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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (S411C210101)
Reader #1:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		20	20
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		30	29
	Sub Total	50	49
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	83

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (S411C210101)

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: 20

   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:

      Applicant proposes a professional development model that fosters teacher competency for implementing an early literacy recovery intervention for grade 2. Talk to Read employs a combination of Language Experience, speech recognition technology, and eMINTS professional development as its approach to early literacy recovery that closes the gap between oral lexicons and sight vocabulary. (e20-21, e26-27) This promising new strategies both builds on existing strategies and is an alternative to strategies such as sight vocabulary acquisition using commercially-published texts exclusively. (e22)

      Weaknesses:

      None 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:

      Plans to disseminate research findings via project website, multiple social media outlets (e.g. twitter) and traditional methods including state and national conferences, via university communications office news releases. Opportunities to publish in key national and professional journals will be pursued. (e34)

      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: 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:

   A comprehensive conceptual framework that includes professional development, teacher coaching, and various elements of early literacy is provided. The essential role of sight vocabulary acquisition (e20), its connection to oral lexicons (e21), and the ways in which they support comprehension of text (e19) are thoroughly discussed and cited. Barriers to language experience (e23) and the propensity for speech recognition technologies to mitigate against those barriers are also well cited, framed and discussed (e23).

   Weaknesses:

   None 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:

   Applicant specifies five measurable goals, each having one or more objectives. Most objectives are also measurable with aligned outcomes and measures that are clearly specified. (e28-29) Short term student outputs as well as long term teacher and long-term student outcomes are also provided. (e27)

   Weaknesses:

   The proposal could be strengthened by including quantitative measures as targets within outcomes.

   Reader's Score: 4

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 proposed study has substantive potential to improve literacy outcomes for underserved students in grade 2 within rural populations. (e15) The proposal cites multiple recent reports on reduced learning opportunities caused by the pandemic as evidence of need. Talk to Read addresses this need by targeting educators' pedagogical skill and early literacy instruction, integrating speech recognition technologies and utilizing an established PD provider to support teachers' professional learning through job embedded coaching.

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

   Reader's Score: 10

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

> **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.**

> **Strengths:**

> The applicant provides a comprehensive management plan that includes timeline and activities organized by phase and year. (e148-149) The project would be implemented in phases – an early phase and an efficacy study phase. Select activities for each phase such as treatment and control school onboarding, website, materials and course management and revisions, and school recruitment for Phase 2 are identified. (e32-33)

> **Weaknesses:**

> Statements characterized as milestones are not provided and would greatly strengthen the proposal by signaling major events, decision points, or deliverables thereby breaking the project into manageable chunks and enabling progress monitoring.

> **Reader's Score:** 9

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

> **Strengths:**

> The five key personnel have substantial experience as principal investigators and with grant management, literacy research, fiscal management, evaluation and strategic planning. (e31) Experience in these specific areas indicate key knowledge necessary for successful execution of the proposed study. (e46-e113)

> **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 proposed budget is thorough, including travel and PD costs for both treatment and control group teachers. Costs are aligned with the objectives and design of the proposed project and include technology appropriate for the virtual coaching and observations. (169) Personnel costs are aligned with the expertise require to administer the study. (163-192)

> **Weaknesses:**

> None 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 proposes collecting and analyzing data and feedback from project records, surveys, interviews and classroom observations to make revisions and improvements. (e33) This process is repeated annually, with each analysis used to inform revisions for phase 2 of the project.

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.

Sub

   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:

   Applicant presents relevant data evidencing that pandemic induced challenges include a reduction in learning opportunities and the impact it will likely have on rural and underserved students. (e18-19) An increased urgency for early literacy development, in response to the pandemic, is described. The proposed study seeks to support sight word acquisition with a professional development model that targets early literacy pedagogy.

   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 proposal describes a culturally and linguistically responsive approach to improving liteacy achievement of students in primarily high-poverty, rural schools. (e15) Acknowledging that meaning is derived from learners' personal experiences, children with diverse backgrounds are put at a disadvantage when schools use texts that are mismatched to their rich linguistic and cultural heritage (e20). This mismatch creates inequity to sight word acquisition that this study seeks to address. Building the capacity of educators to implement language experience strategies supported by speech recognition technologies has the potential to provide access to critical resources for underserved students.

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/12/2021 05:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (S411C210101)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		20	20
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		30	29
	Sub Total	50	49
Resources & Management Plan			
Resources & Management Plan			
1. Resources & Manag. Plan		25	25
	Sub Total	25	25
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	84

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (S411C210101)

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: 20

    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 plan described by the applicant to involve the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies is adequate. Proposed project will encompass the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies by providing documented interventions, resources, activities, services, programs and practices that can help to solve the persistent problems in education that prevent students, particularly high-need students, from succeeding. The project will address the problem; and demonstrate how their proposed project (based on best available evidence) could build on previous existing strategies designed to appeal to high needs students to accelerate student achievement. Proposed project will modify, transfer, and/or redesign eMINTS strategies for the target population; expand access and participation in professional development programs to benefit the underserved schools and communities. The applicant will seek to support second-graders' literacy learning recovery among underserved and rural populations by utilizing three proven strategies: Language Experience (LE), Speech Recognition (SR) technologies, and eMINTS professional development by utilizing the (Talk To Read Model) to improve student achievement and attainment for high-need students. (page e 11)

