of the award is 3 years and the maximum award for a 3-year project is \$1,500,000 (total cost). Development costs vary according to the type of intervention that is proposed; the size of the award depends on the scope of the project.

Under Development/Innovation, no more than 30 percent of the total funds may be used for collection of pilot data to demonstrate the promise of the intervention for achieving the desired outcomes.

D. Requirements for Goal Three: Efficacy and Replication

Because the requirements for Efficacy and Replication projects are essentially the same across the Institute's standing research grant programs, a generic description is used in the funding announcement. Consequently, the examples provided may not apply to a particular topic.

Under the Efficacy and Replication (Efficacy/Replication) goal, the Institute requests proposals to test the efficacy of fully developed interventions (i.e., practices, programs, and policies). By *efficacy*, the Institute means the degree to which an intervention has a net positive impact on the outcomes of interest in relation to the practice, program, or policy to which it is being compared.

a. Purpose of Efficacy and Replication (Efficacy/Replication) Projects

The Institute's purpose in funding Efficacy/Replication evaluations is to determine whether or not fully developed interventions produce a net positive impact relative to a counterfactual when they are implemented in authentic education delivery settings (e.g., schools) with a limited (homogenous) and specified sample. By *limited and specified*, the Institute means with a specific student or teacher population and with specific types of schools. That is, efficacy studies are not expected to encompass widely diverse samples. The Institute is interested in funding small, well-designed and well-conducted efficacy studies that are adequately powered to test the primary questions of interest.

In efficacy trials, the intervention may be implemented under what is sometimes called "ideal" conditions that include more support than what would be expected under routine practice. For example, for an intervention implemented by the regular classroom teachers, the research team could provide additional support to the teachers to improve the fidelity of implementation of the intervention. The goal of efficacy trials is to determine if an intervention *can work* to improve student outcomes with a limited and specified sample as opposed to if an intervention *will work* when implemented under conditions of routine practice (as expected in Scale-up Evaluation projects). The Institute funds efficacy studies in which implementation is by highly or specially trained teachers as well as studies in which implementation is by regular teachers who may or may not receive additional support from the developer or research team.

The Institute also encourages researchers to examine which organizational supports, tools, and procedures may be needed for sufficient implementation of the core components of the intervention under routine practice. For example, based on observational studies of which supports seem to be linked to the successful adoption of the intervention by all or specific subgroups of those implementing it, the researcher might be able to make recommendations on how best to implement the intervention under a future Scale-up Evaluation project.

The Institute expects to generate evidence that an intervention can work (or to gain information about the limitations of an intervention – where it does not work – and what modifications might be needed) under diverse conditions and for different types of students through replication studies (i.e., replicating the efficacy evaluation with different populations or in different types of schools or districts). For instance, in a previous study, the applicant could have demonstrated the efficacy of an intervention in a small random assignment trial in an urban school district, and a reasonable next step might be to replicate these findings in a rural school district. The Institute does not expect a *single* efficacy evaluation to include sufficient diversity in the sample of schools, classrooms, or students to ensure appropriate generalizability of the impact of the intervention to a wide variety of schools in a state or region of the country. Applicants proposing to replicate an efficacy evaluation should give thoughtful regard to the appropriate sample for the proposed replication evaluation considering, for example, the types of students and schools that participated in the previous evaluations.

The key differences between Efficacy/Replication evaluations and Scale-up evaluations, as the Institute uses these terms, have to do with the delivery of the intervention under ideal versus routine conditions (discussed above), the degree of independence of the evaluators (see *Section 16.D.e* below), and the existence of evidence pertaining to the efficacy of the intervention (see *Sections 16.D.b.iv-v* below).

From the Institute's standpoint, a funded Efficacy/Replication project would be *methodologically successful* if, at the end of the grant period, the investigators had rigorously evaluated the impact of a clearly specified intervention on relevant student outcomes and under clearly described conditions using a research design that meets (without reservation) the Institute's What Works Clearinghouse standards (<http://whatworks.ed.gov>), whether or not the intervention is found to improve student outcomes relative to the comparison condition. The Institute would consider methodologically successful projects to be *pragmatically successful* if the rigorous evaluation determined that the intervention has a net positive impact on student outcomes in relation to the policy, program, or practice to which it is being compared. The Institute expects all methodologically successful projects to contribute to our theoretical understanding of education processes and procedures and to the advancement of the education sciences.

Finally, under the Efficacy/Replication goal, applicants may also propose to collect follow-up data to existing efficacy trials. Requirements for follow-up studies are detailed in *Section 16.D.d, Efficacy follow-up studies*.

b. Significance of the project

Interventions appropriate for study under the Efficacy/Replication goal are (a) interventions that are already widely used but have not been rigorously evaluated or (b) interventions that are fully developed, have evidence of their feasibility for use in authentic education delivery settings, and empirical evidence of the promise of the intervention but are not yet widely used. Also appropriate for Efficacy/Replication applications are proposals to *replicate* the efficacy of an intervention in a different setting or with a different population.

Applicants address the significance of their proposal by describing (i) clear aims (hypotheses and/or research questions) for the project, (ii) the fully developed intervention (e.g., features, components), (iii) the theory of change for the intervention, and (iv) a compelling rationale for evaluating the proposed intervention, which may include input from education stakeholders such as practitioners and policymakers.

(i) Research aims

Applicants should clearly describe the aims of the research project, including hypotheses and/or research questions to be addressed.

(ii) Interventions are ready to be evaluated

Applicants must have an intervention that is fully developed and ready to be evaluated. Applicants may devote a short period of time (e.g., 6 months) to develop measures and prepare

supporting materials or training manuals for the intervention. However, applicants who intend to devote a longer period of time to developing new components or materials for the intervention or new delivery approaches should apply to Development/Innovation. Efficacy/Replication projects are limited to those interventions that are fully developed. Applicants should clearly describe the intervention and provide evidence that it is fully developed and ready for evaluation.

(iii) Theory of change

Applicants should clearly present the theory of change for the intervention by describing the features or components of the intervention and how they relate to each other and to the intended outcomes both temporally (operationally) and theoretically (e.g., why A leads to B). When applicants clearly describe the model that guides the intervention and the intervention itself (e.g., specific features or components of the intervention), reviewers are better able to evaluate the relation between the intervention and its theoretical and empirical foundation (e.g., is the proposed intervention a reasonable operationalization of the theory?), as well as the relation between the intervention and the outcome measures (e.g., do the proposed measures tap the constructs that the intervention is intended to address?).

The Institute recognizes that oftentimes widely used interventions (e.g., published curricula) are not based on a formal theory of change. In such cases, applicants should articulate a general theory of change for the proposed intervention in which they describe what the intervention is expected to change that will ultimately result in improved student outcomes. This general theory of change should be sufficient for guiding the design of the evaluation (e.g., selecting an appropriate sample, measures, comparison condition).

Some interventions are designed to *directly* affect the teaching and learning environment and *indirectly* affect student outcomes. In such cases, it is important for applicants to be clear in their theory of change to identify the proximal outcomes that the intervention is designed to affect (e.g., teacher practices), as well as the more distal student outcomes, that are intended to be improved.

Strong applications will also include detailed descriptions of what the comparison group experiences. By clearly describing the intervention and the comparable treatment that the comparison group will receive, reviewers are better able to judge whether the intervention is sufficiently different from what the comparison group receives so that one might reasonably expect a difference in student outcomes. In addition, reviewers are better able to determine if the proposed fidelity measures and observations of the comparison group are sufficiently comprehensive and sensitive to identify and document critical differences between what the intervention and comparison groups receive.

(iv) Rationale for evaluating interventions that are already in wide use

Applicants should provide a compelling rationale that justifies the Institute's investment in the evaluation of the proposed intervention. As justification for the evaluation of an intervention that is already in wide use, the Institute will accept conceptual arguments of the importance of evaluating the intervention because of its relevance to public policy or current education practice as would be judged by practitioners and policymakers. For example, the intervention may already be widely used but has not been rigorously evaluated (e.g., a commercially distributed program that is used in a number of states, a specific state education policy). To support this argument, applicants might include documentation of the widespread use of the program to justify the proposed efficacy evaluation. By *widespread use*, the Institute means used across multiple states or in the majority of districts in a single large state or in the majority of schools in two or more large districts. Typically, interventions that fall in this category are commercially produced and distributed. In this section, applicants are, in essence, justifying why the proposed evaluation is important for the Institute to fund.

(v) Rationale for evaluating interventions that are not in wide use

Applicants should provide a compelling rationale that justifies the Institute's investment in the evaluation of the intervention. Applicants should provide evidence that the intervention can be implemented in authentic education delivery settings—that is, evidence of the feasibility and usability of the intervention in authentic education delivery settings. Applicants should provide a strong argument for the promise of the intervention for improving education outcomes by including, for example, information on (a) the theoretical foundation on which the intervention was developed, (b) the practical problem the intervention is intended to address, (c) empirical evidence for the feasibility of the intervention's implementation, and (d) empirical evidence demonstrating the promise of the intervention for achieving the desired outcomes.

Demonstration of the promise of the intervention does *not* need to be through a randomized controlled trial. However, applicants should be aware that reviewers are generally more convinced of the promise of the intervention for achieving the desired outcomes when the effect of the intervention on intended outcomes is compared to change in the intended outcomes over a comparable period for some other group.

In short, the applicant needs to address the following questions: Why is this intervention likely to produce better student outcomes relative to current practice? What is the *practical* importance of the intervention (or why should education practitioners or policymaker care about the results of the proposed evaluation)? Why is the proposed evaluation important for the Institute to fund?

c. Methodological requirements

For all applications, including those submitted under the Efficacy/Replication goal, the proposed research design must be appropriate for answering the research questions or hypotheses that are posed.

(i) Sample

The applicant should give thoughtful consideration to the sample that is chosen and its relation to addressing the overall aims of the project. The applicant should define, as completely as possible, the sample to be selected and sampling procedures to be employed for the proposed study, including justification for exclusion and inclusion criteria. Additionally, the applicant should describe strategies to increase the likelihood that participants (including schools, teachers, and students, as appropriate) will remain in the study over the course of the evaluation (i.e., reduce attrition).

