Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships & Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies

ALLEN RUBY, Ph.D.

National Center for Education Research

SARAH BRASIEL, Ph.D.

National Center for Special Education Research

Transcript

(Slide 1)

This webinar discusses key issues when writing an application for the Partnerships and Collaborations Focused on Problems of Practice and Policy, or Research Collaborations grants program (84.305H). My name is Sarah Brasiel and I'm the contact for projects with the focus on students with or at risk for disabilities. I am a program officer at the National Center for Special Education Research.

Allen Ruby is the contact for all other projects and he is an Associate Commissioner at the National Center for Education Research. The Research Collaborations Grant Program contains two topics: Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships in Education Research (or RPP), and Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies (State/ Local Evaluations).

This webinar is an introduction and it is not a substitute for reading the 84.305H Request for Applications. The Institute strongly recommends that you read the Requests for Applications to ensure you're familiar with all of the requirements and recommendations as you write your grant application. Also, so you're familiar with all the accompanying documents that must be submitted and the procedures for submitting your grant application.

(Slide 2)

This webinar follows the agenda as set out in this slide. I'll provide an overview of IES, the Research Collaborations Grant Program, 84.305H, and its two topics, general requirements for both topics, comparing the purposes of the two topics, the project narrative, appendices, award parameters and key dates, peer review process, sources of information.

(Slide 3)

This graphic represents the organizational structure of IES. We're led by a Director who receives advice and consultation from the National Board for Education Sciences. The board consists of 15 voting members who are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Our Standards and Review Office oversees the scientific peer review process for IES grant applications and IES reports. We also have four centers within IES. The National Center for Education Statistics is the primary federal entity for collecting and analyzing data related to education.

Within NCES, you may be familiar with the NAEP assessment, the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Under NCES, you'll also find many large national longitudinal data sets, including, for example, the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study. The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance conducts unbiased large scale evaluations of education programs, supported by federal funds, provides technical assistance and supports the development and use of research and evaluation throughout the United States.

In NCEE, you'll find the What Works Clearinghouse or WWC, and the Regional Educational Labs or RELs. The two centers that award grants are highlighted here in blue, the National Center for Education Research referred to as NCER, and the National Center for Special Education Research or NCSER. The grant opportunities that we will be talking about today are managed through NCER.

You'll notice here that the research centers are separate from the Standards and Review Office, meaning that we, program officers, are not involved in the peer review process. So,

this allows us to work closely with you, providing technical assistance to you on your applications. We will discuss more about that later in this webinar.

(Slide 4)

The Research Collaborations Grant Program (84.305H), is intended to support research that is carried out by research institutions and U.S. state and local education agencies working collaboratively on problems or issues of high priority for the education agencies. The research may focus on students within a wide range of education settings from prekindergarten through postsecondary and adult education, and may focus on typically developing students and/or students with or at risk for disability.

The goal of this research grant program is the improvement of education outcomes for all students, particularly those at risk of failure.

(Slide 5)

For the FY 2019 competition, IES is accepting applications for the Research Collaborations Program under two topics: 1) Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships in Education Research, or RPP, and 2) Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies, or State/Local Evaluations.

IES believes that education research must address the interest and needs of education practitioners and policymakers as well as students, parents, and community members. Under the Research Collaborations Program, the Institute encourages a development of partnerships between researchers and education agencies to advance the relevance of education research, and the accessibility and usability of the findings for the day-to-day work of education practitioners and policymakers.

These partnerships are intended to increase the relevance of the research through the required inclusion of education agencies as partners from the start of the work with the identification of the research questions, and design of the project, to carrying out of the research, and adoption and dissemination of the results.

(Slide 6)

For both topics, your application must address three general requirements.

First, you must examine student education outcomes. For example, if you propose looking at principal or teacher actions, you would then have to include how these actions are linked to student education outcomes. Second, you must apply as a partnership, which at minimum includes a research institution and a state or local education agency.

Third, you must have a plan to disseminate your findings from the project to a variety of audiences. That includes education agency personnel, and the stakeholders in that agency, policymakers, and researchers.

(Slide 7)

The first general requirement is that your research must address student education outcomes. Your research may be examining non-student issues such as teacher or principal knowledge and skills, school organization, or district or state polices. These must be linked to student education outcomes for your application to be considered for funding by the Institute. These student education outcomes are for students from prekindergarten through postsecondary and

adult education. You can address any grade or grade range within these boundaries, for example, focus on fifth grade, examine middle school, look at transition between high school and college.

