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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)
Reader #1: **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	25	0
Quality of Management Plan		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	20	0
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Quality of Project Eval	20	12
Total	100	12

Technical Review Form

Reader #1:   **********

Applicant: Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

   Strengths:

   NA

   Weaknesses:

   NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, strong theory means a rationale for the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice that includes a logic model.)

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

   (iv) The extent to which the proposed development efforts include adequate quality controls and, as appropriate, repeated testing of products.

   Note: In responding to the Quality of the Project Design selection criterion, an applicant should include a detailed description of its proposal to develop media and conduct outreach, as described in section 2431 of the ESEA.

   Strengths:

   NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

   (i) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice, or to work with others to ensure that the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

   (ii) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

   Strengths:

   NA

   Weaknesses:

   NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) 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.

   (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

   (iii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

   Strengths:

   NA

   Weaknesses:

   NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

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

   (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

   (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide timely guidance for quality assurance.

   (iii) 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 with reservations. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards means the standards set forth in the What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook (Version 3.0, March 2014), which can be found at the following link: http://ies.ed. gov/ncee/wwc/DocumentSum.aspx?sid=19.)

   Strengths:

   The evaluation has a strong design, particularly for the summative portion, a design that would allow for the resulting evidence to meet WWC standards without reservations should overall and differential attrition levels be low. The evaluators are comparing outcomes to a reasonable counterfactual, business as usual resources that are focused on the same science contents. The designers are also taking a prudent approach by including a feasibility study phase to pilot test instruments. Finally, the Feature Analysis study and formative research will enrich the evaluation and contribute much to theory building.

   Weaknesses:

   The efficacy questions seem to overlap quite a bit to the point of suggesting an attribution problem. For example, the narrative states that the RTL interventions are based upon the Learning Packs. It is not clear then how two specific evaluation questions could be pursued; one about the efficacy of the RTL interventions and one about the efficacy of the PBS Learning Packs. If the RTL interventions ultimately include more educational innovations than what are in the Learning Packs alone, the effect of either will be difficult to isolate. Similarly, there is a summative evaluation question that refers to the efficacy of the CPB-PBS RTL Initiative model. This phrase is found only in this research question and it is unclear to what it refers. If it refers to the Learning Pack interventions as well as the Community Collaborative model activities, then the intervention is sufficiently bundled to allow for clear interpretation (i.e., what aspect or aspects of the model are responsible for any effects observed). Finally, one of the sets of evaluation questions referred to measuring caregiver science inquiry knowledge. Independent measures that would be appropriate for this purpose are clearly scarce if not non-existant. If it is a self-report measure, then the validity of the self-assessment would be questionable.

Reader's Score: **12**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/15/2015 05:51 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)
Reader #2: **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	22
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	25	25
Quality of Management Plan		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	20	20
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Quality of Project Eval	20	0
Total	100	77

Technical Review Form

Reader #2:   **********

Applicant: Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

   Strengths:

   The proposal demonstrates a clear movement from previous transmedia RTL work to new approaches to connectivity and adaptivity within a cohesive system of media properties that are accessed through multiple contact points. Not only does it move forward in approach with RTL priorities (considering the kinds of product development that would innovatively use RTL funding to support all young learners in developing scientific and academic readiness skills), but clearly is building on specific findings and innovations from the last grant cycle of PBS allocated funding.

   The significance of the project addresses critical needs in supporting young learners at risk of educational failure by featuring the importance of content, community, and collaboration (p. 1), and linking these project emphases to specific strategic activities (p.6). The overall plan demonstrates a clear connection between significant needs for creating equitable access to tools to support academic readiness for all learners and building a media project out to large scale access and potential impact.

   Weaknesses:

   The requirements for this section were met with excellence.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, strong theory means a rationale for the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice that includes a logic model.)

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

   (iv) The extent to which the proposed development efforts include adequate quality controls and, as

appropriate, repeated testing of products.

Note: In responding to the Quality of the Project Design selection criterion, an applicant should include a detailed description of its proposal to develop media and conduct outreach, as described in section 2431 of the ESEA.

Strengths:

This proposal demonstrates a strong project design that shows a thoughtful and intentional approach to meeting the needs of diverse learners, particularly including those that may be marginalized and have reduced access to resources and systems that promote academic readiness (for myriad reasons). The project intends to use technology to link media access points through child-centered and asset-based activity structures, promoting meaningful feedback loops between users, caring adults, educators, media designers, community-based resources, and researchers (pp.20, 22).

