

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 04:03 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	18
Total	100	18

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR - Expansion Grants - 1: 84.411A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The independent evaluator appears to have the necessary experience and expertise to conduct the evaluation (vita) including extensive experience leading impact analyses in education research.

The impact study is well designed and appropriate for the project. The sample is clearly described and appropriate for the scope of the project (p. 38). The randomization design with school-level random assignment to three conditions will allow for a head-to-head evaluation of two versions of the treatment in comparison to a services-as-usual control condition. The research questions (p. 37) are appropriate for the scope of the scale up project and the evaluation details for each RQ are clearly described (pp. 39-47). The MDES estimate seems conservative and based on prior research data (p. 45) and power seems appropriate.

The assessments and observations (pp.26-30) built into the A2i technology along with the Literacy Scan measure and state testing scores are appropriate and designed to monitor user activity and student learning. The to-be-developed qualitative interviews/surveys (p. 29) are well described and should provide valuable information to inform the implementation study. In addition, the fidelity of implementation measures and monitoring plan are strong and includes A2i program records and observations with a rubric and criteria for meeting fidelity.

The expansion study includes both qualitative and quantitative data sources to determine the extent of the scale up and strategies useful to the scale up. These data show promise to provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings. The cost study (p. 46) is based on what teachers will do and the resources necessary for each of the three conditions. The cost measures are linked to student outcomes to determine costs for student outcomes.

The included letters of commitment from interested implementation schools (appendices) show promise that the project can recruit and retain the target sample and move forward within the described timeline.

Weaknesses:

The proposed analysis would benefit from justification for excluding teachers from the model (p. 45). The proposal specifies a two-level model and it is likely that there will be variability across teachers that warrants using a three-level model or other methods to include of teacher-level covariates.

The proposal would also benefit from an estimation of attrition over the 4 years of the study. The proposal identifies that students are enrolled for the baseline assessment at Kindergarten then assessed through 3rd grade. Including a clear estimate of typical movement and attrition for the target sample in these regions as well as strategies to reduce attrition or manage observed attrition would strengthen the proposal.

Reader's Score: 18

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/02/2017 04:03 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/01/2017 12:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	17
Total	100	17

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR - Expansion Grants - 1: 84.411A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The proposed external evaluator for the project has extensive expertise and experience (p. 33-34) to be able to effectively conduct an evaluation for a project of this scope and magnitude. In addition, the dedicated resources in the proposed budget (budget narrative p. 15) are detailed and sufficient to comprehensively complete the proposed evaluation tasks.

The proposed performance measures for the project outcomes (p. 24-30) would provide valid and reliable performance data. Utilizing standardized test scores - to conduct analysis across different tests that are given in different states - is also appropriate (p. 44).

The design of the study, testing three different levels of support (p. 13-14), is inherently geared towards providing strong guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication in other settings and best practices for expansion of this program. In particular, the main confirmatory impact research question - focused on cumulative impact of different levels of professional development support - is appropriate. In addition, the two-level model with student nested in schools with appropriate key covariates and baseline characteristics used to estimate program impact is strong (p. 45). This also includes calculations of statistical power appropriate to detect minimum effect sizes (p. 45-46).

Weaknesses:

The proposed study with random assignment of 70 schools to one of three groups (p. 40) could potentially produce evidence of the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations; however, no assurances are given regarding minimizing overall and differential sample attrition or what levels of attrition could be considered low enough for the study to meet the "without reservations" standard. If attrition is high, the study would meet the "with reservations" evidence standard at best.

No benchmark thresholds are articulated or given for any of the objectives or outcomes related to the evaluation to assess measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation.

Reader's Score: 17

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/01/2017 12:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 10:38 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	8
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	33
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	35
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	
Sub Total	100	76
Total	100	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR - Expansion Grants - 1: 84.411A

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition

Strengths:

- o The applicant explains the problem through data and directly addresses each of the Priority areas delineated in this competition. This point is proven early in the application on page one when discussing the data from the National School Lunch Program.
- o The proposed solution is measuring success based on student performance on NAEP, an assessment to which our nation has stated a priority in improving our performance. Data from NAEP are used on both pages one and two to illustrate the national significance of this project.
- o The program has had significant success with a great level of evaluation (when receiving other federal dollars). An incredible piece of data noted that with application of the proposed program in one study 94 percent of students were reading at grade level by the end of third grade. Page 3
- o Personalized learning with curriculum support from research based from findings at the Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) is discussed and represents no exceptional approach on page 5.

Weaknesses:

- o The studies used to denote the potential significance of this study were done on very small sample sizes and the ability to project scale is difficult. (page 3) The application would have been strengthened with a greater number of studies of a greater number of subjects in the currently cited studies.
- o There is no mention of the What Works Clearinghouse and the successful meeting of those criteria. While data are provided of past success on page three, it is unclear if moving forward the project is replicable and scalable with the same level of success.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

- The applicant clearly articulates unmet needs. The first need expressed was quality literacy instruction for high-need students. The applicant provided data to support this claim in section one. The second is to bring effective strategies to scale – while no significant data is used to support this it is inferred since it is the impetus for this competition. (page 7)
- The applicant acknowledges that unanticipated barriers will present and the organization will need to be agile enough to adapt. This is a definitive strength as any major project rollout will have issues and acknowledging that it is impossible to project all potential barriers is a demonstration of proactive and critical thought.
- The applicant addresses many barriers, each with a specifically proposed solution. Notably, they addressed the cost per student using data and strong support for their proposed solution on page 16. Addressing cost for future use is the most notable way to ensure a successful project is scalable beyond the existence of Federal support.
- The applicant proposes 5 related, but independent strategies for dissemination each appealing to a different demographic or audience subset on pages 19 and 20 including selecting a research-based framework by Coburn as their methodology for action.