(ii) Research design

The applicant must provide a detailed research design. Applicants should describe how potential threats to internal validity would be addressed. For all types of design, including random assignment, applicants should explain how they will document that the intervention and comparison conditions are equivalent at the outset of the study.⁷

Studies using random assignment to intervention and comparison conditions have the strongest internal validity for causal conclusions and, thus, are preferred whenever they are feasible. When a randomized trial is used, the applicant should clearly state and present a convincing rationale for the unit of randomization (e.g., students, classroom, teacher, or school). Applicants should explain the procedures for assignment of groups (e.g., schools) or participants to intervention and comparison conditions and how the integrity of the assignment process will be ensured.⁸

Studies using regression discontinuity designs may also provide unbiased estimates of the effects of education interventions. Applicants proposing regression discontinuity designs should explain

⁷ Applicants may find the following article useful: Song, M., & Herman, R. (2010). Critical issues and common pitfalls in designing and conducting impact studies in education: Lessons learned from the What Works Clearinghouse (Phase I). *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 32(3), 351-371.

⁸ What a randomized control trial must do to meet the WWC's evidence standards is described in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook (2008) available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/library/>.

the appropriateness of the assignment variable (e.g., show there is a true discontinuity and document that no manipulation of the assignment variable has occurred) and include sensitivity analyses to assess the influence of key procedural or analytic decisions on the results.⁹

Applicants may propose a quasi-experimental design (including a regression discontinuity design) rather than a randomized trial when randomization is not possible. Applicants should justify that the proposed design permits drawing causal conclusions about the effect of the intervention on the intended outcomes. Applicants should discuss how selection bias will be minimized or modeled.¹⁰ To this end, the specific assumptions made by the design should be justified. For example, the covariates used in a propensity score match should be shown capable of explaining selection, and the instrumental variable used in an instrumental variable analysis should be shown to be strongly correlated with the independent variable and correlated with the outcome through that independent variable (but not directly correlated with the outcome or indirectly correlated with the outcome through unobserved variables). Applicants should explicitly discuss the threats to internal validity that are not addressed convincingly by the design and how conclusions from the research will be tempered in light of these threats. Because quasi-experimental designs other than strong regression discontinuity designs can only meet the WWC's standards for evidence with reservations, it is important for applicants to detail how they will ensure that their study meets these standards (e.g., establishing equivalence between treatment and comparison groups, acceptable attrition levels) to prevent the study from being designated by the WWC as not meeting evidence standards.¹¹

Efficacy studies can be based solely on secondary data analyses, provided researchers use an appropriate analytical approach for answering causal questions. Applicants proposing to primarily use existing data sets (e.g., state or local student achievement databases) or to incorporate existing data sets in their analyses should explicitly address how exclusion from testing, or missing data, will be handled within the statistical analysis. If multiple data sets will be linked for the proposed analyses, applicants should provide sufficient detail for reviewers to judge the feasibility of the linking plan.

(iii) Power

Applicants should clearly address the statistical power of the evaluation design to detect a reasonably expected and minimally important effect. When justifying what constitutes a reasonably expected effect, applicants should indicate clearly (e.g., by including the statistical formula) how the effect size was calculated. If a primary research question focuses on subgroups (e.g., boys, children from low-income families), applicants should show that the proposed sample has sufficient power to address the proposed question about specific subgroups.

Many evaluations of education interventions are designed so that clusters or groups of students (e.g., classrooms, schools), rather than individual students, are assigned to intervention and comparison conditions. In such cases, the power of the design depends in part on the degree to which the observations of individuals within clusters are correlated with each other on the outcomes of interest. For determining the sample size, applicants need to consider the number of clusters, the number of individuals within clusters, the potential adjustment from covariates, the minimum effect to be reliably detected, the intraclass correlation (i.e., the variance between clusters relative to the total variance between and within clusters), and the desired power of the design (note, other factors may also affect the determination of sample size, such as the structure of the design [e.g., if a blocking factor is used], repeated observations, attrition of

⁹ What a regression discontinuity design must do to meet the WWC standards of evidence is described in Standards for Regression Discontinuity Designs (2010) available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/library/>.

¹⁰ For more information, see Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., and Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

¹¹ What a quasi-experimental designs must do to meet the WWC's evidence standards with reservations is described in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook (2008) available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/library/>.

participants, etc.).¹² Strong applications will include empirical justification for the intraclass correlation, anticipated minimum effect, and other estimation parameters used in the power analysis.

(iv) Measures

Applicants should give careful consideration to the selection of measures and justify the appropriateness of the chosen measures. For example, are measures included that will be sensitive to the change in performance that the intervention is intended to bring about? Measures of student outcomes may include researcher developed measures. However, applicants should also include relevant measures of student outcomes that are of practical interest to educators and measures that are not overly aligned with the intervention. For example, proposals to evaluate interventions to improve academic outcomes should include measures such as grades, standardized measures of student achievement, or state end-of-course exams. Proposals to evaluate interventions designed to improve behavioral outcomes should include practical measures of behaviors that are relevant to schools, such as attendance, tardiness, drop-out rates, disciplinary actions, or graduation rates. Some interventions are designed to change directly the teaching and learning environment and indirectly affect student outcomes. In such cases, applicants must provide measures of student outcomes, as well as measures of the proximal outcomes (e.g., teacher behaviors) that are hypothesized to be more directly linked to the intervention.

The applicant should provide information on the reliability and validity of the proposed measures. The Institute recognizes that there may be a need for some measurement development to be conducted in Efficacy/Replication projects (e.g., fidelity measures). In such cases, applicants should detail how those measures will be developed and validated. If measures (including those of fidelity, below) are to be developed and/or collected by another organization, that organization must be included in the application and the measures and the instruments (e.g., surveys of participants) that will be used must be described, as well as the data collection procedures and the timing of the data collection. It is not acceptable to simply propose that grant funds be used to contract with an unspecified organization to develop and/or collect the measures.

Applicants should describe the procedures for and the timing of the data collection and indicate procedures to guard against bias entering into the data collection process (e.g., pretests occurring after the intervention has been implemented or differential timing of assessments for treatment and control groups).

(v) Fidelity of implementation of the intervention

Applicants should have a clear plan for how the intervention will be implemented in education settings and what supports are needed to ensure that the intervention will be implemented as intended (e.g., pre-intervention training for school staff who will deliver the intervention, observations of school staff while they deliver the intervention and feedback on their performance by coaches). Applicants should specify how the implementation of the intervention will be documented and measured. Investigators should make clear how the fidelity measures capture the core components of the intervention. In strong applications, investigators will propose methods that permit the identification and assessment of factors associated with the fidelity of implementation (e.g., additional planning time for teachers); such information may provide insight into what supports are needed within schools or districts to successfully implement the intervention with high fidelity. In strong applications, researchers describe how

¹² For more information, see Donner, A., & Klar, N. (2000). *Design and Analysis of Cluster Randomization Trials in Health Research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; Murray, D. M., Varnell, S. P., & Blitstein, J. L. (2004). Design and analysis of group-randomized trials: A review of recent methodological developments. *American Journal of Public Health, 94*(3), 423-432; W.T. Grant Foundation & University of Michigan, http://sitemaker.umich.edu/group-based/optimal_design_software.

fidelity data will be incorporated into analyses of the impact of the intervention.¹³ Applicants should also collect data on the conditions in the school setting that may affect the fidelity of implementation and that can help the researchers understand why the intervention is or is not implemented with high fidelity.

If the applicant is proposing an efficacy study that relies on secondary data analyses of historical data that does not contain information on the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention, the applicant is *not* required to include fidelity data.

(vi) Comparison group

Comparisons of interventions against other conditions are only meaningful to the extent that one can tell what the comparison group receives or experiences. Applicants should compare intervention and comparison groups on the implementation of critical features of the intervention so that, for example, if there is no observed difference between intervention and comparison student outcomes, they can determine if key elements of the intervention were also provided in the comparison condition (i.e., a lack of distinction between the intervention treatment and the comparison treatment). The purpose here is to obtain information useful for *post hoc* explanations of why the intervention treatment does or does not improve student learning relative to the counterfactual.

Applicants should give thoughtful consideration to the selection of the counterfactual. In evaluations of education interventions, individuals in the comparison group typically receive some kind of treatment; rarely is the comparison group a "no-treatment" control. For some evaluations, the primary question is whether the intervention treatment is more effective than a particular alternative treatment. In such instances, the comparison group receives a well-defined treatment that is usually an important comparison to the target intervention for theoretical or pragmatic reasons. In other cases, the primary question is whether the intervention treatment is more effective than what is generally available and utilized in schools. In such cases, the comparison group might receive what is sometimes called *business-as-usual*. That is, the comparison group receives whatever the school or district is currently using or doing in a particular area. Business-as-usual generally refers to situations in which the standard or frequent practice across the district or region is a relatively undefined education treatment. However, business-as-usual may also refer to situations in which a branded intervention (e.g., a published curriculum or program) is implemented with no more support from the developers of the program than would be available under normal conditions. In either case, *using a business-as-usual comparison group is acceptable*. When business-as-usual is one or another branded intervention, applicants should specify the treatment or treatments received in the comparison group. In all cases, applicants should account for the ways in which what happens in the comparison group is important to understanding the net impact of the intervention treatment.

The applicant should describe strategies they intend to use to avoid contamination between treatment and comparison groups. Applicants do *not* necessarily need to randomize at the school level to avoid contamination between groups. Applicants should explain and justify their strategies for reducing contamination.

(vii) Moderating and mediating variables

Applicants should provide a theoretical rationale to justify the inclusion (or exclusion) of factors/variables in the design of the evaluation that have been found to affect the success of education programs (e.g., teacher experience, fidelity of implementation, characteristics of the student population). Observational, survey, or qualitative methodologies are encouraged as a

¹³ See, e.g., Hulleman, C. S., & Cordray, D. S. (2009). Moving from the lab to the field: The role of fidelity and achieved relative intervention strength. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 2, 88-110.

complement to experimental methodologies to assist in the identification of factors that may explain variation in the effect of the intervention.

The Institute expects efficacy studies to examine relevant moderating factors. Moderating variables that are measured in the intervention condition that are also likely to affect outcomes in the comparison condition should be measured in the comparison condition (e.g., teacher experience/time in position). The Institute recognizes that many efficacy studies are not powered to rigorously test the effects of a wide-range of moderators and so expects applicants to focus on a small set of well-justified ones.

The Institute also recognizes that most efficacy studies are not designed or powered to rigorously test the effects of specific mediating variables. However, the Institute encourages applicants to propose exploratory analyses to better understand potential mediators of the intervention.

