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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cleveland State University (S411C210069)
Reader #1:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		20	0
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		30	0
	Sub Total	50	0
Resources & Management Plan			
Resources & Management Plan			
1. Resources & Manag. Plan		25	0
	Sub Total	25	0
Selection Criteria			
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	25
	Sub Total	25	25
Priority Questions			
CPP1			
CPP1			
1. CPP1		5	
	Sub Total	5	
CPP2			
CPP2			
1. CPP2		5	
	Sub Total	5	
CPP3			
CPP3			
1. CPP3		5	
	Sub Total	5	
	Total	115	25

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - EIR Early Phase - 12: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Cleveland State University (S411C210069)

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:**

Reader's Score: **0**

   Sub

   1. **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:

      Weaknesses:

      Reader's Score:

   2. **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:

      Weaknesses:

      Reader's Score:

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:**

Reader's Score: 0

  Sub

  1. **The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

  3. **The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 0

  Sub

  1. **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.**

Sub

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

2. **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

3. **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

4. **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the 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:**

Reader's Score: 25

1. **(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 standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

   Strengths:

   The applicant provides a thorough, detailed description of the evaluation which aligns very closely with WWC standards. For example, the comprehensive list of data sources discussed on page e46 are all considered eligible outcome measures according to WWC standards. The evaluation plan limits the risk of bias due to joiners and establishes baseline equivalence through a strong matching approach (p. e47) both of which are required in order to meet WWC standards with reservations. The external evaluator's experience in the Ohio region (e.g. Cleveland Metro school district) and with conducting multiple rigorous evaluations provides convincing evidence the methods will be well implemented. (p. e44)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were noted.

   Reader's Score: 15

2. **(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

   Strengths:

   Using an implementation survey (p. e49) in conjunction with the Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR) process template and semi-annual classroom observations (p.e51) is a strong approach to documenting fidelity of implementation and is likely to provide extensive performance feedback to program developers. This approach supplemented with 60-minute interviews with teachers, detailed on p. e50, demonstrates an exhaustive data collection process through which the evaluation team can periodically assess progress toward achieving intended outcomes. In addition, the applicant provides a comprehensive discussion of how qualitative data will be analyzed using an a priori coding structure along with emergent codes (p. e50) which demonstrates a strong approach to analysis of this valuable formative data to guide progress and performance.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were noted.

   Reader's Score: 5

3. **(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

   Strengths:

   The plan to study exploratory data related to school-level differences between SchYPAR and non-SchYPAR groups will provide valuable insights into the contexts where this intervention may be more likely to experience success. (p. e48) In addition, the plan to collect extensive qualitative implementation and perception data (p.e49-e50) will yield important information about how this strategy can be effectively incorporated into the regular instructional approaches in schools. Changing the context of intervention delivery from out-of-school programs to in-school integration (p. e51) will make an important contribution to increased knowledge and understanding of this strategy, since this transition from extracurricular to curricular is often one where interventions tend to fail due to contextual factors like teacher buy-in, core content demands on instructional time, and school-level leadership support.

Sub

> **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

> **Reader's Score:** 5

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

   > **Strengths:**

   > **Weaknesses:**

Reader's Score:

CPP2 - CPP2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through…[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

   > **Strengths:**

   > **Weaknesses:**

Reader's Score:

CPP3 - CPP3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following…[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/30/2021 02:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cleveland State University (S411C210069)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		20	19
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		30	29
	Sub Total	50	48
Resources & Management Plan			
Resources & Management Plan			
1. Resources & Manag. Plan		25	23
	Sub Total	25	23
Selection Criteria			
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	0
	Sub Total	25	0
Priority Questions			
CPP1			
CPP1			
1. CPP1		5	
	Sub Total	5	
CPP2			
CPP2			
1. CPP2		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
CPP3			
CPP3			
1. CPP3		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
	Total	115	81

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Cleveland State University (S411C210069)

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:

Reader's Score: 19

    Sub

1. **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 applicant clearly identifies a set of three strategies [problem-based learning (PBL), culturally relevant instruction (CRT), and multi-tiered behavioral frameworks (MTBF)] that will be used as the framework for this new project and provides strong supportive, empirical evidence of their effectiveness, particularly for the population of students who are the focus of the project (e28-e29).