The proposal demonstrates a concern for product utility, that is, a consideration for how the developed tools and materials will be used in a local context by diverse role groups. This includes front end assessment that thinks about tool use by various role groups, and builds up toward large-scale implementation in ways that empower families and community organizations, allow for flexible product implementation and adaptation based on local needs and contexts, and include comprehensive engagement strategies that are more than product handoffs (p. 8).

The proposal also demonstrates forward-thinking approaches to literacy, moving beyond letters and vocabulary to "functional literacy" (p.7). The project builds this functional literacy approach into a review and revision of the learning frameworks that guide PBS product development, integrating science learning mindsets with literacy frameworks already shown to be effective, and adjusting the existing frameworks to include current research and policy driven approaches to science education and school readiness (p.9).

Deliverables are linked to strategically selected research, statistics, and learning theories in the fields of media use, learning, and community engagement to support clearly defined project goals and activities. Part of the current research covers the adaptive nature of the media systems that are based on nuanced analytics. These analytics include behaviors and choices, not simply "right" and "wrong" answers. Patterns and profiles become part of actionable feedback loops that include making performance visible and meaningful to parents and children.

Weaknesses:

As learners in the target audiences of RTL program goals are often culturally and linguistically diverse, and as research in this area is shedding light on the complex (and beneficial) impacts of multiliteracy on development and meaning-making, more attention could be brought to the implications of multilingual and multicultural learners in the scope of the project, beyond product translations (reference p.28-29).

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

   (i) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice, or to work with others to ensure that the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

   (ii) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

The applicant has proven capacity in their long history of RTL projects, research and development in early learning, and implementation of products/services. The team of key personnel appears to be highly qualified to develop and take this project to scale. Attention in the proposal is given to fiscal, strategic, and operational oversight areas (pp. 43-44), demonstrating that the applicant is both aware of and has the capacity to develop and disseminate an interconnected and multi-platform suite of products of this size.

The proposal includes strategic activity to increase community capacity to support early learning through collectives, making room for customization and reflective implementation based on community needs. This approach increases the ways "touchpoints" with the properties included in the proposal can be utilized effectively by larger numbers of people, thus increasing the effective scope. This approach is one of the strongest and most potentially impactful strategies that is included in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

There are no perceived weaknesses to this proposal in the area of taking the project to scale for broad impact.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) 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.

   (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

   (iii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

   Strengths:

   The project appears to have a detailed management plan, clearly delineating roles and responsibilities (e71) for a large group of products and properties whose use and activity are connected through an analytics system and human implementation. WIthin the management plan, the applicant demonstrates attention to iterative design and feedback, not only as a strategic activity for the project design, but as a fundamental practice for managing the development of high-quality children's educational media. The advisory panel is experienced and well-rounded, with areas of expertise that cover science education, literacy, technology, accessibility, formal education, and community engagement.

   The production timeline is very aggressive, but the proposed plan uses key personnel, partnerships, and qualified professionals in the field of early education and children's media development to achieve the goals and deliverables according to the project description (e233).

   Weaknesses:

   There are no perceived weaknesses to the management plan that guides the activities of this proposal.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

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

   (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

   (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide timely guidance for quality assurance.

   (iii) 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 with reservations. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards means the standards set forth in the What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook (Version 3.0, March 2014), which can be found at the following link: http://ies.ed. gov/ncee/wwc/DocumentSum.aspx?sid=19.)

   Strengths:

   n/a

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/14/2015 05:14 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/08/2015 01:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)
Reader #3:   **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	9
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	22
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	25	25
Quality of Management Plan		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	20	20
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Quality of Project Eval	20	0
Total	100	76

Technical Review Form

Reader #3:   * * * * * * * * * *

Applicant: Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

   Strengths:

   •   The proposed partnership between CPB and PBS is extremely strong as both are very well-known organizations with extensive track records of developing products for and providing services to children.
   •   The focus on their specific age range is well-supported, and the specific inclusion of children with special needs and English Language Learners is commendable.
   •   The applicants' "Ready to learn" premise for school readiness fits well into grant mechanism goals.
   •   Integrated assessments and analytics are very timely topics that represent a valuable extension of the current state of the literature.
   •   The overlap of literacy and science is important and interesting given the importance of both types of skills for school achievement.