(viii) Data analysis

All proposals must include detailed descriptions of data analysis procedures. For quantitative data, specific statistical procedures should be described. The relation between research questions/hypotheses, measures, and independent and dependent variables should be clear. For qualitative data, the specific methods used to index, summarize, and interpret data should be delineated. In strong applications, researchers describe how questions or hypotheses related to moderators, subgroups, and fidelity of implementation will be addressed in the data analyses.

Most evaluations of education interventions involve clustering of students in classes and schools and require the effects of such clustering to be accounted for in the analyses, even when individuals are randomly assigned to condition. Such circumstances generally require specialized multilevel statistical analyses. Strong applications will provide sufficient detail for reviewers to judge the appropriateness of the data analysis strategy.

(ix) Requirements for single-case experimental designs

By single-case experimental designs, the Institute refers to experimental studies involving repeated, systematic measurement of a dependent variable before, during, and after the active manipulation of an independent variable (e.g., intervention) intended to demonstrate a causal relationship between the two variables using a small number of participants or cases. By "case", the Institute is referring to a single participant or a cluster of participants (e.g., a classroom), and is *not* referring to descriptive case studies.

Single case-experimental designs would be *methodologically successful* if, at the end of the grant period, the investigators had rigorously evaluated the impact of a clearly specified intervention on relevant student outcomes and under clearly described conditions using single-case research designs that meet (without reservation) the Institute's What Works Clearinghouse standards described in the *Single-Case Design Technical Documentation* (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/wwc_scd.pdf) whether or not the intervention is found to improve student outcomes.

The efficacy studies proposed must meet two sets of criteria regarding (1) the design and analysis of individual single-case studies, and (2) the set of single-case studies required to provide evidence of the efficacy of an intervention. Applicants are strongly encouraged to read the *Single-Case Design Technical Documentation* for a full description of the requirements for single-case research studies that will meet Institute's What Works Clearinghouse standards for individual studies and for the set of studies required to establish efficacy of an intervention.

(1) Design and Analysis of Each Study

Each study being conducted must meet the following requirements:

- (a) **Sample.** Applicants should define the criteria used for selecting participants, the process for selecting participants, and the critical features of the physical setting from which participants are recruited with sufficient detail to allow other researchers to identify similar individuals from similar settings. Defining selection criteria typically requires specifying a particular disability, the measurement instrument, and criterion used to identify the disability.
- (b) **Intervention.** In addition to meeting the requirements for interventions listed above in *Section 16.D.b. Significance of the project*, applicants should describe the intervention in sufficient detail to allow other researchers to reliably replicate the intervention without requiring assistance from the intervention developer. Applicants should clearly specify how, when, and under what conditions the intervention will be implemented to demonstrate how the intervention will be systematically manipulated and under the control of the researcher.
- (c) **Fidelity of implementation.** Applicants should describe how fidelity of implementation will be measured, the frequency of assessments, and what degree of variation in treatment fidelity will be accepted over the course of the study.
- (d) **Baseline and comparison conditions.** The majority of single-case research studies are likely to compare the effects of an intervention with performance during the baseline or comparison condition. Applicants should describe the baseline or comparison conditions in sufficient detail to document what can be characterized as a stable pattern of behavior and to allow other researchers to replicate the baseline condition.
- (e) **Measures.** Measures of student outcomes may include researcher developed measures and other measures that are closely aligned with the proposed intervention. Applicants should identify and operationally describe the dependent variables (DVs) and outcome measures, provide technical information on the reliability and validity of the measures, detail procedures for collecting observations, and where applicable, specify procedures for determining inter-observer reliability or agreement (e.g., Kappa) associated with each DV and monitoring inter-observer reliability during the study and over both baseline and treatment conditions.
- (f) **Design.** Applicants must provide a detailed research design and describe how the research design demonstrates experimental control and addresses common threats to internal and external validity. The Institute expects designs to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards for single case research designs.¹⁴ For example, each study should include at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time or with three different phase repetitions.
- (g) **Analysis.** Applicants should describe the criteria that will be used to demonstrate a functional relationship between manipulation of the intervention and the change in the outcomes, and to determine if the response to the treatment is large enough and sufficiently replicated to support a causal conclusion. Applicants are expected to describe the procedures that will be used to document a causal relationship, and what statistical procedures (e.g., time series analyses), if any, will be employed to determine if the change is significant. Finally, the Institute encourages applicants to

¹⁴ In addition to the general guidelines for efficacy studies, the What Works Clearinghouse recently published specific guidelines for Single-Case Design. Interested applicants may find them at http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/wwc_scd.pdf.

consider strengthening the internal validity of single case experimental designs through the inclusion of randomization procedures (e.g., Koehler & Levin, 1998; Levin & Wampold, 1999).

(2) Set of Studies Required to Provide Evidence of the Efficacy of an Intervention

The Institute recognizes that the confidence in the validity of intervention effects demonstrated with single case experimental studies is enhanced by evidence of effects across different cases, studies, and research groups. The single-case design studies must be conducted by at least three different research teams at three different geographical locations before the What Works Clearinghouse would consider the evidence for an intervention's impact. Therefore, the Institute requires an intervention to have evidence of producing an effect across multiple single-case studies. The set of studies required to establish efficacy must follow the requirements below.

- (a) **Number of research teams and sites.** Applicants proposing single-case research studies for the purpose of establishing the efficacy of an intervention should propose a set of studies that are conducted by at *least three independent research teams at three different geographical locations*. By independent teams, the Institute means teams that independently implement and evaluate the intervention. The intervention developer may be part of one of the intervention teams, but should not have trained the additional research teams on the intervention being investigated.
- (b) **Intervention Procedures.** The intervention procedures for the sample selection criteria and the measurement protocol should be sufficiently manualized to allow for independent implementation.
- (c) **Data Analysis.** Each team must perform the data analysis procedures as outlined in the research grant application on data from its site, and must be completed independently from the other teams.

d. Efficacy follow-up studies

The Institute will support two types of follow-up studies of well-conducted efficacy studies that show robust effects on intended outcomes. Follow-up studies examine the sustainability of the impacts of the intervention after the original project has ended on either (a) students who received the intervention and have entered a new grade or (b) a new group of students who are now entering the grade or place where the intervention took place. Under the first type of follow-up study, students who took part in the original study are followed through additional grades (or places) in which they do not continue to receive the intervention in order to determine if positive effects are maintained in succeeding years. For example, if an efficacy study shows that students in the intervention group do substantially better on third grade reading achievement tests relative to students in the comparison group, researchers could propose to follow those students to determine if the advantage is maintained through elementary school. The Institute will also support a second type of follow-up study that examines the sustainability of the intervention's impacts after the additional resources provided by the original study are withdrawn. Consider, for example, a teacher professional development intervention to improve reading instruction of third grade teachers that was found to produce the desired changes in teachers' behaviors and in student outcomes during the original study. For a follow-up study, researchers could propose to follow the teachers and evaluate whether the treatment teachers continue to engage in the desired practices the year after the professional development intervention ended and whether the students in their new class outperform students of teachers in the comparison group.

(i) Significance of efficacy follow-up studies

The Institute will support the follow-up studies of well-conducted Efficacy/Replication studies that show robust effects on intended outcomes. The data used to support the proposed follow-up study must be data from the study for which the applicant is proposing additional follow-up data collections. The Institute will *not* accept applications for a follow-up study if the application does

not present impact results on student outcomes for the original study (i.e., the study that the applicant is proposing to extend).

To address the significance of the project, applicants should clearly describe the aims of the research project (i.e., their hypotheses or research questions). Applicants should clearly describe the existing efficacy study, including the sample, the design, measures, fidelity of implementation of the intervention, and analyses. Reviewers need sufficient information to assess how well the efficacy study was conducted. It is helpful if applicants include a CONSORT flow diagram showing numbers of participants at each stage of the study.¹⁵ Applicants should discuss the participant attrition identified in the flow diagram, the level of attrition expected in the follow-up study and ways it might be reduced, how the analysis will address attrition, and its impact on the interpretation of the results. Second, all applicants should clearly describe the impact of the intervention on all the outcomes measured in the original study, including the impact of the intervention on student outcomes. The Institute intends to support follow-up studies of interventions that produce robust effects. Applicants should provide a compelling rationale justifying the importance of the proposed research.

(ii) Methodological requirements for efficacy follow-up studies

Applicants must provide a detailed research design and show how the proposed design is appropriate for answering the proposed research questions. Applicants should describe the sample and strategies to minimize attrition of participants over the course of the study. Applicants should describe what measures will be collected and the procedures for collecting the data. If the applicant is proposing a study regarding the continued implementation of the intervention after the efficacy project has ended, the applicant should describe how fidelity of implementation will be monitored. Applicants must include a detailed data analysis plan and demonstrate that they will have sufficient power to detect the expected effects.

e. Personnel

Competitive applicants will have research teams that collectively demonstrate expertise in the relevant content domain, the methodological expertise required for conducting this proposed study, and experience working with schools or other education agencies. In the project narrative, applicants should briefly describe the qualifications, roles, responsibilities, and percent of time to be devoted to the project for key personnel. Reviewers will also consider the applicant's track record for disseminating research findings in peer-reviewed scientific journals.

If aspects of the proposed project will be conducted by another organization (e.g., measurement development, data collection, data analysis), that organization must be included in the application and the personnel responsible for that work should be described in this section.

The Institute recognizes that the Principal Investigator of an efficacy trial may often have played an important role in the development of the intervention to be evaluated which raises issues of conflict of interest. However, the current education research enterprise does not have sufficient numbers of independent evaluators to conduct all of the efficacy projects that the Institute funds. Further, the involvement of the developer is often critical to implementation of the intervention with the skill and fidelity appropriate for an efficacy trial. Consequently the Institute allows a researcher/developer to be

¹⁵ CONSORT, which stands for Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials, was developed to provide guidance on the tracking and reporting of critical aspects of randomized controlled trials (RCTs). The main initiative of the CONSORT group was the development of a set of recommendations for reporting RCTs, called the CONSORT Statement. The Statement includes a checklist that focuses on study design, analysis, and interpretation of the results, and a flow diagram that provides a structure for tracking participants at each study stage. IES encourages researchers to use these tools in their Efficacy/Replication and Scale-up Evaluation research projects. The CONSORT Statement can be found at <http://www.consort-statement.org/consort-statement/overview0/>.

the Principal Investigator of an efficacy evaluation provided that reasonable safeguards are in place to ensure the objectivity and integrity of the evaluation. The Institute recommends the following steps be taken.