These outcomes are for students without disabilities as well as students with or at risk for disabilities. If you're going to work with students with or at risk for disabilities, please review the definition accessible through the hyperlink on this slide because there are specific requirements for how IES defines at-risk. Applicants proposing to study children at risk for developing disabilities must 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 disability 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 must be made explicit in applications and must be completed as part of the sample selection process.

Evidence consisting only of general population characteristics, for example, labeling children as "at risk for disabilities" because they're from low-income families or English learners is not sufficient for this purpose. In addition, applicants must identify the disability or disability categories that the sampled children are at risk of developing.

(Slide 8)

IES also identifies the academic outcomes of interest that you would want to address by the age or grade and education settings students are in.

For prekindergarten, the required outcomes are primarily those that would be considered school readiness such as pre-reading, pre-language, vocabulary, early skills in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics). Research must address center-based pre-K programs.

From kindergarten to grade 12, there are two categories of student outcomes. First, learning outcomes in the major academic subjects of reading, writing, and STEM such as standardized test scores end of course exams, exit exams, and grades. Second, progress through the education system such as completing a course, completing a grade, being retained, graduating from high school, or dropping out.

(Slide 9)

IES is primarily interested in research that is focused on improving outcomes for low-income and historically disadvantaged students in postsecondary and adult education, and for students from all backgrounds who are attending open- and broad-access institutions that accept a majority of students who apply for admission.

Outcomes, for both postsecondary education and adult education, include both measures of achievement and progress through the education system. However, for postsecondary education, measures of achievement can only be used for a subset of students, those enrolled in developmental education, undergraduate writing, career and technical education or CTE, and science, technology, engineering and math, or STEM courses.

(Slide 10)

The second general requirement is that the application must come from a partnership made up at minimum of one research institution and one state or local U.S. education agency. The Institute does not endorse a specific model of research partnerships.

However, the Institute views research partnerships as going beyond two common forms of collaboration between research institutions and educational agencies; 1) the researchers hired by an educational agency to perform a specific research service and to report the results to the agency, or 2) the researcher has an initial research interest and obtains permission from the agency to carry out the research within the agency's schools.

The Institute envisions that work supported by the Research Collaborations Program will be collaborative from start to finish. Together, the partners are expected to develop the research questions, agree on the research design and its implementation, establish a mechanism to discuss the results as they're obtained, and direct further research, consider the practice and policy implications of the results, disseminate the results to multiple audiences, and plan for future research.

On the practitioner's side, relevant decision-makers from across the agency are expected to take part in this process, but so too are other relevant stakeholders. IES ask that the education agency provide a PI who has decision-making authority over the education issue or problem being studied.

This does not mean the superintendent but someone who has some oversight over the education issue. The goal for involving decision-makers is to ensure their access to the research help assure them of the quality and relevance of the research and support their making use of the results.

(Slide 11)

The definition of a "research institution" is broad. To be eligible to be the research institution partner, you have to show that the institution has the ability to do this type of research.

This includes nonprofit and for-profit organizations, public and private institutions, and agencies, for example, colleges and universities or research firms. The eligibility criteria for an education agency partner is more complex. The next two slides describe the type of agencies that qualify.

(Slide 12)

This slide describes possible state education agency partners.

The examples are all eligible as long as they're overseeing some aspect of education, early learning, elementary, secondary, postsecondary, higher education, or adult education. Sometimes different types of public organizations are established to oversee a specific area of education.

If the research will link to the main state education agency, it is helpful to include that agency as well. For example, if you were proposing research of a transition from high school to community college, the partnership would be stronger if it included the agency that oversees high school and the agency that oversees community college. For this grant program, IES uses a broader definition of state education agency than the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) which focuses on the primary agency responsible for supervision of public elementary and secondary schools.

(Slide 13)

This slide describes possible Local Education Agency or LEA partners, including public school districts, community college districts, tribal education agencies, state and city postsecondary systems, and adult education providers when no state or local education agency exist for adult education.

In regards to state and city postsecondary systems, serving as the education agency partner, if there is a state or city education agency that oversees the postsecondary system, the application will be stronger if they're part of the partnership. A postsecondary system that applies as an education agency partner cannot also serve as the research institution partner in the same project.

