

Establishing Proposal Review Panels

Query – 01.30.2004

Query: In terms of review panelists, I would like to know how other states are forming their committees and what they offer participants? Are there any restrictions on stipends? I welcome whatever suggestions/recommendations you can provide!	
From: Virginia	
Responses:	
Missouri	<p>Missouri pays its reviewers a \$200 stipend and covers room, board, and mileage for a 1 1/2 day review session. By the time they arrived in early January, they had had their proposals for a month.</p> <p>Reviewers worked in teams of four. Each team included a higher education science faculty member, a higher ed College of Ed faculty member, a K-12 science person, and an "other" person (such as a reviewer with expertise in assessment/evaluation, or someone with a background in K-12 technology integration). Incidentally, this cycle only addressed science, it required a technology integration component, and it also required at least one objective (with corresponding activities) that addressed the impact of the project on the participating IHE.</p>
Iowa	<p>Iowa is still designating math and science as priority academic subjects in accordance with state policy. The Iowa Title IIA Advisory Committee consists of three representatives of the three public universities (one from each divided up so we get one math, one science, one administrator), three representatives of the 30 independent colleges and universities (one math, one science, one administrator), three representatives from the 15 community college districts (one math, one science, and one administrator), three representatives from 371 K-12 LEAs (one elementary, one secondary, one administrator), and the curriculum specialists from math and science in the Iowa Department of Education (math and science, currently 2 in number). Members serve until they resign or retire. When the competition opens to other curricular areas, the committee will be augmented by specialists in those areas (one of the K-12 reviewers began when we had the reading money under Eisenhower). In addition to reviewing proposals, the Advisory Committee reviews the RFP before it is mailed.</p> <p>Tricia - forgot to mention that Iowa offers mileage and other business expense reimbursement. If we meet using the in-state communications network, we pay the hook-up fees for video conferencing. Several years ago our state auditors asked that we not automatically include a lunch in our business meeting as this might be considered in violation of the state gift laws.</p>
Utah	<p>Utah uses seven reviewers. All are experts in math, science, or language arts. Four are paid a stipend of \$450. to review and score the submissions and to participate in a telephone conference call to discuss the scoring and come to consensus. The other three are from the Utah State Office of Education and are not entitled to a stipend but</p>

	<p>participate in the reviews and the conference call. In Utah, higher education and public K-12 work closely on a number of fronts.</p> <p>Of the four who are paid a stipend, three reside in other parts of the country and one lives in Utah and is a vice president at a community college. All reviewers have had experience with the former Eisenhower grant process.</p> <p>This process works well for us.</p>
Wyoming	<p>We offer our grant readers \$300 to review the RFP applications. I selected a mathematics teacher who also worked on our state math standards (the focus of the RFP was math), a community college professor who is also the grant manager, a community member who owns her own educational consulting company that focuses on professional development, and a retired administrator who was a former math teacher. Therefore, I tried to select a diverse panel that represented teachers, administrators, higher ed, and the community. They all had the background to read an application of this nature and judge its merit.</p>
Georgia	<p>In Georgia we use a mix of teachers who have participated in Eisenhower and/or Teacher Quality projects and former PI's -- current college professors from Education and Arts and Sciences -- plus a few Regents and SEA personnel, school content supervisors and occasionally a school superintendent. We put them in mixed groups of 4 or 5. We try to have 6 groups/day.</p> <p>Groups read a proposal (9-12 pages plus budgets and letters of support) and discuss it's strengths and weaknesses. Then each reviewer privately fills out a one page rating form - primarily assessing the Quality of the Goals and Activities, Potential Impact on Teachers, and Capability of the Plan and Staff. That takes about 40 minutes/proposal. We just evaluated 92 proposals over a 3 day period --working from 9 to 4. Reviewers stay one, two, or three days (their choice) and we replace them as we go along. We have found this process to work very well for us ---- and reviewers as well --- as they often want to come back the next year feeling they learn a lot about writing a grant proposal from this process.</p>
Rhode Island	<p>we do use external reviewers from out-of-state. This past year, we had an external reviewer from Massachusetts who works in the Office of Higher Education and has experience with the grants. The review team also included a professor from Stonehill College in Massachusetts plus a retired coordinator of the grants from the Dept. of Ed. in R.I. Two of my staff also served as reviewers. The two reviewers from Massachusetts were paid an all-inclusive stipend of \$600. The others were not paid a stipend or travel.</p>
Arkansas	<p>Arkansas used 11 reviewers to review the 03-04 proposals in December. All reviewers are experts in math, science, foreign language, social studies or language arts. The number changes from year to year depending on the number of grant applications submitted. Every grant is read by 3 reviewers who use a scoring rubric prepared for the grant application. The rubric was included as part of the RFP so that all grant applicants know how it will be scored and the weight of the point system. Eight reviewers were paid a stipend of \$300 each to review and score the submissions. The</p>