   Weaknesses:

   •   The rationale for why the applicants' "content, community, and collaboration" (CCC) approach is better than current approaches was not explicit.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, strong theory means a rationale for the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice that includes a logic model.)

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

   (iv) The extent to which the proposed development efforts include adequate quality controls and, as

appropriate, repeated testing of products.

Note: In responding to the Quality of the Project Design selection criterion, an applicant should include a detailed description of its proposal to develop media and conduct outreach, as described in section 2431 of the ESEA.

Strengths:

• The project explicitly calls out the inclusion of individuals with disabilities by including the Universal Design for Learning guidelines.

• Curriculum aligns with NGSS and CCSS-ELA and emphasizes the four core domains of each curriculum/standard.

• The proposed project represents a logical next step based on the papers published from the applicants' previous projects.

• Using a mix of extant and new shows to deliver content should appeal to a broad range of audiences. Additionally, the inclusion of "just in case" show content (Wild Kratts and Dinosaur Train) demonstrates the applicants' plans to adapt to formative research findings.

• The applicants plan to produce different shows for the 3-5 age group and the 4-8 age group which is appropriate because of the typical differences in skills and developmental stages of children across these age groups.

• The applicants' plan to partner with ASU's Center for Games and Impact to develop their Kart Kingdom systems-thinking curriculum shows attention to detail and careful planning of the digital game component of the proposed media.

• The applicants' plan to partner with UCLA CRESST for the individualized assessments and analytics, which parents can access, should allow for cutting-edge results as this center is a leader in the field of behavior measurement in technology.

Weaknesses:

• Logic model is vague with respect to measurable outcomes of child learning. For example, a short-, mid-, and long-term outcome is listed as "Millions of children engage with and learn from the Project's content; numbers increase over time". What the children are learning, how those skills will help them achieve in school, and how we will know when this outcome is achieved is unclear, especially as the final outcome in the model is "Children from low-income families prepared to succeed in school and in life".

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

   (i) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice, or to work with others to ensure that the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

   (ii) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

   Strengths:

   • The applicant provides options for families with limited connectivity, including non-digital options like card games, board games, and kits.

   • Outreach activities are clearly specified beyond the "build awareness" and "increase capacity" verbiage, including

outlines of family creative learning workshops, camps, etc. (see potential issue below).
- • The applicants plan to hire a PR agency to ensure national coverage of resources developed.
- • The applicants undoubtedly have the capacity to bring the proposed products to scale given the stellar reputations and reach of both CPB and PBS.

Weaknesses:

- • None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) 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.

   (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

   (iii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

   Strengths:

   - • The team is strong and experienced, with relevant qualifications, training, and experience. Percent time allocation for this project is clear and appropriate.
   - • Organizational/team members' roles are clearly defined and presented well in the organizational chart in the Appendix.
   - • Partners provided letters to demonstrate their commitments to the project, if funded. The letters show strong (and prestigious) partner support, including specific agreements of the research partner (e.g., EDC, SRI), advisory board members (   ), professional development modules (e.g., NAEYC), etc.

   Weaknesses:

   - • None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

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

   (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

   (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide timely guidance for quality assurance.

(iii) 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 with reservations. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards means the standards set forth in the What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook (Version 3.0, March 2014), which can be found at the following link: http://ies.ed. gov/ncee/wwc/DocumentSum.aspx?sid=19.)

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/08/2015 01:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)
Reader #4:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	9
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	19
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	25	25
Quality of Management Plan		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	20	20
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Quality of Project Eval	20	0
Total	100	73

Technical Review Form

Reader #4:   `**********`

Applicant: `Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)`

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

   Strengths:

   This project is designed to reach the target demographic of low-income children from ages 2-8 years (pg. 1).

   One of the goals of this project is to make an impact on young learners, particularly those from low-income families, early in life in an effort to help minimize the achievement gap, specifically in the areas of science and literacy (pg. 5-6).

   The proposal builds on the applicant's past success and materials by creating a new collection of television/video and additional content such as games, apps, and offline activities that will bring culturally diverse talent to children's media. (pg. 7).

   There are overlapping skills between students who are good in literacy and in science. This project works to integrate both into the context of the new materials created in this proposal (pg. 9-10).