   The applicant provides an explanation of the new strategy, youth participatory action research (YPAR) that will be utilized in the project and includes a discussion of research about how YPAR if particularly effective for high needs students (e30-e32).

   The applicant discusses how the new strategy (YPAR) will build upon the existing strategies and how it will offer an improved method for supporting high needs students (e32-e35).

   Weaknesses:

   no weaknesses noted

   Reader's Score: 15

2. **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 provides multiple avenues for dissemination of the results of the project, including both applied and research-based audiences and stakeholders (e35-e36). These diverse methods of dissemination will ensure that various stakeholders are able to access information from the project and implement strategies relevant to their educational contexts.

   The applicant indicates that an online resource will be developed that includes YPAR activities connected to

academic standards (e25). Such an online resource will allow those working in educational settings to be able to utilize YPAR and implement it in their own settings.

Weaknesses:

More information about the online resource (e35), including how it will be shared with other stakeholders, is needed to understand the extent of the dissemination and how others will be able to access the information from the project.

Reader's Score: 4

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:**

Reader's Score: 29

Sub

1. **The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clear framework for the design process that will be utilized to implement the project (e36). Additionally, there is research evidence cited to provide evidence of the success of this framework for use in similar projects, which indicates that this is an effective process that can be implemented in the proposed project.

The applicant provides additional resources for the basis of the proposed project and indicates that these resources will be used as part of the framework during the design portion of the project (e37). The resources proposed as part of the framework are based in research evidence and have strong support for use in the proposed project.

The applicant provides a clear conceptual framework for the use of YPAR and research evidence to support the framework (e38-e39).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clearly articulated set of goals, objectives, and outcomes that are measurable and achievable given the scope of the project (e40-41).

The logic model (e78) clearly outlines a cohesive project with alignment between goals, objectives, and outcomes that set up the project to be achieved successfully.

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. **The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

Strengths:

The applicant clearly defines the target population of high needs students (e27). This is helpful to understand the empirical evidence supporting YPAR and to disaggregate that evidence for this population of students.

YPAR is a strengths-based approach that takes into account and provides space for student voice and agency. This is a powerful way to address the needs of the target population in this project (e39-e40).

The applicant provides empirical evidence, including both qualitative and quantitative studies, that demonstrate the effectiveness of the primary practice to be used in the proposed project for use with the target population (e39-e40). The research cited includes quasi-experimental studies on the use of YPAR with high-needs students that demonstrate its effectiveness.

The applicant clearly identifies the needs of the population and how YPAR will be utilized to support those needs (e39-e40). This will enable the project to successfully meet their needs.

Weaknesses:

There is no specific empirical evidence indicating the effectiveness of YPAR for English learners who are included as part of the defined target population of high needs students (e27; e39-e40). Given that YPAR requires student participation and students to have language abilities to participate in the project, some evidence or discussion of how the project will ensure that English learners can effectively participate would be helpful.

Reader's Score: 9

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 23

Sub

1. **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.**

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant clearly names each of the key personnel who will be responsible for managing the project and provides a specific set of responsibilities for each of those individuals (e41-e42).

The applicant has provided a clear timeline for all the activities of the grant with milestones for each year (e42-e43). Each of these are connected to the relevant personnel, which indicates that the activities will be achieved on time and within budget.

The applicant includes a timeline which clearly outlines the objectives and milestones for the project as well as when they will be conducted during the course of the project (e86).

The applicant indicates that two graduate students will be on the project at half-time each. This is a sufficient amount of time to ensure the successful completion of project goals and objectives.

Weaknesses:

The timeline does not indicate who is responsible for which of the activities noted in the timeline (e86). That information would more clearly support that the project will be managed in such a way to ensure completion on time and within budget.