	<p>other three are from Arkansas and have 12 month positions and are not entitled to a stipend but participate in the reviews. In Arkansas, higher education and public K-12 work closely on a number of fronts. Developing the RFP process and reviewing proposals are two of these occasions. Of the eight who were paid a stipend, 6 reside in other parts of the country and 2 live in Arkansas. All reviewers have had experience with the former Eisenhower grant process and/or with last year's NCLB competition. The scoring rubric is in the Arkansas RFP located at www.arkansashighered.com/nclb.htm.</p> <p>The guidelines for review and appeal are located in the attached set of guidelines.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>NCLB Guidelines.doc</p> </div>
Washington	<p>Our statewide advisory committee (they review the RFP and evaluate the grants) is comprised of C&I specialists in reading and mathematics, faculty, deans of education, principals, PD staff, Governor's education policy advisor, and representatives from K-12 private schools, Washington Education Association, State Board of Education, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Professional Education Standards Board, and Washington Professional Associations for Principals, Superintendents, and Paraprofessionals. We reimburse them for travel and meals.</p>
Nebraska	<p>In Nebraska we use only in-state reviewers. We try for a mix of K-12 teachers (the majority of the panel), higher ed, and community people who have an interest in education and who represent the various geographic parts of the state. One person from our state department of education also sits on the panel. The SAHE person (me) facilitates the meeting, but doesn't vote. We usually have 6-10 people. Since we are a small state, we usually know of people who would be good reviewers. I also ask curriculum specialists at the dept of ed for recommendations. I have asked the teacher of the year and teachers who have achieved national certification (less than 50 in our state so far).</p> <p>Nebraska has fairly small administrative funds. We mail proposals to reviewers in advance, have them evaluate and rank the proposals, then bring them to Lincoln for a one day meeting to reach consensus. We pay mileage, meals, and lodging if needed. We don't do stipends and thankfully we have always had people willing to read "for free".</p>
Michigan	<p>Michigan has an established history of review panels so there is a substantive data base of reviewers we have. Sometimes we pay them stipends, sometimes just mileage and sometimes we even pay overnight accommodations for people from our Upper Peninsula in order to get representation from the upper half of the state. It all depends on how much administrative money we can spare during any given cycle.</p>
West Virginia	<p>In West Virginia, I use only in-state reviewers and pay them nothing. I have been fortunate that most of my reviewers are nearby and have no travel expenses. I have provided expenses in the past for one reviewer, but she did not request support this year. I have long standing relationships with most of the reviewers and they are</p>

	<p>committed to the initiative and choose to be involved. Stipends have never been considered. Currently my committee consists of six reviewers representing a county school district, the state department of Education, a regional education laboratory and three institutions of higher education. The higher education representatives come from math, science and teacher education. I am contemplating the addition of individuals representing other content areas such as reading. Proposals are provided to the reviewers at least one month prior to the meeting. I provide the reviewers with an evaluation sheet. We gather for a one day meeting to reach consensus on the approved projects. It's simple, but it has worked for us.</p>
<p>Louisiana</p>	<p>Louisiana uses only out-of-state reviewers to review proposals submitted from universities in response to our RFP for content rich mathematics, ELA, and combinations of math/science or math/ELA professional development projects. This spring, we will pay our reviewers \$500/day for two days prior to coming to Baton Rouge to read and score proposals using a rubric we include in our RFP (www.lasip.org and click on 2004-05 RFP) and then \$500/day for the three days they spend doing on-site interviews, completing a final panel rubric and report on the strengths and/or weaknesses of the proposals to be recommended to our LaSIP Council for funding. We look to the expertise of our panels to provide serious judgments and improvements concerning our overall program. We do not use Title II, NCLB funds for this, but rather use state funds provided by our Legislature.</p> <p>Our reviewers this year will serve on one of three panels, each with three experts from among higher education content departments, colleges of education, K-12 education, or technology backgrounds. Each panel reviews 8-10 proposals; we pay their travel expenses to participate in the on-site reviews. The review team makes the final recommendations to fund the very best proposals that will provide professional development, which addresses the targeted needs of K-12 teachers while fostering the evolution of professional learning communities. This is an integrated 5-yr. statewide program which this year will impact approximately 200 under-performing schools.</p>
<p>Puerto Rico</p>	<p>In Puerto Rico we have a group of six external evaluators for the evaluation of proposals. Each proposal is evaluated by three evaluators. We pay \$125.00 for each proposal evaluated by each evaluator. The evaluators receive the proposals that they will evaluate a week before the week-end meeting where they will discuss their individual evaluations to reach a consensus on each proposal ranking. They are paid travel mileage, and room and board during the week-end meeting.</p>