- The procedure for assignment of units to condition is conducted by an individual (or team) who is independent of the developer. For example, the person who writes the program to generate random numbers and assigns units (e.g., teachers, schools) to condition is separate from the developer/distributor of the intervention.
- Collection and coding of outcome data should be under the supervision of someone other than those who were or are involved in the development or distribution of the intervention.
- Analysis of data is conducted by individuals who are not involved with the development or distribution of the intervention and have no financial interest in the outcomes of the evaluation.

Applicants proposing single-case design efficacy studies are reminded of the requirement to involve three independent research teams. The intervention developer may be part of one of the intervention teams, but should not have trained the additional research teams on the intervention being investigated.

f. Resources

In competitive proposals, applicants will describe having access to institutional resources that adequately support research activities and access to schools in which to conduct the research. Applicants should document the availability and cooperation of the schools or other education delivery settings that will be required to carry out the research proposed in the application via a letter of support from the education organization. These letters should convey that the organizations understand what participation in the evaluation will involve (e.g., if assigned to a wait-list control condition, a school will not receive the intervention for X-number of years).

g. Additional considerations

Applicants who have received previous research grants from the Institute should describe the results and outcomes of prior or currently held awards (e.g., findings, publications).

h. Awards

Typical awards for Efficacy and Replication projects are \$250,000 to \$650,000 (total cost = direct + indirect costs) per year for up to 4 years. The maximum duration of the award is 4 years and the maximum award for a 4-year project is \$3,500,000 (total cost).

Typical awards for Efficacy and Replication follow-up studies are \$150,000 to \$300,000 (total cost = direct + indirect costs) per year for up to 3 years. The maximum duration of the award is 3 years and the maximum award for a 3-year project is \$1,200,000 (total cost).

E. Requirements for Goal Four: Scale-Up Evaluation

Because the requirements for the Scale-up Evaluation goal are essentially the same across the Institute's standing education research grant programs, a generic description is used in the funding announcement. Consequently, the examples provided may not apply to a particular topic.

a. Purpose of Scale-up Evaluation Projects

The Institute's purpose in funding Scale-up evaluations is (i) to determine whether or not fully developed interventions are effective when they are implemented under conditions that would be typical if a school district or other education delivery setting were to implement them (i.e., routine practice; implementation

without special support from the developer or the research team) and (ii) when they are evaluated by an independent evaluator, (iii) to generate evidence that an intervention works under different school and population conditions (e.g., urban vs. rural districts; with vs. without high proportions of English learners), and (iv) to understand the organizational supports that are needed to ensure sufficient implementation of the core components (active ingredients) of the intervention. Scale-up evaluations are also employed to determine the effects of theoretically important moderators of the intervention. The key differences between Scale-up evaluations and Efficacy/Replication evaluations, as the Institute uses these terms, have to do with the delivery of the intervention, the conduct and oversight of the evaluation, and the existence of strong prior evidence pertaining to the efficacy of the intervention.

(i) Routine implementation of the intervention

Scale-up evaluations require that the intervention be implemented under conditions of routine practice. That is, *the intervention should be implemented in the school or other authentic education setting as it would be if the school or entity had purchased and implemented the intervention on its own without any involvement in a research study.* Consider an example in which a curriculum is to be implemented and the developer/distributor designed professional development for teachers who are using the curriculum for the first time. In such cases, the professional development should be delivered in a manner consistent with what would happen if the curriculum were widely distributed. For example, the developer/distributor might plan to use a train-the-trainers model for professional development if the curriculum were widely distributed. Alternatively, the developer/distributor might have manualized the professional development or created online professional development modules to accompany the curriculum. In such cases, the manual or online modules would be what is used in the Scale-up evaluation. For Scale-up evaluations, the primary question of interest is, "Does this intervention produce a net positive increase in student learning and achievement relative to the comparison group *under typical conditions?*"

(ii) Independent evaluation of the intervention

Scale-up evaluations require the design and conduct of the evaluation to be independent from the developer/distributor of the intervention. The individuals involved in the design of the evaluation, the determination of random assignment, the data collection, and analysis of data must be individuals who did not and do not participate in the development or distribution of the intervention. The Principal Investigator must be an individual who has not been involved in the development or distribution of the intervention and has no financial interest in it. However, as noted above, it may be appropriate for the developer/distributor to be involved in the implementation of the intervention, if that level of involvement is what is intended under conditions of routine practice.

(iii) Generating evidence that the intervention works under different conditions

The Institute expects to generate evidence about how well an intervention works under diverse conditions and for different types of students through multiple Scale-up evaluations (i.e., replicating the evaluation with different populations or in different types of schools or districts). (This is analogous to a Goal Three Replication study.) The Institute does not expect a *single* Scale-up evaluation to include sufficient diversity in the sample of schools, classrooms, or students to ensure generalizability of the impact of the intervention to all schools in a state or region. Thus, size of the evaluation (e.g., numbers of districts, schools, students) *is not* the key distinction between Efficacy and Scale-up evaluations. Applicants should give thoughtful regard to the appropriate sample for the proposed Scale-up evaluation considering, for example, prior evidence of the effects of the intervention, as well as the types of students and schools that participated in previous efficacy and scale-up evaluations. (See related discussion of moderators in *Section 16.E.a.v Determining the effects of selected moderators of the intervention.*)

(iv) Understanding the organizational conditions needed to support the intervention

In Efficacy/Replication projects, the Institute encourages researchers to try to identify the conditions, tools, and procedures that are needed to support the implementation of the intervention in order to make recommendations for its successful implementation under the routine conditions within a Scale-up evaluation. As part of the preparation for a Scale-up evaluation, the project could formalize these recommendations for routine use by teachers and schools. For example, if during an efficacy evaluation researchers noted that implementation went more smoothly in schools that gave teachers time to troubleshoot difficulties together, then a common planning period for teachers might be built into the intervention under the Scale-up evaluation to allow all teachers the same opportunity under routine practice. In addition, the Institute encourages researchers to continue to examine which organizational supports, tools, and procedures may be needed for sufficient implementation of the core components of the intervention under routine practice during the Scale-up Evaluation project in order to support successful dissemination of interventions found to have beneficial impacts.

(v) Determining the effects of selected moderators of the intervention

As noted above, the Institute expects to generate evidence on the broad generalizability of an intervention through multiple scale-up evaluations. However, individual scale-up evaluations can contribute evidence to the generalizability of an intervention by testing theory-driven hypotheses about differential effects related to selected setting, school, and student characteristics for which there is reason to believe that such differential effects may occur. The Institute encourages applicants to propose to test selected, theoretically relevant moderators within a Scale-up Evaluation study. Based on a consideration of the prior evidence and theory of change, an applicant might identify key differences in the settings, circumstances, or student populations that such considerations suggest may produce consequential differential effects. For example, based on such considerations, an applicant might decide that a primary research question for a Scale-up evaluation is whether the target intervention has different effects on low-performing native English speakers than it has on low-performing English learners. In such an instance, the applicant would design and power the study to be able to appropriately test a difference in outcomes for these two subgroups.

b. Significance of the project

To be considered for Scale-up Evaluation awards, applicants must propose to evaluate a fully developed intervention that has strong evidence of efficacy of the intervention.¹⁶ Scale-up Evaluation applicants address the significance of their project by (i) posing clear aims (hypotheses or research questions) for the project, (ii) clearly describing the intervention, (iii) describing the intervention's theory of change, (iv) providing strong evidence of the educationally meaningful effects that are expected, (v) detailing the conditions under which the intervention will be implemented, and (vi) a compelling rationale for evaluating the proposed intervention, which may include input from education stakeholders such as practitioners and policymakers.

(i) Research aims

Applicants should clearly describe the aims of the research project (i.e., their hypotheses or research questions).

(ii) Description of the intervention

All applicants should clearly describe the intervention (e.g., features, components). Strong applications will also include detailed descriptions of what the comparison group experiences. When applicants clearly describe the components of the intervention and the comparable treatment that the comparison group will receive, reviewers are better able to judge whether (a)

¹⁶ Applicants proposing to evaluate a widely used intervention for which there is little evidence of the efficacy of the intervention should refer to the Efficacy/Replication goal. The Institute encourages applicants to discuss the appropriate goal for a proposal with the relevant program officer listed in *Section 32*.

the intervention is sufficiently different from the comparison condition so that one might reasonably expect a difference in student outcomes, and (b) fidelity measures and observations of the comparison group are sufficiently comprehensive and sensitive to identify and document critical differences between the intervention and comparison conditions.

(iii) Theory of change

Applicants should clearly present the theory of change for the intervention by describing the features or components of the intervention and how they relate to each other and to the intended outcomes both temporally (or operationally) and theoretically (e.g., why A leads to B). When applicants clearly describe the model that guides the intervention and clearly describe the intervention itself, reviewers are better able to evaluate the relation between the intervention and the outcome measures (e.g., do the proposed measures tap the constructs that the intervention is intended to address?) and to assess the degree to which the applicant has included measures of potential moderators of the intervention.

(iv) Strong evidence of educationally meaningful effects

Applicants should provide strong evidence of the efficacy of the program to justify the proposal to conduct a scale-up evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention. As an example of strong evidence of efficacy, an applicant might describe the results of two or more rigorously conducted evaluations using random assignment to intervention and comparison conditions in which the efficacy of the intervention is demonstrated with different populations (e.g., urban and rural school districts). Evidence of the efficacy of the intervention should be based on the results of rigorous randomized field trials or well-designed quasi-experimental evaluations. To enable reviewers to judge the quality of the efficacy studies, applicants should clearly describe the research design and methodology of the efficacy studies, the results of the studies, and the conditions under which the intervention was implemented. (Note that under efficacy trials, implementation of the intervention may be under "ideal" conditions. That is, implementation of the intervention may have occurred with support from the developer that enables the core elements of the intervention [i.e., active ingredients] to be implemented with a high degree of fidelity.)

Strong applications will include information on the size and statistical significance of the effects that were obtained through efficacy trials. Applicants should indicate clearly (e.g., including the statistical formula) how the effect size was calculated when they use effect sizes as part of the rationale for justifying their intervention. Furthermore, information on effect sizes is more useful to reviewers when sufficient context for interpreting the effect sizes is provided.