Reader's Score: 9

2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

All key personnel have very strong qualifications and background relevant to their roles on the project. For example, the PI has extensive training and experience in projects involving YPAR and the external evaluator has a proven track record in conducting evaluation research (e43-e44).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Utilizing two graduate student research assistants to run the logistics of the program over the course of the year is a cost-effective way to support the day-to-day aspects of the project (e90).

The majority of costs on the grant are going toward personnel, which is appropriate and reasonable give the project design and objectives (e90-e92).

The project will use in-kind support from the infrastructre of Cleveland State University, which is a good use of the resources since the project is based at a large instittuion (e90).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a clear framework for the way that feedback and continuous improvement will take place over the course of the project. The use of design-based research (DBR) as a framework for the project incorporates feedback as a part of the design and there is empirical evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of this process in supporting design project such as the proposed project (e36, e44-45).

The applicant indicates that both formative and summative evaluation data will be used as feedback for continuous improvement (e44-45). This is an effective method to support changes during the project cycle to improve the effectiveness of project activities.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not indicate the role of the teachers in the feedback process (e44-45). It seems like they will be passive receivers of the information, which is not likely to support their ability to implement changes to the project activities. A more active role in the feedback process and discussion of data related to the project would enhance the capability of the project to make continuous improvements over the course of the project period.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the 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:**

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. **(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 standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP2 - CPP2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through…[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

Strengths:

The applicant's use of YPAR as the primary activity proposed in the project provides a method for allowing student voices to be heard (e27-e35). As such, the project does meet this criteria by providing for a two-way mutually respectful collaboration about what is important to the students in light of both historical inequities and COVID-19.

Additionally, the applicant indicates that the practices to be implemented in this project build on multi-tiers of support, provide professional development to teachers, and strengthen the relationships between teachers and students (e27-e35). These practices are aligned to the criteria for this competitive preference priority and will address the needs of the students serviced by the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

CPP3 - CPP3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following…[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

   Strengths:

   The use of YPAR in this project will specifically address both implicit and explicit bias and create a more inclusive, supportive learning environment for those schools participating in the project. The applicant provides research evidence that YPAR has a positive effect on school climate (e39), which directly addresses this priority.

   The use of YPAR will also allow for the teachers who participate in the professional development to engage in processes of identifying and addressing issues of equity and shift their teaching practices to be more active and robust (e27-e35).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/11/2021 12:10 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cleveland State University (S411C210069)
Reader #3:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		20	0
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		30	0
	Sub Total	50	0
Resources & Management Plan			
Resources & Management Plan			
1. Resources & Manag. Plan		25	0
	Sub Total	25	0
Selection Criteria			
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	22
	Sub Total	25	22
Priority Questions			
CPP1			
CPP1			
1. CPP1		5	
	Sub Total	5	
CPP2			
CPP2			
1. CPP2		5	
	Sub Total	5	
CPP3			
CPP3			
1. CPP3		5	
	Sub Total	5	
	Total	115	22

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - EIR Early Phase - 12: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Cleveland State University (S411C210069)

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:**

Reader's Score: **0**

   Sub

   1. **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:

      Weaknesses:

      Reader's Score:

   2. **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:

      Weaknesses:

      Reader's Score:

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:**

Reader's Score: 0

    Sub

1. **The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

3. **The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 0

    Sub

1. **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.**

Sub

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

2. **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

3. **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

4. **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the 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:**

Reader's Score: 22

1. **(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 standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

    Strengths:

    The applicant has provided detailed evidence to demonstrate how the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook. For example, the applicant plans to employ a quasi-experimental two-stage matching design (pp. e45-e46). The narrative provides details of a matched comparison group of students within the same school along with baseline equivalence sharing similar characteristics. This meets What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations. The applicant articulated that the outcome evaluation will produce an effect of school-based youth participatory action research student outcomes (p. e46). The applicant has identified an external evaluator who will assist in executing the evaluation and produce evidence about the project's effectiveness. If the planned matching approach is not practical, the applicant plans to consider an alternative evaluation method.