An individual postsecondary institution, for example, one campus, cannot serve as the agency partner. The whole system must sign onto the project. But the evaluation does not have to be across the whole system. It can take place at only some of the campuses. In regards to adult education, Title II of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) defines organizations eligible for federal funding as adult education providers, including community-based organizations, institutions of higher education, public or nonprofit agencies, libraries.

If the state or district lacks an agency for adult education, one or more of the providers recognized under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act can serve as the education agency partner. There are several types of organizations that can be additional partners but cannot serve alone as the education agency partner.

Intermediate districts, sometimes called service districts, that provide services to multiple districts but do not have decision-making authority over implementing programs and policies. However, they can serve as the agency partner if they do oversee the program or policy.

Organizations made up of LEAs, and sometimes other organizations such as universities or practitioners, for example, research and implementation networks, associations of LEAs or professional associations of LEA leaders that do not have decision-making authority over the implementation of policies and programs within the LEAs need to have some of the LEA members join as the education agency partner.

Nonpublic organizations that oversee or administer schools such as an education management organization or charter management organizations. Those groups can be partners but you must include the public, state or district agency that oversees the schools that are involved. There are also some very small local education agencies, in some cases even having one school.

These can apply as a partner, but the peer reviewers may consider that research on them as less significant than research involving multiple schools.

(Slide 14)

The third general requirement is that you must discuss how you will disseminate your findings from your proposed research.

A dissemination plan must be included in Appendix A. The peer reviewers will consider the quality of the Dissemination Plan presented in Appendix A as part of the review of the Significance Section of your Research Narrative and will review your Resources Section to

determine if you have the resources to carry out your dissemination plan. Your dissemination plan should reflect the purpose of the topic under which your project was funded.

RPP projects are expected to carry out exploratory research to identify potentially important associations between malleable factors and student education outcomes. Findings from these projects are likely to be most useful in pointing out potentially fruitful areas for further attention from researchers, policymakers, and practitioners, rather than providing proof or strong evidence for adopting specific interventions.

State/local Evaluation projects are to evaluate the causal impact of education policy or program on student education outcomes. The Institute considers all types of findings from these projects to be potentially useful for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners and expects dissemination to include both findings of a beneficial impact on student outcomes and findings of no impact or negative impact on student outcomes.

(Slide 15)

This slide compares the purposes of Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships and State/Local Evaluation projects. The type of research to be carried out differs by topic.

RPP projects are expected to carry out descriptive and correlational research on education issue, while State/Local Evaluation projects carry out rigorous causal evaluations of a program or policy. Greater detail on the research to be done under each topic is discussed in the upcoming Project Narrative section of this webinar. Both types of projects are expected to carry out activities that maintain and strengthen the partnership.

This includes ongoing communication; self-checks to see if the partnership is operating as intended; and collaboration in the research activities, discussion of the findings, dissemination, and consideration of future research. Both types of projects are expected to broadly disseminate the findings to multiple audiences as discussed in the earlier slide on dissemination.

Both types of projects are intended to increase the education agency's capacity to take part in research and use it. The Institute's expectation for capacity building depends upon the initial capacity of the education agency. For some, the process of taking part in jointly setting research questions and considering the implications of their results will build their capacity, while others may also be ready with support to be involved in the design, choice of measures, data collection, and/or analysis.

The research institution may also provide, at the request of the education agency, specific training and a research area, for example, understanding evaluation design, designing a survey, interpreting findings from different types of designs. RPP projects have a specific purpose of developing a research agenda on the issue being studied and developing a plan for obtaining funding to carry it out, which could include applying to IES for another type of grant, or to another funder.

State/Local Evaluation projects have a longer period to identify other joint research opportunities and funding opportunities that may arise during the project. In addition, both types of projects may learn lessons on how to develop and strengthen a partnership. These should be documented as they will be of use to other research institutions and education agencies interested in forming partnerships.

(Slide 16)

The Project Narrative is the heart of your application and the peer reviewers focus their attention on it.

You should use it to describe the research you propose to do, its importance, the partnership, and the personnel resources you have to carry out the work. The project narrative is recommended to be no longer than 25 pages. The Project Narrative must contain the five sections listed on the slide. Each section receives a score by the peer reviewers who also give each application an overall score.

For each section of the Project Narrative, the Requests for Applications list: Requirements, the minimal needed in the application in order to be considered responsive to the RFA and accepted for peer review; Recommendations, these are issues the peer reviewers are asked to use to rate the quality of the application.

In the next slides, we will cover each of the five sections for both RPP and State/Local Evaluation projects.