   Weaknesses:

   None 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 plan described by the applicant in which the results of the proposed project to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies is clear. Potential dissemination of the proposed innovations will increase efficiency, understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies by utilizing resources; replication operations; up-to-date and research-based methods of assessment; adaptations of practices; as well as a clear description of how the grant activities will be implemented. Proposed project will provide community awareness of the project, provide nonparticipants with information about the project outcomes by websites, media,

Sub

Facebook, LinkedIn, etc. ; and provide information on project effectiveness to accelerate achievement; to implement strategies in a variety of new population and settings; and enable others to utilize information or strategies. (page e34)

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: 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 proposed project's conceptual framework is well-conceived and will likely lead to sound project implementation by employing strong alignment between the proposed project activities and outcomes outlined in the logic model provided. Their strategic revisions to improve and adjust services; as well as activities will achieve the proposed outcomes (Build sight vocabulary and comprehension) and their goal. Additionally, specific tasks that will be completed, the primary participants that will be involved, the methods that will be employed, and the tangible results that are expected for identified tasks are logically linked to a rationale for the implementation strategy and referenced literature by (Copp, S. B., Cabell, S. Q., & Tortorelli, L. S. (2016) to validate their proposed design. The detailed project plan provided in the applicant's proposal will lead to a more organized project implementation by itemizing project tasks, (Develop Talk to Read Model) assigning task owners (Partners), outlining timelines for specific project deliverables, and allowing all stakeholders to monitor progress in real time to meet the objectives of the proposed project. (page e 127)

Weaknesses:

None 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 presents some activity objectives in measurable terms that include baselines, indicators, targets, timelines, population. Measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes will be achieved by utilizing ongoing curriculum adjustments; initiating training modalities based on formative and summative evaluations; and aligning the proposed

implementation plan and the performance indicators with proposed activities (professional development services). The proposed goal: (increase teacher efficacy and effectiveness) will be also accomplished by aligning activities and strategies with the implementation plan. The overall rate of change anticipated across the project period and aligned objectives will be determined by rates of increase from performance indicators. Project objectives such as, (1.2 Prepare and implement a successful pilot study) are outlined and include corresponding program purpose; and clear outcomes or projections such as (Increased reading skills such as sight vocabulary, and comprehension) that describe the specific desired results of programmatic operations will be achieved by implementing measurable terms such as measuring tools, quantitative qualitative levels of success, projected baselines, indicators, timelines, and population to achieve measurable goals of the project. (pages e 15,e28,e27)

Weaknesses:

The application addresses all of the factors, however, one or more factors such as, target fails to show a clear alignment with the project's vision, how it will be implemented, and/or contributes to the proposed impact. (page e 27)

Reader's Score: 4

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 application clearly addresses a high coronavirus burden and includes data that substantiates the need for their project.
   A high coronavirus burden and critical barriers to implementing LE in classroom and documented data and other relevant information such as: MU partner conducted field-based pilot studies to explore the potential of Talk to Read (see Baker 2017; 2019; Baker & Dorman, 2019)—a program that uses SR to mitigate barriers and harness the potential of LE (Dominique et al., 2021). Illiteracy is a major contributor to poverty, the spread of disease, and political instability according to (U.S. AID, 2014) and justifies that neighborhood public schools are low performing and employees lack the necessary resources and support to meet student needs. Disparities such as students' lack of preparation for remote learning, a wide range of academic, social, educational stresses, emotional, and economic challenges, etc. will be addressed by Talk to Read instructional strategies and technology integration through 40 hours of professional development with eMINTS; 4 hours of technology training and support with KCAV; and a minimum of 6 coaching visits that will occur virtually and onsite to ensure that the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (pages e 15, e19)

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

   Reader's Score: 10

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: 25

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 management plan described by the applicant is adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. The management plan will achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities (data collection and analysis) timelines, and activities for accomplishing project tasks via incorporating a detailed timeline (Year 1) that provides a clear roadmap for project implementation by positioning key benchmarks with objectives, outputs, and outcomes (Increase implementation of Talk to Read Approaches) outlined in the logic model; and highlighting specific deliverables from key partners and stakeholders involved in the project. Project activities (plan, develop, recruit) will drive continuous improvement by addressing data checkpoints where information collected is analyzed and used to identify areas where pivots in strategy of implementation may be warranted. Clearly defined roles for key personnel and sufficient staff time will accomplish project tasks by improving results and productivity. The proposed budget appears to be consistent with the size and scope of the project in order to provide proposed services, and achieve the activities and goals of the proposal with the total amount of money requested. The key personnel (MU/eMINTS) assigned to the proposed project stem from multiple departments within the organization, which will provide an opportunity for the project to have a systemic impact on the organization's overall operation to maximize the effectiveness of the project. (pages e 148,e27)

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

   Reader's Score: 10

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

   Strengths:

   The qualifications of the key project personnel are clearly appropriate to the respective positions. Qualified key project personnel with relevant training and experience will improve productivity and accomplish project tasks by employing their expertise in leadership, evaluation, curriculum development, and management skills. Additionally, key personnel are appropriate to their respective positions and qualified to carry out the proposed project; have the programmatic capability to serve the target population; will provide assurances that the project has the capacity to meet program goal by providing proper and effective administration of the proposed project. Qualifications (included in resume) and training and education of the Project Coordinator/ Principal Investigator (Ph.D.) in a relevant field with curriculum, management, teaching, administrative skills will provide management services to effectively fulfill the objectives of the project; maximize the effectiveness of the project, and provide oversight to justify assurances that the project has the capacity to achieve the objectives on time. (page e 83)

   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.**

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant has provided relevant information regarding how costs are appropriate and reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The costs will reflect their work plan, objectives, and detailed computations of personnel salaries, fringe benefits, travel ($ 3,500.0 Year 1) and supplies by utilizing a budget justification that details cost basis, calculations; and demonstrates how each line-item expenditure was derived. The budget delineates costs of the project to be met by the funding source. The individual line items (e.g., personnel ($ 119,466.00 Year 1), travel, materials, etc.) are understandable in terms of what they will cost and what services will be rendered for the proposed project. Items are logically linked to the activities in the proposed project and are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The total proposed budget $(3,999,812.00) appears to be consistent with the size and scope of the project in order to accomplish the activities and goals of the proposal with the total amount of money requested. (page e198)

Weaknesses:

None 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 effective procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. Proposed procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvements will operate in the proposed project by employing effective intervals (timeline 1/23-6/23) for gathering and analyzing project data; allowing meaningful assessment of progress to occur in time for course corrections to be made; implementing a data analysis mechanism for assessing project implementation; providing remediation and ongoing communication strategies; providing ongoing multiple assessments (Administering the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) by administering the Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire, which is developmentally calibrated for early elementary school students) ,and by monitoring of components and analysis and dissemination of data to facilitate improvement and sustainability of effective strategies. Means to collect and analyze data from project records, surveys, interviews, and classroom observations to make revisions and improvements and gather feedback from staff and partnering schools are addressed to evaluate and to ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. (pages e148, e 33)

   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

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:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

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:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

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

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

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 has addressed the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19. Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators" ("high needs students") will provide, improve, or expand services by assessing and understanding students' social, emotional, physical and mental health, and academic needs, in light of historical educational inequities and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic; and reengaging students (and their families) and strengthening relationships between educators, students, and families. Additionally, urgent needs in Grade 2 (impact of the novel coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) will be addressed by focusing on literacy recovery in second grade by supporting a sight word acquisition; by providing Language Experience (LE) to support reading acquisition; providing Language Experience to Promote Literacy Learning; Promoting Self-Efficacy, Peer, and Classroom Relationships and offering Speech Recognition Technologies to mitigate L.E Barriers to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19. (page e23)

   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 has clearly designed a plan to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12. Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities and improving the quality of educational programs will be addressed by promoting equity in primarily high-poverty, rural schools; by providing literacy learning (e.g., sight words, sight vocabulary, fluency, comprehension)and equity (using students' culturally relevant language and experiences to create texts for reading); and by using LE in the classroom to implement culturally responsive literacy recovery for underserved and rural students to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12.
   (pages e 28,e23)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: **5**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/12/2021 11:39 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (S411C210101)
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	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

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

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (S411C210101)

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 proposed methods of evaluation, if implemented well, would result in a What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. The methods propose reliable and eligible outcomes, are prepared to account for attrition in the sample by using an acceptable approach to missing data or adjusting for baseline data.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses 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:

   The proposed project provides a strong plan for continuous feedback and improvement. The plan will allow for modifications from year to year to adjust based on implementation findings and outcome results.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses 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 proposed project will help expand the knowledge and understanding of an effective strategy and how it can be implemented with different populations. The current project will build upon previous pilot studies with a more rigorous evaluation to build a stronger research base.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses 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:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/12/2021 09:17 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (S411C210101)
Reader #4: **********

		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 #2 - EIR Early Phase - 2: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri Special Trust (S411C210101)

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

    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:

   The investigators propose to study the efficacy of Talk To Read on teacher and student outcomes, with a Randomized-Controlled Trial design that if well implemented would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook. To determine their sample of 20 schools within districts to treatment and 20 schools to a waitlist control they conducted a power analysis with adequate statistical assumptions. (Page e39) The investigators are also prepared to handle attrition with two adequate pathways described in page in page e39.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses 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:

   Investigators plans to triangulate their proposed measures to identify which schools are effectively implementing Talk to Read. This information will be used for continuous improvement of the project. Additional qualitative feedback from teachers, and initial estimates of impacts on student outcomes, will be used to optimize training and program supports. (Pages e41-e42)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses 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 proposed project if implemented with fidelity has great potential for increasing evidence to the knowledge base and future directions for developing programs for struggling readers.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses 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:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/11/2021 05:08 PM