   Weaknesses:

   This project seems very similar to products and media that are already in existence from PBS, using science in place of math initiatives, so it is unclear how this project will create new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to existing strategies (pg.8).

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, strong theory means a rationale for the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice that includes a logic model.)

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

(iv) The extent to which the proposed development efforts include adequate quality controls and, as appropriate, repeated testing of products.

Note: In responding to the Quality of the Project Design selection criterion, an applicant should include a detailed description of its proposal to develop media and conduct outreach, as described in section 2431 of the ESEA.

Strengths:

This proposal plans to use their research and findings from past proposals to develop a new collection of media experiences for at-risk learners from ages 2-8 year (pgs. 3-4).

In order to meet learners where they are, this project includes multiple platforms and strategies to meet the target audience, as well as embed Universal Design for Learning principles which will support children with special needs (pgs. 4 & 10).

In order to develop new materials, the project team will work with experts in early learning and science, as well as with classroom teachers. This cooperative approach supports the quality of the products being created (pg. 11).

As part of this project, the team will develop a Science Learning Framework for children ages 2-8 that aligns with the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards, as well as coincides with the National Science Teacher Association and National Association for the Education of Young Children's statements on Early Childhood science learning. All of these are well-known and respected tools and organizations (pgs. 11-12).

The goals, as proposed by this grant, include new episodes or material for currently existing PBS shows, such as Curious George and Wild Kratts, as well as the development of two new shows - one for children ages 3-5 and the other for children ages 4-8 (pgs. 13, 15-16).

Learning Packs will also be created as a product of this proposal. The Learning Packs will be an adventure game that adapts to the child's learning needs and also assesses the student along the way. The Learning Packs will be available via web, apps, computer download, and more. This multi-faceted approach should help to reach the majority of children in the targeted demographic (pgs. 17-18).

Some activities in the Learning Packs will lead to hands-on exploration and engineering that do not involve screens and foster parent-child interactions. Having real-world and hands-on experiences will help children meet the desired proposal outcomes (pg. 19).

The Learning Packs will also make use of the latest technology giving parents, caregivers, and teachers a data driven report about how their child is doing on the given concepts through the Super Vision app. Teachers and parents like to see how their children are doing, so this is a nice addition to the project (pgs. 20-21).

Weaknesses:

The new shows have yet to be created, thus Year 1 will be a development year where new shows are not reaching students in need (pg. 14).

There are no clear examples of what a Learning Pack will look like, how children will interact with it, or what alternatives there are for children & families without internet or mobile access. Parents, caregivers, and teachers without internet or mobile access also do not appear to be able to make use of the accompanying Super Vision tool (pg. e199 & e202).

Reader's Score: 19

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

   (i) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice, or to work with others to ensure that the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

   (ii) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

   Strengths:

   The project is designed to meet the needs of learners where they are despite challenges such as special education needs and supports for English language learners. Having a strategy to meet the needs of all children is essential in getting the most out of a new project (pg. 28).

   This proposal includes strategies for reaching children and families with limited or no internet connectivity. Some of these ideas include card games, and STEM/Maker kits. Including these ideas and materials now will help expands the projects overall growth (pg. 29).

   Studies have shown that preschool teachers who interact with PBS Kids resources report a positive change in their confidence and comfort with the concepts provided, and if teachers are feeling positive about something it is more likely that they will share their enthusiasm with their students and address the desired concepts more often (pg. 31).

   To engage the community and help spread the use of the PBS resources, the team will create community collaborations of local partners who have the ability to reach more low-income families, thus furthering the scale of the project (pgs. 31-32).

   This proposal also includes the creation of family workshops and camp materials to extend the learning possibilities beyond just the home and school (pg. 34).

   To further extend the reach of this project, the team will make use of social media, which is a fast growing tool for parents (pg. 35), and provide early childhood educators with classroom resources to extend their instruction (pg. 36).

   The grantee will also partner with a PR firm to help build awareness of their products and to provide opportunities for those using their materials to share their success stories. By including a team of people dedicated to advertising the product, the breadth of the products should expand (pg. 37).

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) 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.

(ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

(iii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

The applicant has a long history of providing services to the public through a variety of means – television, digital media, etc. with a strong track record (pg. 42).

PBS and CPB have strong management teams in place to oversee the development of the product, manage the fiscal components, and provide strategic & operational oversight for the project (pg. 43-44).