(Slide 17)

This table compares the Significance Section of your application for the Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships topic and the State/Local Evaluation topic.

RPP projects. For the RPP topic as you describe a specific issue or a problem the partnership will address, its importance to the education agency, it is helpful to include: 1) theoretical and empirical links between the issue and student education outcomes (a simple theory of change), 2) how addressing the issue could contribute to the improvement of student education outcomes, 3) evidence that the issue is a priority for the education agency partner, 4) current work on the issue being done by the education agency, and 5) how the agency might use the findings of the research in its own decision-making.

In addition, you may also discuss the issue's importance to other education agencies, policymakers, and stakeholders. This point is of secondary importance for the significance of the proposed project. It is also helpful to describe the education system in which you will examine the issue or problem including the levels you will be looking at, for example, classroom, school, district, postsecondary system, or state.

Also, remember that the peer reviewers will consider your dissemination plan in ~~this~~ Appendix A as part of their review of your Significant Section.

Now, State/Local Evaluation. For the State/Local Evaluation topic, as you describe the program or policy the partnership will address and its importance to the education agency, it is helpful to identify: 1) the components of the program or policy, 2) the student groups that the program or policy is trying to affect, 3) evidence that the program or policy is fully developed and ready for implementation, 4) how the program or policy substantially modifies or differs from existing practice, either in the same location or in other locations.

As part of the description of the program or policy, you should also describe its implementation, including: 1) evidence that it has adequate funding, 2) the program or policy has been adopted by and is being managed or overseen by the education agency (it cannot be an intervention if the agency is allowing a researcher or organization to try out - funding for this type of evaluation is provided by 84.305A and 84.324A), 3) the date implementation began, will begin, or will be expanded, 4) the processes and materials (for example, manuals, websites, training, coaching) that will be used to support its implementation, 5) the

target population and where implementation will take place, 6) the end-users of the program or policy, and how they will carry out implementation, 7) the routine conditions under which the study will take place.

Routine conditions reflect the everyday practice occurring in classrooms, schools, and districts such as the expected level of implementation that will take place if no study was being done in a sample that represents the heterogeneity of the students, teachers, schools, and districts being studied. Describe the initial theory of change for the program or policy to articulate the underlying logic or sequence of events that is to result from the program or policy to lead to improvements to student education outcomes.

Your theory of change should describe the component or components of the program or policy that are to lead to changes in one or multiple underlying processes which in turn will foster better student education outcomes directly or through intermediate outcomes (for example, change teacher practices). For programs or policies designed to directly affect the teaching and learning environment and thereby indirectly affect student education outcomes, identify any intermediary outcomes that are to be affected, (for example, teacher practices and how these outcomes affect the student education outcomes of interest).

Provide the rationale for the evaluation of the program or policy by describing: 1) why the program or policy is likely to produce better student outcomes relative to current practice or indicate that the program or policies is current practice if widely used, 2) how the education agency will use the project's findings and its decision-making both during and after the project, 3) why education practitioners and policymakers outside of the agency partner would care about the results of the proposed evaluation, 4) any studies that have attempted to evaluate the program or policy, their findings, for example, on implementation cost and impact, and discuss why your proposed study would be an important improvement on past work.

Also remember that peer reviewers will consider your dissemination plan in Appendix A as part of their review of your Significant Section.

(Slide 18)

The Partnership section is similar for a Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships projects, and State/Local Evaluation projects.

The Partners and the Partnership: Along with the description of all the organizations that will form the partnership, you should also describe: 1) the stage of the partnership, for example, an early partnership or a mature one and explain how the partnership stage will affect the type of work proposed, the roles of the partners, and the expectations for the results of the partnership, including both the research produced and the future research to be carried out by the partnership, 2) the process through which the involved organizations decided to propose the project, 3) past or ongoing collaborations between members of the partnership and the results of this joint effort, 4) how the research questions posed in your application were developed by the partnership noting the partner's common interest in answering them, and how all partners will contribute to and benefit from the project, 5) the management structure and procedures that will be used to keep the project on track and ensure the quality of its work especially important for partnerships involving multiple institutions carrying out coordinated or integrated tasks, and 6) any other research partnerships the education agency already has in place and the research topics they address.