(v) Conditions of implementation

One objective of scale-up evaluations of interventions is to determine if programs are effective when the developers/distributors of the program do not provide any more support than would be available under normal conditions. That is, the program should be implemented as it would be if the schools or other entities that are delivering the program were to obtain the program on their own and decide to use it apart from participation in any research and evaluation study – conditions of routine practice. For Scale-up Evaluation studies, the applicant should detail the conditions under which the intervention will be implemented and include a method to document conditions and critical variables that affect the success of a given intervention.

The materials, training procedures, organizational arrangements (e.g., requiring five instructional periods of at least 50 minutes per week for the curriculum or teacher participation in professional development sessions once a month), and all other aspects of the intervention should be developed or specified to the point where the intervention is ready to be implemented under real-world circumstances in a real-world way. Strong applications will provide reviewers with sufficient information to evaluate whether the tools and procedures exist that will enable schools or districts to achieve, monitor, and maintain adequate fidelity of implementation of the

intervention under conditions of routine practice (i.e., without any support from the researchers or developers of the intervention that would not typically be available to entities wanting to implement the intervention outside of a research study).

(vi) Importance of the proposed project

Applicants should provide a succinct but compelling rationale explaining why the proposed research is important to fund.

c. Methodological requirements

For all applications, including those submitted under Scale-up Evaluation, the proposed research design must be appropriate for answering the research questions or hypotheses that are posed.

All of the methodological requirements listed under the Efficacy and Replication goal apply to Scale-up Evaluation goal projects. However, the Scale-Up goal does *not* allow scale-up studies that are single-case experimental designs.

In addition to the Efficacy/Replication goal methodological requirements, strong applications for Scale-up Evaluation projects will include a Cost-Feasibility analysis to assess the financial costs of program implementation and assist schools in understanding whether implementation of the program is practicable given their available resources. Data should be collected on the monetary expenditures for the resources that are required to implement the program. Financial costs for personnel, facilities, equipment, materials, and other relevant inputs should be included. Annual costs should be assessed to adequately reflect expenditures across the lifespan of the program. The Institute is not asking applicants to conduct an economic evaluation of the program (e.g., cost-benefit, cost-utility, or cost-effectiveness analyses), although applicants may propose such evaluation activities if desired.¹⁷

d. Scale-up follow-up studies

The Institute will support follow-up studies of well-conducted Scale-up Evaluation studies that show robust effects on intended outcomes. The data used to support the follow-up study must be data from the study for which the applicant is proposing additional follow-up data collections. The Institute will *not* accept applications for a follow-up study if the application does not present impact results on student outcomes for the original study (i.e., the study that the applicant is proposing to extend).

Under Scale-up Evaluation, the Institute will fund follow-up studies in which students who took part in the original study are followed to determine if positive effects obtained in the original study are maintained in succeeding years. For example, if a Scale-up Evaluation study shows that students in the intervention group do substantially better on third grade reading achievement tests relative to students in the comparison group, researchers could propose to follow those students in later grades to determine if the advantage is maintained.

The requirements for Scale-up Evaluation follow-up studies are the same as the requirements for Efficacy/Replication follow-up studies.

e. Personnel

Competitive applicants will have research teams that collectively demonstrate expertise in the relevant content domain, the methodological expertise required for conducting this proposed study, and experience working with schools or other education agencies. In the project narrative, applicants should briefly describe the qualifications, roles, responsibilities, and percent of time to be devoted to the project for key personnel. Reviewers will also consider the applicant's track record for disseminating research findings in peer-reviewed scientific journals.

¹⁷ For additional information on how to calculate the costs of a program or conduct an economic evaluation, applicants might refer to Levin, H.M., & McEwan, P.J. (2001). *Cost-Effectiveness Analysis*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

If aspects of the proposed project will be conducted by another organization (e.g., measurement development, data collection, data analysis), that organization must be included in the application and the personnel responsible for that work should be described in this section.

Scale-up evaluations require the design and conduct of the evaluation to be independent from the developer/distributor of the intervention. The individuals involved in the design of the evaluation, the determination of random assignment, the data collection, and analysis of data should be individuals who did not and do not participate in the development or distribution of the intervention. The Principal Investigator must be an individual who has not been involved in the development or distribution of the intervention. The evaluation team must have no financial interest in the outcomes of the evaluation.

The requirements do not preclude the developer or distributor from having some role in the evaluation. For example, a developer/distributor may use a train-the-trainers model and may conduct a professional development training session for district personnel who will subsequently train the teachers in their schools on the intervention. However, involvement of the developer or distributor must not jeopardize the objectivity or independence of the evaluation. Strong applications will carefully describe the role, if any, of the developer/distributor in the intervention. Note that developers or distributors must not provide any training or support for the implementation that would not normally be available to users of the intervention under conditions of routine implementation.

In all cases, applicants should describe how objectivity in the evaluation would be maintained and declare any potential conflicts of interest (e.g., close relationships with the developer/distributor) that members of the evaluation team may have.

f. Resources

In competitive proposals, applicants will describe having access to institutional resources that adequately support research activities and access to schools in which to conduct the research. Strong applications will document the availability and cooperation of the schools or other education delivery settings that will be required to carry out the research proposed in the application via a letter of support from the education organization. These letters should convey that the organizations understand what participation in the evaluation will involve (e.g., if assigned to a wait-list control condition, a school will not receive the intervention for X-number of years). Applicants should discuss the overall management of the research project and what resources and procedures are available to support the successful completion of this project.

g. Additional considerations

Applicants who have received previous research grants from the Institute should describe the results and outcomes of prior or currently held awards (e.g., findings, publications).

h. Awards

Typical awards for Scale-up Evaluation projects are \$350,000 to \$900,000 (total cost = direct + indirect costs) per year for up to 5 years. The maximum duration of the award is 5 years and the maximum total award for a 5-year project is \$5,000,000 (total cost).

Typical awards for Scale-up Evaluation follow-up projects are \$250,000 to \$400,000 (total cost = direct + indirect costs) per year for up to 3 years. The maximum duration of the award is 3 years and the maximum total award for a 3-year project is \$1,500,000 (total cost).

For Scale-up Evaluation Projects, no more than 25% of the award may be allocated to the cost of the intervention. For purposes of this award, cost of the intervention includes any materials, software, computers, or training required to implement the intervention. Cost of the intervention does not include salaries for school or district staff who implement the intervention as part of their regular duties. Cost of the intervention does not include funds allocated to pay teachers or other participants for time involved in completing questionnaires, surveys, or any other assessments that are part of the evaluation.

F. Requirements for Goal Five: Measurement

The Institute's requirements for Measurement projects are the same for all standing education research programs and are described in this section.

a. Purpose of Measurement Projects

Applications appropriate for consideration under the Measurement goal are (a) proposals to develop and validate new assessments, (b) proposals to validate existing assessments, (c) proposals to adapt and validate assessments originally designed and used for research purposes for broader use in instructional settings, (d) proposals to develop and test new techniques for assessment or analysis of assessment data in the context of state accountability standards and systems, and (e) proposals to develop assessments used to certify or assess education professionals (e.g., teachers, education leaders, related service providers) and validate these assessments or existing assessments against student outcomes. Proposed assessments must meet the specific requirements detailed under the topic to which the proposal is submitted.

Measurement development and refinement activities can be supported as part of projects submitted under the other goals (e.g., development of fidelity instruments or development of an outcome measure that is aligned with the intervention). Applications to the Measurement goal are for research that focuses primarily on assessment development and validation.

Under the Measurement goal, the Institute does *not* accept applications to test whether or not the use of an assessment affects student outcomes. Applicants, for example, who are interested in testing whether or not using a progress-monitoring instrument improves student learning must apply under Efficacy/Replication or Scale-up Evaluation. In all cases, the Institute encourages interested researchers to contact the relevant program officer for guidance on the appropriate goal for a particular application.

Under the Measurement goal, the Institute primarily supports research on assessments intended for use in education delivery settings for purposes such as, screening, progress monitoring, outcome assessment, assessment of teachers and other education professionals, and assessment of education systems. However, the Institute recognizes that there are circumstances in which an instrument needs to be developed that will primarily be used by researchers whose translational research will ultimately lead to improvements in education practices. The Institute will accept applications to develop and validate such assessments.

b. Significance of the project

Applicants address the significance of their proposal by (i) posing clear aims for the project, (ii) clearly describing the theoretical and empirical rationale for the proposed assessment, (iii) describing the components of the assessment, and (iv) providing a compelling rationale justifying the importance of the proposed research, which may include input from education stakeholders such as practitioners and policymakers.

(i) Research aims

Applicants should clearly describe the aims of the research project (i.e., their hypotheses or research questions).

(ii) Theoretical and empirical rationale

Applicants should provide a compelling rationale to support the development, refinement, and/or validation of the proposed assessment for a given purpose and population. Applicants should clearly describe the theoretical basis for the construct(s) that are intended to be measured by the assessment. Reviewers will consider (a) the strength of the theoretical foundation for the proposed assessment, (b) the existing empirical evidence supporting the proposed assessment, and (c) the practical need for the proposed work (e.g., whether the proposed assessment duplicates existing assessments). In developing or refining an assessment, researchers should

keep in mind the pragmatic constraints (e.g., number of students, limited class time, time required to train teachers to use the assessments, costs) that teachers and administrators will consider to determine whether the instrument is a viable option for use in classrooms and other education delivery settings.

(iii) Description of the assessment

Applications should provide sufficient description of the proposed assessment and how it will be used for reviewers to judge the practicality of the proposed assessment. Applicants should describe the components of the assessment (e.g., specific knowledge and skills that the instrument is designed to measure) in sufficient detail to allow reviewers to evaluate relations between the theoretical and empirical foundations for the assessment and the assessment itself (e.g., does the proposed assessment capture critical skills?) and whether the proposed assessment will meet the needs for which it is intended. Applications to examine the use of assessments for accountability purposes should provide sufficient description of the proposed assessment instrument or technique in the context of state and federal accountability policies so that reviewers are able to judge the merits and feasibility of the proposed research on assessment for accountability.

(iv) Overall importance of the proposed research

All applicants should address the practical need for the proposed work (e.g., whether the proposed assessment duplicates existing assessments). For assessments that are intended to be used by practitioners, researchers should explain how the proposed assessment takes into account the pragmatic constraints (e.g., number of students, limited class time, time required to train teachers to use the assessments, costs) that teachers and administrators will consider to determine whether the instrument is a viable option for use in classrooms and other education delivery settings. Applicants proposing research on an assessment that will primarily be used by researchers should provide a strong argument that explains how research using the assessment would ultimately lead to improvements in education.