In addition to the key staff, this proposal also notes that there will staff involved in the project who are not grant funded, thus providing in-kind support to the project (pg. 46).

An advisory board will be developed that includes individuals from a diverse background to inform the development of content and to provide feedback. This board will include curriculum specialists, teachers, content area experts, and professional community members. The diversity among this group will help to bring this project to its fullest scale (pg. 47).

Both an overview timeline of key activities (pg. 50) and a more specific timeline with job responsibility assignments (pg. e71) are included in the proposal.

The applicant has also secured support letters for multiple organizations who will help in the development and dissemination of the products (appendix).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

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

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide timely guidance for quality assurance.

(iii) 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 with reservations. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards means the standards set forth in the What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook (Version 3.0, March 2014), which can be found at the following link: http://ies.ed. gov/ncee/wwc/DocumentSum.aspx?sid=19.)

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/16/2015 10:16 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)
Reader #5:   **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	25	0
Quality of Management Plan		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	20	0
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Quality of Project Eval	20	13
Total	100	13

Technical Review Form

Reader #5:   `* * * * * * * * * *`

Applicant: Corporation for Public Broadcasting (U295A150003)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

   Strengths:

   NA

   Weaknesses:

   NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

   (ii) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, strong theory means a rationale for the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice that includes a logic model.)

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

   (iv) The extent to which the proposed development efforts include adequate quality controls and, as appropriate, repeated testing of products.

   Note: In responding to the Quality of the Project Design selection criterion, an applicant should include a detailed description of its proposal to develop media and conduct outreach, as described in section 2431 of the ESEA.

   Strengths:

   NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

   (i) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice, or to work with others to ensure that the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

   (ii) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

   Strengths:

   NA

   Weaknesses:

   NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) 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.

   (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

   (iii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

   Strengths:

   NA

   Weaknesses:

   NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Evaluation

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

   (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

   (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide timely guidance for quality assurance.

   (iii) 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 with reservations. (As defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards means the standards set forth in the What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook (Version 3.0, March 2014), which can be found at the following link: http://ies.ed. gov/ncee/wwc/DocumentSum.aspx?sid=19.)

   Strengths:

   The formative evaluation is thorough and describes several activities (i.e., concept map, producer-researcher boot camp, functional spec review) that will help ensure that the quality is high and the content is appropriate (Appendices, Formative Research).

   Feasibility studies will be used to pilot test measures and data collection methods to help ensure that the success of the experimental studies planned for year 5 (Appendices, Feasibility Studies).

   Pre-treatment/intervention data will be collected to establish baseline equivalence and a longitudinal study will examine changes in outcomes over time (Appendices, Longitudinal Child and Family Engagement Study: Science Efficacy Study & Literacy Efficacy Study).

   In an effort to account for variations in outcomes, the evaluation will include reviewing child outcomes within the context of children's opportunities to engage in learning in various settings within their communities as well as the types of support they receive from their parents (e.g., parent engagement in school and outside settings, home activities) Appendices, Longitudinal Child and Family Engagement Study: Community Collaboratives Tracking Study).

   Weaknesses:

   The formative evaluation described in the application is confusing and offers limited explanation for how the information will be used for program improvement or to ensure quality. For example,
   • coordinated play and usability testing will be used to make some improvements in media products, but only those usability issues that are "the most pressing" will be addressed (Appendices, Formative Research).
   • reviews of engagement materials and parent and family resources will involve the researchers, but not end users. In addition, it is noted that only selected materials will be reviewed, but there is no information about how products will be selected or who will make the selections (Appendices, Formative Research).
   • the baseline/context study in community collaboratives does not include information about the data to be collected, the procedures for collecting data, or the number of children to be involved (Appendices, Longitudinal Child and Family Engagement Study).
   • the method for randomly assigning children to groups for the community collaboratives tracking study is confusing and unclear. There also is insufficient information provided for the specific contextual factors to be included or how contextual data will be collected (Appendices, Longitudinal Child and Family Engagement Study: Methods).

   With regard to the research study, the provision of electronic devices for the RCT introduces a confounding variable that is

not addressed by the researchers. Without this information, it is difficult to tease apart whether to credit outcomes to increased activity related to the novelty of the device or the specific intervention under study (Appendices, Longitudinal Child and Family Engagement Study: Science Efficacy Study).

Reader's Score: **13**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/13/2015 12:55 PM