Partnership Development Plan: Identify the expectations for the partnership by the end of the project and describe: 1) the activities and processes the partnership will use to establish and

develop the partnership. These activities should contribute to the proposed research, education agency capacity building, and the longer-term collaboration, 2) the partnership's decision-making process, for example, how it will determine research direction, capacity building activities, release of research results, future research plans, and 3) how the proposed project will improve the education agency's capacity to participate in, and/or use research.

Partnership Tracking Strategy: IES recommends that you include a partnership tracking strategy that will be used to monitor whether the partnership is working as planned as it carries out the research. To this end, you may include measures of the partnership's success in completing the initial research, developing a future research plan, increase in the education agency's capacity to participate in and use research, and promoting the continuation of the partnership beyond the grants end.

The Institute encourages you to include indicators that you would value as signs of the project's success and could be used by others carrying out similar collaborative work.

(Slide 19)

This table compares the Research Plan section of your application for the Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships topic and the State/Local Evaluation topic.

RPP projects: For an RPP project, the Institute expects the research to be exploratory and descriptive to better understand the links between the education systems characteristics, for example, student, teacher, and the school factors, education agency policies, programs or practices, and student education outcomes without establishing causal linkages.

It may include primary data collection, analysis, secondary data analysis, or a combination of both. The Institute expects that a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods will yield the most useful findings. As you describe the research plan, it is helpful to identify: 1) the main research objectives of the partnership's work, including your research questions, 2) the sample to be studied, 3) the research design, 4) the measures you will use, 5) how you will collect the data, and 6) the analyses you will conduct and the variables to be included in them.

A timeline of your research plan may help the peer reviewers understand it. As part of this discussion, it may be helpful to consider: 1) why this research will benefit from being done within a partnership project rather than under one of the institute's other research grant competitions that do not require a partnership, 2) how this research might directly contribute to the education agency's decision-making on the education issue being studied, and 3) how this initial research might prepare the partnership for a specific type of future research that could be supported by a future grant from the institute or other funder, for example, more in-depth exploratory research, development of an intervention, or evaluation of an intervention.

In addition, describe how the partnership will develop a plan for a research that continues beyond the end of the grant and how the plan will ensure that the future research will be of value to the education agency.

State/Local Evaluation: For the State/Local Evaluation topic, the research plan will be for a rigorous evaluation, so it's important to address how you'll make causal inferences from your results and to whom these inferences will apply.

As you describe the research plan for estimating the impacts of the policy or program on student education outcomes, it is helpful to identify: 1) your research questions, 2) the population you intend to study and how your sample and sampling procedures will allow you to draw inferences from this population, 3) how the research design will allow you to make

causal inferences and how potential threats to internal validity will be addressed (typical designs include Randomized Control Trials, Regression Discontinuity Designs, and other Quasi-Experimental Designs with comparison groups), 4) how you will account for attrition, 5) how you will determine the comparison condition to ensure there is a treatment differential, 6) the measures you will use and their psychometric properties, for example, reliability and validity, 7) the results of a power analysis showing the minimum effect of the program of policy that you'll be able to detect, 8) how you will collect the data., and 9) the analysis you will conduct, and the variables to be included in them.

In addition to describing your impact analysis, you should also detail: 1) a fidelity of implementation study, 2) a study identifying the factors that lead to implementation fidelity, 3) moderator and mediator analysis, and 4) cost and cost-effectiveness analyses. For each of these, you should include the measures you will use, how the data will be collected, and what analyses will be done. To support your research plan, it may be helpful to include: 1) a timeline of your research plan, and 2) a discussion of why the research plan will benefit from being done within a partnership rather than under one of the Institute's other research grant competitions that did not require a partnership.

(Slide 20)

The Personnel section is similar for Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships projects, and State/Local Evaluation projects. In the Personnel section, you want to make clear that your team, overall, and the individual members have the experience, expertise, and time to carry out the proposed project.

To this end, you should briefly describe the following for all key personnel, i.e., principal investigator, co-principal investigators, co-investigators on the project team: 1) each person's roles and responsibilities on the project, 2) their qualifications to carry out their roles on the project, 3) their percent of time and calendar month per year, academic plus summer, to be devoted to the project, and 4) past success at working in similar partnerships and producing products of value to an education agency.

In addition, for the education agency's PI or Co-PI, describe their role in the education issue being examined, and the level of decision-making they have regarding it. School-based personnel unless holding district-wide authority and personnel from an institutional research office unless this issue falls under their office, are normally not the appropriate personnel to serve as the agency PI or Co-PI though they may be important to include as other key personnel.