All applicants should provide a compelling justification arguing the overall importance of the proposed research. In essence, why is this research important to fund?

c. Methodological requirements

For all applications, including those submitted under the Measurement goal, the proposed research design must be appropriate for answering the research questions or hypotheses that are posed.

Applicants proposing to develop a new assessment or refine an existing assessment should clearly address (a) the proposed methods for developing or refining the assessment, and (b) the proposed research methods for obtaining evidence to support the *validity and reliability* of the instrument for the specified purpose(s). Applicants proposing to validate an existing assessment without refining or modifying the assessment should clearly describe the proposed research methods for obtaining evidence of the *validity and reliability* of the instrument for the specified purpose(s).

Applicants should detail the proposed framework and procedures for developing and/or validating the assessment and provide a clear rationale for the design of the project. The framework should provide detailed operational definitions of the construct(s) of measurement, summarize how the assessment will provide evidence of the construct(s) identified in the rationale, and describe the processes for reasoning from assessment items and scores to making intended inferences regarding the construct(s) of measurement. To enable reviewers to better understand the proposed framework for the assessment, applicants should make clear the purpose(s) for which the assessment results are likely to be used and how the results are likely to be interpreted. Validity arguments and techniques for estimating reliability should be clearly articulated. Strong applications will include descriptions of (a) the procedures for determining adequate representation of the construct(s) that will be measured by the instrument; (b) the procedures for developing and selecting items to be used in the assessment, including assessing difficulty

of selected items, and obtaining representative responses to items for overall score and subscores (if applicable); (c) procedures for scoring the assessment, including processes for maximizing the reliability of scoring for open response items; (d) procedures for minimizing the influence of factors that are extraneous to the intended construct(s) (i.e., construct irrelevance); (e) if alternate forms will be developed, the procedures for establishing the equivalency of the forms (i.e., horizontal equating); (f) if the proposed assessment is used to measure growth, the procedures for establishing a developmental scale (e.g., vertical equating); (g) plans for establishing the fairness of the test for all members of the intended population (e.g., differential item functioning); and (h) the process for determining the administrative procedures for conducting the assessment (e.g., mode of administration, inclusion/exclusion of individual test takers, accommodations, and whether make-ups or alternative administrative conditions will be allowed).

The Institute recognizes that the applicability and feasibility of issues identified in (a) through (h) above (e.g., equating of alternate forms of an instrument; vertical equating) will vary based on the purpose of the proposed measurement project. For example, some applicants propose to develop new or novel assessments that one would not reasonably expect to be fully developed within the time and resources allocated for a Measurement grant. Other applicants may propose to conduct activities to further develop existing assessment. Applicants should describe the expected end product of the proposed measurement project and explain why any items in (a) through (h) are not relevant to the proposed project. *All applicants should describe the iterative development process to be used in the design and/or refinement of the proposed measurement tool.*

Applicants must detail planned analytic methods (e.g., statistical and/or psychometric models). Data analysis plans should include treatment of missing responses and criteria for interpreting results. Applicants should describe the characteristics, size, and analytic adequacy of samples to be used in each study, including justification for exclusion and inclusion criteria.

Applicants proposing to use existing data sets (e.g., state or local student achievement databases) to validate an assessment should explicitly address how exclusion from testing, test accommodations, or missing data, will be handled within the statistical analysis. If multiple data sets will be linked for the proposed analyses, applicants should provide sufficient detail of the linking method for reviewers to judge the feasibility of the plan.

Applicants proposing to collect original data should carefully describe the sample, measures (including reliability and validity for the specified purpose), and procedures proposed for the primary data collection. If observational data are collected, applicants should describe how the data would be collected (e.g., procedures for maintaining inter-observer reliability), coded, and analyzed.

Applicants proposing research on assessments of teachers, education leaders, or education systems must relate the assessments to measures of student outcomes.

d. Personnel

Competitive applicants will have research teams that collectively demonstrate expertise in (a) content area; (b) assessment development and administration; (c) psychometrics; (d) implementation of and analysis of results from the research design that will be employed; and (e) working with teachers, schools, or other education delivery settings in which the proposed assessment might be used. In the project narrative, applicants should briefly describe the qualifications, roles, responsibilities, and percent of time to be devoted to the project for key personnel. Reviewers will also consider the applicant's track record for disseminating research findings in peer-reviewed scientific journals.

If aspects of the proposed project will be conducted by another organization (e.g., data collection, data analysis), that organization must be included in the application and the personnel responsible for that work should be described in this section.

e. Resources

In competitive proposals, applicants will describe having access to institutional resources that adequately support research activities and access to schools in which to conduct the research. Applicants should also demonstrate access to statistical and measurement resources and technical expertise needed for developing and studying assessment instruments and techniques.

f. Additional considerations

Applicants who have received previous research grants from the Institute should describe the results and outcomes of prior or currently held awards (e.g., findings, publications).

In addition, applicants who previously held or currently hold Measurement grants to conduct research on the proposed measure should describe the results and outcomes of those grants to date. They should indicate whether what was developed has been (or is being) validated and, if results are available, what the results of those studies have been.

The Institute recognizes that there are situations in which researchers may appropriately apply for a second measurement award to further develop or to continue to validate an assessment that was the focus of a previous measurement project (funded by the Institute or other organizations). In such cases, the applicant should also provide a compelling rationale of the need for a second measurement award.

Finally, the Institute reiterates that the purpose of Measurement goal grants is to develop and validate new instruments, to modify and validate existing assessments, or to validate existing assessments. Applicants who are interested in testing whether or not using an assessment improves student outcomes must apply under the Efficacy/Replication goal or Scale-up Evaluation goal. In all cases, the Institute encourages interested researchers to contact the relevant program officer listed in *Section 32* for guidance on the appropriate goal for a particular application.

g. Awards

Typical awards for Measurement projects are \$150,000 to \$300,000 (total cost = direct + indirect costs) per year for up to 4 years. The maximum duration of the award is 4 years and the maximum award for a 4-year project is \$1,600,000 (total cost). The size of the award depends on the scope of the project.

PART IV GENERAL SUBMISSION AND REVIEW INFORMATION

17. MECHANISM OF SUPPORT

The Institute intends to award grants pursuant to this request for applications. The maximum length of the award period varies by goal. The maximum length of the award period for each goal ranges from two to five years. Please see details for each goal in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research* of the announcement.

18. FUNDING AVAILABLE

The size of the award depends on the goal and scope of the project. Please see specific details in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research* of the announcement. Although the plans of the Institute include the research programs (topics) described in this announcement, awards pursuant to this request for applications are contingent upon the availability of funds and the receipt of a sufficient number of meritorious applications. The number of projects funded under a specific topic and goal depends upon the number of high quality applications submitted to that topic and goal. The Institute does not have plans to award a specific number of grants under each particular topic and goal.

19. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Applicants that have the ability and capacity to conduct scientifically valid research are eligible to apply. Eligible applicants include, but are not limited to, non-profit and for-profit organizations and public and private agencies and institutions, such as colleges and universities.

20. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Research supported through this program must be relevant to education in the United States.

Recipients of awards are expected to publish or otherwise make publicly available the results of the work supported through this program. Institute-funded investigators must submit final, peer-reviewed manuscripts resulting from research supported in whole or in part by the Institute to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC, <http://eric.ed.gov>) upon acceptance for publication. An author's final manuscript is defined as the final version accepted for journal publication and includes all graphics and supplemental materials that are associated with the article. The Institute will make the manuscript available to the public through ERIC no later than 12 months after the official date of publication. Institutions and investigators are responsible for ensuring that any publishing or copyright agreements concerning submitted articles fully comply with this requirement.

Applicants must budget for one meeting each year (for up to 3 days) in Washington, D.C. with other grantees and Institute staff. At least one project representative must attend the meeting.

Applicants are reminded to apply their negotiated off-campus indirect cost rate, as directed by the terms of the applicant's negotiated agreement with the federal government, when conducting research in field settings.

Research applicants may collaborate with, or be, for-profit entities that develop, distribute, or otherwise market products or services that can be used as interventions or components of interventions in the proposed research activities. Involvement of the developer or distributor must not jeopardize the objectivity of the research.

Applicants may propose studies that piggyback onto an existing study (i.e., that require access to subjects and data from another study). In such cases, the Principal Investigator of the existing study must be one of the members of the research team applying for the grant to conduct the new project.

If an application is being considered for funding based on the technical merit scores from the scientific peer review panel and the research relies on access to secondary data sets, the applicant will need to provide documentation that they have access to the necessary data sets in order to receive the grant.

This means that if an applicant does not have permission to use the proposed data sets at the time of application, the applicant will need to provide documentation to the Institute from the entity controlling the data set(s) indicating that the applicant has permission to use the data for the proposed research for the time period discussed in the proposal before the grant will be awarded. Similarly, applicants who had permission to use a proposed data set prior to the application may be asked to provide documentation that they continue to have permission to use the data set to conduct the proposed research during the project period.

If an application is being considered for funding based on the technical merit scores from the scientific peer review panel and the research relies on access to education delivery settings (e.g., schools), the applicant will need to provide documentation that they have access to the necessary schools in order to receive the grant. This means that if an applicant does not have permission to conduct the proposed project in the necessary number of schools at the time of application, the applicant will need to provide documentation to the Institute indicating that the applicant has successfully recruited the necessary number of schools for the proposed research before the full first-year costs will be awarded. Similarly, applicants who recruited sufficient numbers of schools prior to the application may be asked to provide documentation that the schools originally recruited for the application continue to be willing partners in the research.

The Institute strongly advises applicants to establish a written agreement among all key collaborators and their institutions (e.g., Principal and Co-Principal Investigators) regarding roles, responsibilities, access to data, publication rights, and decision-making procedures within three months of receipt of an award.

21. DESIGNATION OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

The applicant institution is responsible for identifying the Principal Investigator. The Principal Investigator is the individual who has the authority and responsibility for the proper conduct of the research, including the appropriate use of federal funds and the submission of required scientific progress reports. An applicant institution may elect to designate more than one Principal Investigator. In so doing, the applicant institution identifies them as individuals who share the authority and responsibility for leading and directing the research project intellectually and logistically. All Principal Investigators will be listed on any grant award notification. However, institutions applying for funding must designate a single point of contact for the project. The role of this person is primarily for communication purposes on the scientific and related budgetary aspects of the project and should be listed as the Principal Investigator. All other Principal Investigators should be listed as Co-Principal Investigators.