    Weaknesses:

    Although the applicant identified an external evaluator who would assist in the evaluation process, it would have been beneficial for the applicant to clearly delineate its role in conjunction with the external evaluator's role in the evaluation.

    Reader's Score: 13

2. **(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

    Strengths:

    The applicant provided detailed methods of evaluation that should provide performance feedback toward achieving intended outcomes. For instance, the applicant plans to administer Likert-type response scale surveys each spring to the thirty participating teachers to measure attitudes and efficacy facilitating youth participating action research in their schools. During the planning phase of the project, the applicant plans to administer the surveys and use the preliminary scores as benchmarks for each participating school to determine validity and reliability (p. e49).

    Weaknesses:

    In addition to the survey, the applicant stated that it will conduct a 60-minute virtual interview with participating teachers each spring; however, it is not clear whether teachers would be mandated to participate in these interviews. It would have been beneficial if the applicant provided clarity about how it would address issues, such as teachers who opt out of participating in the virtual interviews.

    Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

    Strengths:

    The applicant demonstrated its potential contribution to increase knowledge based on the implementation of the youth participatory action research integrated within the academic curriculum opposed to out-of-school programs (p. e51). The implementation of the proposed project would increase understanding of the impact of youth participatory action research on student outcomes and school climate.

Sub

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified in this section.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP2 - CPP2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through…[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP3 - CPP3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following…[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/30/2021 01:36 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cleveland State University (S411C210069)
Reader #4: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	17
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Sub Total	50	42
Resources & Management Plan		
Resources & Management Plan		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	24
Sub Total	25	24
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	25	0
Priority Questions		
CPP1		
CPP1		
1. CPP1	5	
Sub Total	5	
CPP2		
CPP2		
1. CPP2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
CPP3		
CPP3		
1. CPP3	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	76

Technical Review Form

Reader #4:　　**********

Applicant:　Cleveland State University (S411C210069)

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:

Reader's Score:　　17

　　Sub

1. **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 applicant presents an innovative three-pronged approach that is a combination of problem-based learning (PBL), culturally relevant teaching (CRT), and multi-tiered behavioral frameworks (MTBF; and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports or PBIS). These will be used to support at-risk students. PBL has students work in small groups to solve problems; so, students have opportunities to learn and practice social-based skills like collaboration and communication. (pg. e. 29) Additionally, high-needs high school students' comprehension and application of concepts have been shown to increase when authentic problem solving is used.

　　Weaknesses:

　　The applicant generally describes the four steps a student would make to identify and conduct a Youth Participatory Active Research (YPAR) Project. More information is needed to understand how these four steps support this strategy. There is no description as to any guiding rules for the students to select a project, no understanding of who will guide the student through the project once chosen, or description of how the student chooses their project stakeholders or other details that would standardize project implementation so that it could be better assessed, and project progress tracked. (pg. e. 31. 32) More information is needed to understand how this project's approach is new or the approach is building on existing strategies. (pg. e. 31, 32)

　　Reader's Score:　　12

2. **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 results of the proposed project will be disseminated at the AERA Annual Meeting, peer-reviewed journals, and weekly state-based emails on education. Nationally the findings and resources of the project will be presented at the annual meetings of the Council for Great City Schools (CGCS) and the National Network of Education Research-Practice Partnerships (pg. e. 33)

Sub

> **Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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:**

Reader's Score: 25

> **Sub**

1. **The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant states that educators are increasingly interested in the value and flexibility of problem-based learning and the benefits offered by YPAR activities. This project will provide an assessment of the impact of this program on teacher and student outcomes (pg. e. 21). The logic model provides for input from teachers and students and outlines four impacts for student outcomes. (pg. e. 79) The applicant's goal is to create an evidence-based solution to problems of high-risk student underachievement and disengagement. The applicant explains that the approach is rooted in the pedagogy of Paulo Freire and holds that people who suffer from oppression can work to better understand the causes and contexts of their oppression and then take action to mitigate it. (pg. e. 30)