For the research institution's PI or Co-PI, describe their knowledge of the issue being examined and familiarity with the education issue or program policy, and the research design and methods that will be used. For the project's PI, describe their qualifications and experience managing a grant of this size and type.

Make sure at least one key person has a large enough time commitment to help maintain the progress of the work throughout the project. If any key personnel intend to donate time to the project, his or her donated time must be listed in the budget, and budget narrative and described as cost sharing. The institute does not require or request such cost sharing nor consider it in award decisions, but does require that it be documented.

Personnel proposing to donate time must demonstrate that they have such time available.

(Slide 21)

The Resources section is similar for Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships projects and State/Local Evaluation projects. In the Resources section, you want to make clear that you have the resources necessary to carry out the proposed project.

To this end, you should briefly describe, 1) your institutional capacity and experience to manage a grant of this size and type, 2) the resources available at the primary institution and any subaward institutions including the partner organization, 3) your plan for acquiring any major resources that are not currently accessible and that are necessary for the successful completion of the project (for example, equipment, test material, curriculum, or training materials).

4) access to the schools or their settings in which the research will take place, 5) how the cooperation of district and school staff will be obtained if needed (including information about incentives if relevant), 6) access to any data sets that you'll require, 7) resources to carry out your plans to disseminate the results from your research partnership as described in the required Appendix A.

Remember to include a joint Letter of Agreement in Appendix E from the primary partnering institutions, the research institution and the education agency, documenting their participation, and cooperation and clearly setting out their expected roles and responsibilities in the partnership. Include separate similar Letter of Agreement from the other members of the partnership, for example, documenting the role of additional partners or consultants, access to secondary data, school's willingness to take part, access to school's classrooms, and/or teachers.

(Slide 22)

In addition to the Project Narrative, there are a set of Appendices, some required, some optional that are used to provide additional information. Appendix A is required and should include your dissemination plan. Your dissemination plan describes the multiple audiences the partnership will provide the findings.

These includes disseminating the findings: 1) throughout the partner education agency and its stakeholders, an agency-wide oral briefing, and a free nontechnical brief or the required minimum, 2) publications and presentations, and venues designed for policymakers, practitioners, and the general public, and 3) publications and presentations and venues designed for researchers.

Appendix A is recommended to be up to two pages long. Appendix B is required for resubmitted applications. In Appendix B, you describe how you have revised the application in response to previous reviewers' comments. Appendix B is recommended to be up to three pages long.

In Appendix C, you may include figures, charts, tables, for example, a timeline for your project's activities, a diagram of the management structure of your partnership or measures. For example, individual items, tests, surveys, observation, interview protocols used to collect data for your project.

Appendix C is optional and recommended to be up to 15 pages long. You should not include narrative text in Appendix C. In Appendix D, you may include examples of the specific education issue, problem, program, or policy that you intend to examine. For example, curriculum materials, computer screenshots, assessment items or other materials.

Appendix D is optional and recommended to be up to 10 pages long. You should not include narrative text in Appendix D. In Appendix E, you may include the Letters of Agreement from partners, for example, research institutions, state and local education agencies, other partnering institutions, sites in which the research will take place, for example, schools, data sources (for example, state agencies holding administrative data and consultants).

The key research institutions and education agencies forming the partnership should submit a joint Letter of Agreement, documenting their participation and cooperation in the partnership, and clearly setting out their expected roles and/or responsibilities in their partnership. Other members of the partnership should submit similar separate letters. Appendix E is optional and there's no recommended page length for Appendix E.

Appendix F is required for applications to the State/Local Evaluation topic and should not be included in applications for the Researcher-Practitioner Partnership topic. Appendix F describes your plans for making the final research data from the proposed project accessible to others.

Your Data Management Plan, or DMP, should include:

- plan for preregistering your study in an appropriate registry for education evaluations;
- type of data to be shared;
- procedures for managing and for maintaining the confidentiality of personally identifiable information;
- roles and responsibilities of project or institutional staff in the management and retention of research data;
- expected schedule for data access including how long the data will remain accessible, at least 10 years;
- format of a final data set;
- dataset documentation to be provided;
- method of data access, (for example, provided by the project director, principal investigator through a data archive) and how those interested in using the data can locate and access them;
- whether or not persons seeking to use the data will be required to sign an agreement that specifies conditions under which the data may be used (if so, you may wish to provide a copy of this agreement in Appendix F);
- any circumstances that prevent all or some of the data from being made accessible (this includes data that may fall under multiple statutes, and hence must meet confidentiality requirements for each applicable statute, for example, data covered by the common rule for protection of human subjects, FERPA and HIPAA).