22. LETTER OF INTENT

The Institute asks all applicants to submit a letter of intent by 4:30 p.m. Washington D.C. time on the relevant due date for the competition to which they plan to submit. The information in the letters of intent enable Institute staff to identify the expertise needed for the scientific peer review panels and secure sufficient reviewers to handle the anticipated number of applications. The Institute encourages all interested applicants to submit a letter of intent, even if they think that they might later decide not to submit an application. The letter of intent is not binding and does not enter into the review of a subsequent application. The letter of intent must be submitted electronically using the instructions provided at: <https://iesreview.ed.gov>. Receipt of the letter of intent will be acknowledged via email.

A. Content

The letter of intent should include:

- a. Descriptive title
- b. Topic and goal that the applicant will address
- c. Brief description of the proposed project
- d. Name, institutional affiliation, address, telephone number and e-mail address of the Principal Investigator(s) and any co-Principal Investigators
- e. Name and institutional affiliation of any key collaborators and contractors
- f. Duration of the proposed project

- g. Estimated total budget request (the estimate need only be a rough approximation)

B. Format and Page Limitation

Fields are provided in the letter of intent for each of the content areas described above. The project description should be single-spaced and should not exceed one page (about 3,500 characters).

23. MANDATORY SUBMISSION OF ELECTRONIC APPLICATIONS

Grant applications must be submitted electronically through the Internet using the software and application package provided on the Grants.gov web site: <http://www.grants.gov/>. Applicants must follow the application procedures and submission requirements described in the Institute's Grants.gov Application Submission Guide and the instructions in the User Guides provided by Grants.gov.

Applications submitted in paper format will be rejected unless the applicant (a) qualifies for one of the allowable exceptions to the electronic submission requirement described in the Federal Register notice announcing the Special Education Research Grant (CFDA Number 84.324A) competitions described in this Request for Applications and (b) submits, no later than two weeks before the application deadline date, a written statement to the Institute that documents that the applicant qualifies for one of these exceptions. For more information on using Grants.gov, applicants should visit the Grants.gov web site.

24. APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS AND APPLICATION PACKAGE

A. Documents Needed to Prepare Applications

To complete and submit an application, applicants need to review and use three documents: the Request for Applications, the IES Grants.gov Application Submission Guide, and the Application Package.

- The *Request for Applications* for the Special Education Research Grant Program (CFDA 84.324A) describes the substantive requirements for a research application.

- ✓ Request for Applications <http://ies.ed.gov/funding/>

- The *IES Grants.gov Application Submission Guide* provides the instructions for completing and submitting the forms included in the Application Package.

- ✓ IES Grants.gov Application Submission Guide <http://ies.ed.gov/funding/>

Additional help navigating Grants.gov is available in the Grants.gov User Guides:

- ✓ Grants.gov User Guides <http://grants.gov/applicants/resources.jsp>

- The *Application Package* provides all of the forms that need to be completed and submitted. The application form approved for use in the competitions specified in this RFA is the government-wide SF-424 Research and Related (R&R) Form (OMB Number 4040-0001). The applicant must follow the directions in *Section C* below to download the Application Package from Grants.gov.

B. Date Application Package is Available on Grants.gov

The Application Package will be available on <http://www.grants.gov/> by the following date:

June Application Package Available by	April 21, 2011
September Application Package Available by	July 21, 2011

C. Download Correct Application Package

a. CFDA number

Applicants must first search by the CFDA number for each IES Request for Applications *without* the alpha suffix to obtain the correct downloadable Application Package. For the Special Education Research Request for Applications, applicants must search on: **CFDA 84.324**.

b. Special Education Research Application Package

The Grants.gov search on CFDA 84.324 will yield more than one Application Package. For the Special Education Research Request for Applications (i.e., the research topics listed in this Request for Applications), applicants must download the package for the appropriate deadline marked:

June Special Education Research

Application Package:

Special Education Research CFDA 84.324A-1

September Special Education Research

Application Package:

Special Education Research CFDA 84.324A-2

In order for the application to be submitted to the correct grant competition, applicants must download the Application Package that is designated for the grant competition and competition deadline. Using a different Application Package, even if that package is for an Institute competition, will result in the application being submitted to the wrong competition; applications submitted to the wrong competition may not be reviewed for the Special Education Research competition.

25. SUBMISSION PROCESS AND DEADLINE

Applications must be **submitted electronically and received by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, D.C. time** on the application deadline date, using the standard forms in the Application Package and the instructions provided on the Grants.gov web site.

Potential applicants should check the Grants.gov web site for information about the electronic submission procedures that must be followed and the software that will be required.

26. APPLICATION CONTENT AND FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS

A. Overview

In this section, the Institute provides instructions regarding the content of the (a) project summary/abstract, (b) project narrative, (c) Appendix A, (d) Appendix B, (e) Appendix C, and (f) bibliography and references cited. Instructions for all other documents to be included in the application (i.e., the SF-424 forms, biographical sketches, narrative budget justification, and human subjects narrative) are provided in the IES Grants.gov Application Submission Guide.

B. General Format Requirements

Margin, format, and font size requirements for the project summary/abstract, project narrative, Appendix A, Appendix B, Appendix C, and bibliography are described in this section. To ensure that the text is easy for reviewers to read and that all applicants have the same amount of available space in which to describe their projects, applicants must adhere to the type size and format specifications for the entire narrative including footnotes.

a. Page and margin specifications

For the purposes of applications submitted under this RFA, a "page" is 8.5 in. x 11 in., on one side only, with 1 inch margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.

b. Spacing of text

Text must be single spaced in the narrative.

c. Type size (font size)

Type must conform to the following three requirements:

- The height of the letters must not be smaller than a type size of 12 point.
- The type density, including characters and spaces, must be no more than 15 characters per inch (cpi). For proportional spacing, the average for any representative section of text must not exceed 15 cpi.
- The type size must yield no more than 6 lines of type within a vertical inch.

Applicants should check the type size using a standard device for measuring type size, rather than relying on the font selected for a particular word processing/printer combination. The type size used must conform to all three requirements. Small type size makes it difficult for reviewers to read the application; consequently, the use of small type will be grounds for the Institute to return the application without peer review.

Adherence to type size and line spacing requirements is necessary so that no applicant will have an unfair advantage by using small type or by providing more text in their applications. **Note, these requirements apply to the PDF file as submitted.** As a practical matter, applicants who use a 12-point Times New Roman font without compressing, kerning, condensing, or other alterations typically meet these requirements.

Figures, charts, tables, and figure legends may be in a smaller type size but must be readily legible.

d. Graphs, diagrams, tables

Applicants are encouraged to use black and white in graphs, diagrams, tables, and charts. If color is used, the applicant must ensure that the material reproduces well when photocopied in black and white.

C. Project Summary/Abstract

a. Submission

The project summary/abstract will be submitted as a separate .PDF attachment.

b. Page limitations and format requirements

The project summary/abstract is limited to one single-spaced page and must adhere to the margin, format, and font size requirements above.

c. Content

The project summary/abstract should include:

- (1) Title of the project
- (2) The RFA topic and goal under which the applicant is applying (e.g., Reading, Writing, and Language Development, Development and Innovation goal)
- (3) A brief description of the purpose (e.g., to develop and document the feasibility of an intervention)
- (4) A brief description of the setting in which the research will be conducted (e.g., rural school districts in Alabama)
- (5) A brief description of the population(s) from which the participants of the study(ies) will be sampled (age or grade level, race/ethnicity, SES)
- (6) If applicable, a brief description of the intervention or assessment to be developed or evaluated or validated
- (7) If applicable, a brief description of the control or comparison condition (e.g., what participants in the control condition will experience)
- (8) A brief description of the primary research method
- (9) A brief description of measures and key outcomes
- (10) A brief description of the data analytic strategy

Please see the website <http://ies.ed.gov/ncser/projects> for examples of project summaries/abstracts.

D. Project Narrative

a. Submission

The project narrative will be submitted as a .PDF attachment.

b. Page limitations and format requirements

The project narrative is limited to **25 single-spaced pages** for all applicants. The 25-page limit for the project narrative does not include any of the SF-424 forms, the one-page summary/abstract, the appendices, research on human subjects information, bibliography, biographical sketches of senior/key personnel, narrative budget justification, subaward budget information or certifications and assurances. If the narrative is determined to exceed the 25 single-spaced page limit, the Institute will remove any pages after the twenty-fifth page of the narrative.

Reviewers are able to conduct the highest quality review when applications are concise and easy to read, with pages numbered consecutively using the top or bottom right-hand corner.

c. Format for citing references in text

To ensure that all applicants have the same amount of available space in which to describe their projects in the project narrative, applicants should use the author-date style of citation (e.g., James, 2004), such as that described in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th Ed.* (American Psychological Association, 2009).

d. Content

To be compliant with the requirements of the Request for Applications, the project narrative must include **four** sections: (a) Significance, (b) Research Plan, (c) Personnel, and (d) Resources. Information to be included in each of these sections is detailed in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research* and in specific requirements subsections for each research topic in *Part II Research Grant Topics*. Incorporating the requirements outlined in these sections provides the majority of the information on which reviewers will evaluate the proposal.

E. Appendix A (Optional)

a. Submission

Appendix A should be included at the end of the Project Narrative and submitted as part of the same .PDF attachment.

b. Page limitations and format requirements

Appendix A is limited to 15 pages. It must adhere to the margin, format, and font size requirements described in *Section 26.B General Format Requirements*.

c. Content

The purpose of Appendix A is to allow the applicant to include any figures, charts, or tables that supplement the research text and examples of measures to be used in the project. In addition, in the case of a resubmission, the applicant may use up to 3 pages of the appendix to describe the ways in which the revised proposal is responsive to prior reviewer feedback. Similarly, applicants who have submitted a somewhat similar proposal in the past but are submitting the current proposal as a new proposal may use up to 3 pages in Appendix A to provide a rationale explaining why the current proposal should be considered to be a "new" proposal rather than a "revised" proposal. These are the only materials that may be included in Appendix A; all other materials will be removed prior to review of the application. Narrative text related to any aspect of the project (e.g., descriptions of the proposed sample, the design of the study, the analysis plan, or previous research conducted by the applicant) must be included in the 25-page project narrative.