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant states they will design and implement the innovation in 30 high schools and evaluate the innovation using quasi-experimental, qualitative, and descriptive methods. (pg. e. 24, 29, 33) More details are needed to describe how the project would standardize implementation of this framework across the schools so that it could be better assessed, and project progress tracked. (pg. e. 31. 32)

   Reader's Score: 12

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant lists three objectives of the project including the creation of an online school-based YPAR resource website, the training of teachers, and the improvement of academic behaviors for students. (pg. e. 41) To obtain a measurable outcome four questions for students and four questions for teachers were given that will guide project research. The measurements instruments for the research were listed in a chart for each question. The research design uses a sample which will include only students for whom they have pre - and post-test data and demographic data. (pg. e. 46, 47, 86) A solid project timeline was included.

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

   Reader's Score: 5

3. **The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

Strengths:

The applicant identifies the need to support at-risk students using a three-pronged approach. They are focusing on a defined target population of students who are living in poverty, students of color, English language learners, students with disabilities, homeless students, and students marginalized by other structural forces. (pg. e.27) The applicant is targeting an at-risk student population. The project's aim is to improved teacher-student relationships and to changes school discipline policies and practices. (pg. e. 39)

Weaknesses:

The applicant explains that the existing materials have not been evaluated in schools for their effect on students' education outcomes. (pg. e 37) The review of what is in the curriculum and what is missing should have been conducted as a part of the assessment of the needs of the target population. The applicant should tie that missing need to this proposal to establish that this design will address this populations' needs that are not being met at this time by the current curriculum.

Reader's Score: 8

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 24

1. **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.**

Strengths:

The applicant explains the management time constraints and responsibility of each person in the project. (pg. e. 42) The applicant explains the creation of the initial version of the online school-based YPAR resource website during the first year. The two YPAR coaches and two CSU graduate research assistants and the design team of teachers and students will meet monthly on the design of the website. This information helps to understand how the online resources will be developed.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

The applicant outlines the time commitments for the personnel on the project. For example, the project manager will commit 35% of the time to the proposed project. (pg. e. 41) Another staff member is a nationally recognized expert

on the approach used in this proposal (YPAR) and will commit 17% of their time to the project. (pg. e. 41) Two CSU graduate research assistants will work half-time each to oversee project completion.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. **The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The budget narrative explains all staffing costs for the 5 years of the grant, the salaries for staff members are reasonable for their positions. (pg. e. 44, 90 - 92)

Weaknesses:

There is no cost breakdown for supplies for the project to determine if these costs were reasonable. For example, the cost of each laptop, statistical software, website design, and website maintenance were not listed separately so that the price of each could be understood. (pg. e. 90 - 92) The $3,600 is budgeted for travel in each project year was also not broken down to explain costs.

Reader's Score: 4

4. **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

This is design-based research with feedback built into the design of the project. AIR research staff will use a qualitative coding process to analyze the transcripts of interviews, and the design team will work together to identify a coding. The applicant states that the YPAR coaches and research assistants will administer an assessment at least once in each participating classroom each semester to monitor implementation and provide formative feedback and coaching to participating teachers. (pg. e. 41, 42 45, 46, 49) Performance feedback is also regularly scheduled for the project team.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the 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:**

Reader's Score: 0

    Sub

1. **(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 standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

3. **(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

    Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP2 - CPP2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through…[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

   Strengths:

   The applicant plans to address Covid 19 concerns by engaging students, teachers, and other school stakeholders in communication using YPAR to understand students' social, emotional needs, physical health, mental health, and academic needs. (pg. e. 27)

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

CPP3 - CPP3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following…[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

   Strengths:

   The applicant's approach has been demonstrated to strengthen relationships between educators and students to create equitable and inclusive learning environments. The applicant is also working to create an environment that is culturally responsive and supportive of social and emotional skills (pg. e. 28)

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/10/2021 02:33 PM