Weaknesses:

- The candidate discusses two ‘demands’ in detail on page 7, but in both cases they address need more than demand. The second ‘demand’ focuses on the need for programs such as the proposed as evidenced by this grant competition. The application would have been strengthened if there was a clear demand presented from the local agency level as well.

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Strengths:

- The goals and objectives are measurable, time bound, and articulate entities responsible for carrying out each step of the plan as demonstrated in the table starting on page 25.
- The management plan is comprehensive and directly aligns directly to the goals and objectives as presented. Additionally, the logic model on page 23 does an excellent job of visually representing the management plan and allows for an ease of interpretation.
- Feedback and continuous improvement are addressed on page 34 and seem to be a focus, and are timely. The applicant acknowledges that for success the plan will need constant adaptations and many iterations
- The applicant states it is ‘built for sustainability’ and discusses how they are financially built to not only sustain

after the grant is completed, but positioned to continue to grow and expand their influence in the educational environment. This is also discussed in previous sections as the applicant addresses this issue in Barrier 2 as the grant will be able to improve their infrastructure to decrease the cost per student over time.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.
 - (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
 - (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
 - (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/02/2017 10:38 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 07:31 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	9
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	33
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	34
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	
Sub Total	100	76
Total	100	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR - Expansion Grants - 1: 84.411A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition

Strengths:

The project of the magnitude's problem of students need for literacy instruction for high achievement in literacy is proposed in this project which is of national significance. This addresses the absolute priority high need students for Title 1 or low performing schools. The project was strong in the area of significance.

Weaknesses:

The project lacked the data to support the extension of the program.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others

Strengths:

The applicant addresses two unmet demands which are to improve high-need students' literacy skills and close the achievement gap and to better understand how to actually bring practices with strong evidence of effectiveness to scale. On pages 7-19 specific strategies address barriers to scale. The data of spread and dimensions of scale is a strong indication of success for the future of this project. The applicant clearly thought through all necessary barriers and has provided relative solutions to address them should they arise.

Weaknesses:

The extent of dissemination could be costly with the digital promise, research publications, and pay for success on pages 20-21.

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
- (4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Strengths:

The quality of the project design was strong for this project in that there were measurable goals that were clearly specified and measurable. The performance measures are aligned with students to serve in this project. There was a clear budget and funding period. The management plan was constructed in an excellent manner on page 25 and 26 with goals, objectives, performance measures, activities, timelines, and responsible parties and roles clearly communicated in the application. The feedback and continuous improvement model for United2 Read was a strong component in that at least monthly conferences would be used for meetings, finances, and progress towards goals as a check in for all parties involved in the project.

Weaknesses:

The resources are not specifically articulated beyond the initial grant funding so that the program may expand to other areas.

Reader's Score: 34

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/02/2017 07:31 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 01:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	9
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	34
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	34
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	
Sub Total	100	77
Total	100	77

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR - Expansion Grants - 1: 84.411A

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: National Center for Research in Advanced Information and Dig (U411A170011)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition

Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly described and demonstrated the severity of the achievement gap that exists for high-need students within the target population for the proposed project. In addition, the proposed project has national significance in that an expansion of the Assessment to Instruction (A2i) model, a model which has been shown to be effective with elementary students in Florida (pg.3), has the potential to improve high-need students' literacy and achievement. The applicant also very thoughtfully explains the A2i approach on page 4 of the proposal.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant does provide some information regarding previous iterations of the proposed intervention, including additional information about program effectiveness from a larger sample/population would add support to the notion that this is indeed an exceptional approach.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others

Strengths:

The applicant's strategy to expand the A2i program focuses on providing "effective evidence-driven literacy instructional practices" to the nation's classrooms that will allow for the improvement of literacy skills of high need students and greater cost effectiveness of delivering the A2i approach (pg. 7). This is clearly aligned with the priorities established for the EIR – Expansion competition. The applicant very succinctly describes three barriers that have prevented expanding to the level

of scale proposed in the application (Impacting 109,000 students – pg. 8) and offers clear and targeted solutions that will effectively address each. Particularly strong are the applicant's proposed solutions for making the program more cost effective. The applicant intends to reduce the cost of the program from \$150/student to a proposed cost of \$50/student, all while maintaining high levels of program effectiveness. This is less than other programs that are also supported by strong evidence of effectiveness. The applicant's dissemination plan is also well thought out and includes several modes of delivery to ensure that information is shared with a broad range of audiences.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly demonstrate that there is an unmet demand for the project that will allow for scalability as proposed. Including information from partners in the proposed expansion areas that clearly indicate a strong demand (interest and desire) for the program would have strengthened the applicant's response to this component of the criterion.

Reader's Score: 34

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

Strengths:

The applicant's goals are very clearly specified and objectives, and performance measures are aligned which will allow the applicant to achieve specified outcomes. Strengthening the applicant's response to this criterion is the fact that each performance measure is also described in great detail (pages 34-30) allowing for the appropriateness of each to be easily determined. The applicant's timeline is very detailed and distinctly depicts how and when activities will occur and specifies the person or partner responsible for overseeing and managing the activity. Personnel have the education and experience necessary to oversee a project of this magnitude and to ensure that goals are met on –time and within budget. The applicant also does a good job of including mechanisms to ensure feedback and continuous improvement via regularly scheduled face-to-face meetings and videoconferences with all management team members.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's multi-year financial and operating model does not include sufficient detail regarding the ability to continue the project beyond the period of federal assistance. Including an indication of partners' financial commitment to the project (i.e., in letters of support) would strengthen the applicant's response to this component of the criterion.

Reader's Score: 34

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/02/2017 01:08 PM