The cost of the DMP can be covered by the grant and should be included in the budget and explained in the budget narrative. The peer review process will not include the DMP and scoring of the scientific merit of the application. Appendix F is recommended to be up to five pages long.

(Slide 23)

This slide includes a table showing the duration and award parameters for the two topics under the Partnerships and Collaborations Requests for Applications.

For the Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships topic, the maximum award duration is two years and the maximum award is $400,000 direct and indirect costs. For the State/Local Evaluation

topic, the maximum award duration is five years, and the maximum award is $5 million direct and indirect costs.

Applicants do not have to propose the maximum award but should link the award request to the amount and cost of the work being proposed. State/Local Evaluation grant funding must be used solely for evaluation purposes. Funds must not be used to support implementation of the policy or the program, for example, materials, tech software, computers assessment training or coaching required for implementation.

As part of your application, you will include a detailed budget form, SF-424, and a budget narrative that links the activities' personnel, etc., from the project narrative to the funds requested.

(Slide 24)

This slide includes a table showing important dates for 34.305H. Applications must be received at Grants.gov no later than August 23rd, 2018 at 4:30:00 p.m. Eastern Time. Letters of Intent were due on June 21st, 2018, but these are not required for submitting an application and are not seen by the peer reviewers. If you did not submit a Letter of Intent but would like feedback on your research idea, email a short description of your proposed project and the grant competition and topic you're considering applying under to the program officer.

The application package was posted on grants.gov on June 21st. The possible start dates for the award are between July 1st, 2019, and September 1st, 2019.

(Slide 25)

All applications must be submitted electronically through the Grants.gov website.

This year there have been several changes in Grants.gov, including a requirement for all applicants to use the Workspace interface. Grants.gov marks alerts in red and these should be attended to as failure to follow the Grants.gov requirements will result in an unsuccessful application.

(Slide 26)

Applications are first reviewed for compliance and responsiveness to the requirements set out for in the Requests for Applications.

Applications that are compliant and responsive are assigned to a review panel. Two or three-panel members conduct a primary review of each application. The most competitive applications are reviewed by the full panel. As a result, applicants whose applications were triaged receive the review comments from the primary reviewers but no scores.

Applicants whose applications go to the full panel receive the reviewers' comments from the primary reviewers, the full panel's review scores, and a summary of the panel's discussion of the application.

(Slide 27)

This is the webpage for the IES Standards and Review Office which contains a listing of the past peer reviewers.

(Slide 28)

The Applicant Notification System, ANS, is housed at iesreview.ed.gov. After you receive an email notification, you may sign in to the ANS to view the reviews of your application and your award status, and if your application went to full panel, the review, scores, and panel discussion summary.

We encourage you to discuss your reviews with the program officer in order to consider reapplying.

(Slide 29)

Please, read the Request for Applications. There's a lot of important detail in the RFA, both on what your application should include and how you should submit it.

IES has attempted to make the RFA a user-friendly self-contained guide to developing a high-quality application, so please review the requirements and recommendations for the topic to which you're submitting. The RFAs are available at the link on this slide where it says IES Funding Opportunities. Browse through the posted abstracts of our funded grants on our website.

Our abstracts are fairly detailed so they will give you a good sense of the quality and type of projects that may typically get funded by IES. See the project selector webpage on the link under NCER Projects and NCSER Projects. IES will also post on-demand webinars covering a wide range of topics, including a grant writing workshop or webinars about other specific funding competitions.

Please click on the Funding Opportunity Webinars' link on the slide for more information. We also have our Resources for Researchers' page with information including methodological resources to assist in preparing an IES research grant application, videos from past IES training institutes, and information about available data sets and tools.

(Slide 30)

Along with the resources just described, program officers are another resource you should use, so please contact us. We want to hear from you. Email your initial research idea to a program officer who can let you know which grant competition and topic it would fit best under.

As you develop your application, program officers can comment on your content and framing of the research.

(Slide 31)

Dr. Sarah Brasiel is a program officer in the National Center for Special Education Research, that's me. I focus on projects that primarily address students with or at risk for disabilities.

Dr. Allen Ruby is the program officer in the National Center for Education Research. Please contact us if you have any questions. And you can also follow us on Twitter @IESResearch. Thank you.