F. Appendix B (Optional)

a. Submission

Appendix B should be included at the end of the Project Narrative, following Appendix A, and submitted as part of the same .PDF attachment.

b. Page limitations and format requirements

Appendix B is limited to 10 pages. It must adhere to the margin, format, and font size requirements described in *Section 26.B General Format Requirements*.

c. Content

The purpose of Appendix B is to allow applicants who are proposing to develop, evaluate, or validate an intervention or assessment to include examples of curriculum material, computer screens, assessment items, or other materials used in an intervention or assessment that are pertinent to the proposed project. These are the only materials that may be included in Appendix B; all other materials will be removed prior to review of the application. Narrative text regarding these materials (e.g., descriptions of research that supports the use of the intervention/assessment, the theoretical rationale for the intervention/assessment, details regarding the implementation or use of the intervention/assessment, or rationale for choosing a particular instrument) must be included in the 25-page project narrative.

G. Appendix C (Optional)

a. Submission

Appendix C should be included at the end of the Project Narrative, following Appendix B (or if no Appendix B is included, then Appendix C should follow Appendix A) and submitted as part of the same .PDF attachment.

b. Page limitations and format requirements

Appendix C does not have a page limit. Appendix C contains letters of agreement from research partners (e.g., schools, districts, consultants). Applicants must ensure that the letters reproduce well so that reviewers can easily read them. Applicants should not reduce the size of the letters.

c. Content

The purpose of Appendix C is to allow the applicant to include letters of agreement from partners (e.g., schools and districts) and consultants.

Letters of agreement should include enough information to make it clear that the author of the letter understands the nature of the commitment of time, space, and resources to the research project that will be required if the application is funded. The most common reason for projects to fail is loss of participating schools and districts.

H. Bibliography and References Cited

a. Submission

The section will be submitted as a separate .PDF attachment.

b. Page limitations and format requirements

There are no limitations to the number of pages in the bibliography. The bibliography must adhere to the margin, format, and font size requirements described in *Section 26.B General Format Requirements*.

c. Content

Applicants should include complete citations, including the names of all authors (in the same sequence in which they appear in the publication), titles (e.g., article and journal, chapter and book, book), page numbers, and year of publication for literature cited in the research narrative.

27. APPLICATION PROCESSING

Applications must be **submitted electronically and received by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, D.C. time** on the application deadline date listed in the heading of this request for applications. Following receipt, each application will be reviewed for completeness and for responsiveness to this request for applications. Applications that do not address specific requirements of this request will be returned to the applicants without further consideration.

28. PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Applications that are compliant and responsive to this request will be evaluated for scientific and technical merit. Reviews will be conducted in accordance with the review criteria stated below by a panel of scientists who have substantive and methodological expertise appropriate to the program of research and request for applications.

Each application will be assigned to one of the Institute's scientific review panels. At least two primary reviewers will complete written evaluations of the application, identifying strengths and weaknesses related to each of the review criteria. Primary reviewers will independently assign a score for each criterion, as well as an overall score, for each application they review. Based on the overall scores assigned by primary reviewers, an average overall score for each application will be calculated and a preliminary rank order of applications will be prepared before the full peer review panel convenes to complete the review of applications.

The full panel will consider and score only those applications deemed to be the most competitive and to have the highest merit, as reflected by the preliminary rank order. A panel member may nominate for consideration by the full panel any proposal that he or she believes merits full panel review but would not have been included in the full panel meeting based on its preliminary rank order.

29. REVIEW CRITERIA FOR SCIENTIFIC MERIT

The purpose of Institute-supported research is to contribute to solving education problems and to provide reliable information about the education practices that support learning and improve academic achievement and access to education for all students. Reviewers for all applications will be expected to assess the following aspects of an application in order to judge the likelihood that the proposed research will have a substantial impact on the pursuit of that goal. Information pertinent to each of these criteria is also described above in *Part III Requirements of the Proposed Research* and in the section describing the relevant research grant topic.

A. Significance

Does the applicant provide a compelling rationale for the significance of the project as defined in the Significance of the Project section for the goal under which the applicant is submitting the proposal?

B. Research Plan

Does the applicant meet the requirements described in the methodological requirements section for the goal under which the applicant is submitting the proposal?

C. Personnel

Does the description of the personnel make it apparent that the Principal Investigator and other key personnel possess appropriate training and experience and will commit sufficient time to competently implement the proposed research?

D. Resources

Does the applicant have the facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources required to support the proposed activities? Do the commitments of each partner show support for the implementation and success of the project?

30. RECEIPT AND START DATE SCHEDULE

A. Letter of Intent Receipt Dates

June Application Letter of Intent April 21, 2011
September Application Letter of Intent July 21, 2011

B. Application Deadline Dates

June Application Deadline Date June 23, 2011
September Application Deadline Date September 22, 2011

C. Earliest Anticipated Start Date

For June Application March 1, 2012
For September Application July 1, 2012

D. Latest Possible Start Date

For June Application September 1, 2012
For September Application September 1, 2012

The grant review and award process takes approximately eight months from the time of submission of the application. Applicants will be notified about funding decisions via email *no later than* the earliest anticipated start date (March 1, 2012 or July 1, 2012).

31. AWARD DECISIONS

The following will be considered in making award decisions:

- Scientific merit as determined by peer review
- Responsiveness to the requirements of this request
- Performance and use of funds under a previous Federal award
- Contribution to the overall program of research described in this request
- Availability of funds

32. INQUIRIES MAY BE SENT TO

A. Early Intervention and Early Learning in Special Education

Dr. Joan McLaughlin
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Joan.McLaughlin@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-1309

B. Reading, Writing, and Language Development

Dr. Kristen Lauer
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Kristen.Lauer@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-0377

C. Mathematics and Science Education

Dr. Rob Ochsendorf
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Robert.Ochsendorf@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-2234

D. Social and Behavioral Outcomes to Support Learning

Dr. Jacquelyn Buckley
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Jacquelyn.Buckley@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-2130

E. Transition Outcomes for Special Education Secondary Students

Dr. Amanda Hoffman
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Amanda.Hoffman@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 208-1177

F. Cognition and Student Learning in Special Education

Dr. Amy Sussman
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Amy.Sussman@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-2126

G. Professional Development for Teachers and Related Services Providers

Dr. Rob Ochsendorf
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Robert.Ochsendorf@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-2234

H. Special Education Policy, Finance, and Systems

Dr. Amanda Hoffman
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Amanda.Hoffman@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 208-1177

I. Autism Spectrum Disorders

Dr. Amy Sussman
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Amy.Sussman@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-2126

J. Technology for Special Education

Dr. Rob Ochsendorf
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Robert.Ochsendorf@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-2234

K. Families of Children with Disabilities

Dr. Amy Sussman
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Email: Amy.Sussman@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-2126

33. PROGRAM AUTHORITY

20 U.S.C. 9501 *et seq.*, the "Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002," Title I of Public Law 107-279, November 5, 2002. This program is not subject to the intergovernmental review requirements of Executive Order 12372.

34. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 77, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86 (part 86 applies only to institutions of higher education), 97, 98, and 99. In addition 34 CFR part 75 is applicable, except for the provisions in 34 CFR 75.100, 75.101(b), 75.102, 75.103, 75.105, 75.109(a), 75.200, 75.201, 75.209, 75.210, 75.211, 75.217, 75.219, 75.220, 75.221, 75.222, and 75.230.

35. REFERENCES

American Psychological Association, Research Office (2009). *Publications Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.)*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Booth, A., & Dunn, J. (1996). *Family-school links: How do they affect education outcomes?* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Carver, S. M., & Klahr, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Cognition and instruction: Twenty-five years of progress*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2009) Prevalence of autism spectrum disorders - Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring Network, United States, 2006. Morbidity and Mortality Surveillance Summaries. Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring Network Surveillance Year 2006 Principal Investigators. December 18, 2009; 58 (10) 1-20.

Cepeda, N. J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J. T., & Rohrer, D. (2006). Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132 (3), 354-380.

Duncan, G. J., Dowsett, C. J., Claessens, A., Magnuson, K., Huston, A. C., . . . Japel, C. (2007). School readiness and later achievement. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 1428-1446.

- Dunst, C. J. (2002). Family-centered practices: Birth through high school. *The Journal of Special Education, 36*, 139-147.
- Dunst, C. J., & Wolery, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Advances in early education and day care: Vol. 9. Family policy and practice in early child care* (S. Reifel, Series Ed.). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 13*, 1-22.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*, 445-476.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, P.L. 108-446, 118 Stat. 2647 (2004).
- Koehler, M.J., & Levin, J. R. (1998). Regulated Randomization: A potentially sharper analytical tool for the multiple-baseline design. *Psychological Methods, 3*, 206-217.
- La Paro, K. M., & Pianta, R. C. (2000). Predicting children's competence in the early school years: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research, 70*, 443-484.
- Levin, J.R., & Wampold, B.E. (1999). Generalized single-case randomization tests: Flexible analyses for a variety of situations. *School Psychology Quarterly, 14*, 59-93.
- Lord, C., Wagner, A., Rogers, S., Szatmari, P., Aman, M., Charman, T., . . . Yoder, P. (2005). Challenges in evaluating psychosocial interventions for autistic spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 35*, 695-708
- National Research Council and Institute of Medicine (2000) *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development*. Committee on Integrating the Science of Early Childhood Development. Jack P. Shonkoff and Deborah A. Phillips, eds. Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Newman, L., Wagner, M., Cameto, R., & Knokey, A.-M. (2009). *The Post-High School Outcomes of Youth with Disabilities up to 4 Years After High School. A Report of Findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) (NCSE 2009-3017)*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Available at www.nlts2.org/reports/2009_04/nlts2_report_2009_04_complete.pdf.
- Parsad, B., Lewis, L., & Farris, E. (2001). *Teacher Preparation and Professional Development: 2000* (NCES 2001-088). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Data, 2007 and 2009, Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs, *29th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2007*, vol. 1, Washington, D.C., 2010
- U.S. Department of Education, Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study (SEELS) Data, Wave 3. SEELS Wave 3 Student School Program Questionnaire: Educational services and supports (Table 46), retrieved February 23, 2010 from <http://www.seels.net/search/tables/21/sp3b4frm.html>.

Wagner, M., Newman, L, Cameto, R., & Levine, P. (2006). *The academic achievement and functional performance of youth with disabilities. A report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Wilson, S. J., Lipsey, M. W., & Derzon, J. H. (2003). The effects of school-based intervention programs on aggressive behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*, 136-149.