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Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411C210117)
Reader #1: **********

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Project Design</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; Management Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Project Evaluation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:
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:
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:
1. The proposal identifies an independent evaluator, American Institutes for Research (AIR), which is a requirement of this grant. The evaluators are experienced and have the appropriate expertise for conducting educational field evaluations.

2. At least one relevant outcome is being measured, meeting a What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standard (e.g., academic achievement (course grade, Grade Point Average and Social-Emotional Learning skills)- table pp e40-41).

3. The evaluation is guided by clear and specific research questions related to relevant outcomes comparing treatment and comparison groups (p. e39) and are aligned with the logic model (p. e97).

4. The proposal includes an evaluation plan designed to meet WWC standards without reservations. The application describes the design as “a rigorous experimental design” - p. e38. The application refers to the design as a quasi-experimental design, but on p. e39 as an experimental design. Importantly, the description of the design and how treatment/control conditions are assigned is a cluster-randomized study design (p. e40) which can meet WWC standards without reservations. The application was clear in the description of the design, including the sampling strategies and assigning schools to treatment and control conditions (p. e39-e40, e106).

5. Standardized measures were clearly identified for each of the primary outcomes (academic achievement and SEL) p. e40-41. Confirmatory measures meet WWC standards for reliability and validity (p. e40). Data sources, collection methods and plan for collecting data was described (e40-41; e109-110).

6. Data analytic plan includes appropriate statistical methods for the design and includes plans for (per WWC standards) assessing baseline equivalence and making statistical adjustments if needed (per WWC definition). p. e41-42, Appendix J p. e108

Weaknesses:
1. 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:
1. The application describes a plan for performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress that includes preliminary data analysis, producing and sharing reports with schools to review school-specific findings from various data sources, annual performance reports summarizing work completed, formative feedback meetings and annual evaluation reports (p. 112-113).

2. Program implementation will also be assessed across school sites, developing fidelity rubrics and finalizing thresholds in years 1 and 2. The application includes multiple data sources (students, teachers, administrators) and methods of data collection (surveys, interviews, focus groups) to assess multiple components of program implementation. (p. e43-44; e110-111)
Weaknesses:
1. No weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 5

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

Strengths:
This project has strong potential to increase knowledge related to impacts of strategies to improve online learning related to dual enrollment (DE) courses for high need students on achievement and SEL outcomes due to the strength of the evaluation design (as noted in section 1) and focus on high-needs students. This project will also help to build knowledge related to a promising educational strategy of providing SEL skills in the context of delivering DE courses online, which could fill gaps related to access to DE courses and knowledge for improving successful completion of DE online courses for high needs students.

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

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:
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### Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411C210117)  
**Reader #2:** **********

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Significance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Project Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Design</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources &amp; Management Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources &amp; Management Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Resources &amp; Manag. Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Selection Criteria**         |                 |               |
| **Quality of the Project Evaluation** |             |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation         | 25              | 0             |
| **Sub Total**                  | 25              | 0             |

### Priority Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPP1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPP2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPP3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPP3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CPP3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 115 74
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:

   - 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 proposes a significant project that plans to serve a total of 1,200 students in 11th and 12th grade by selecting 20 high schools in partnership with postsecondary institutions. The applicant defines high-need students as low-income and/or students of color in need of academic support to increase college and career readiness, socioemotional skills development and course curriculum design and delivery methods that increase access and participation in dual enrollment courses in College Math and English.

   The proposed project, ICAN, will provide a new strategy and interventions that build on evidence-based research in Dual Enrollment (DE), online learning, and socio-emotional learning (SEL). The applicant identifies and will address two of the most urgent educational problems: access inequities in dual enrollment and lack of socioemotional learning support needed to enhance effective learning. Professional development of faculty will also increase capacity of educators to teach SEL skills that will contribute to students’ attainment of skills and success in graduation and retention in postsecondary studies.

   **Weaknesses:**
   The applicant does not specify how they will accomplish the desire objectives by describing procedures or who is in charge.

   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 applicant clearly describes an appropriate and efficient plan to disseminate the results of the project. Two documents will guide the replication and implementation of the ICAN courses, the Blueprint and the SEL Playbook that will be disseminated regionally, statewide, and nationally. Additional publications and materials with lessons and best practices, communications toolkit and resources will be available to the public.

   Reader’s Score: 17
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:

**Strengths:**

The proposed project contains a conceptual framework supported by research studies that will result in a favorable student outcome in their schoolwork, specially for high need students, by unifying effective and proven strategies for dual enrollment and leveraging the expertise and networks of the Increase college access network partners to redesign DE courses and provide training to the educators.

The logic model shows how a multi-task approach will develop innovative strategies to increase college access network courses and support high school students and colleges. Implementation of the model will improve student outcomes; provide educators with resources, tools, and training to increase students' social-emotional learning skills attainment and success in completion of online courses.

The applicant will re-design the curriculum used in-person learning to online learning curriculum and methods based on evidence-based research. The applicant will work with high schools and post-secondary institutions to establish collaborations. The ICAN Model will require that educators provide student support to develop the skills needed in online learning platforms, dual enrollment (DE) and development of socio-emotional skills (SEL) to approach, communicate, respond, and succeed in successful course completion.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide details of the training teachers and staff will receive.
The applicant provides detailed and specific goals and objectives with measures and time frames for accomplishing them. A detailed chart includes goals, objectives, performance measurements, needs, and coordinated resources. The objectives and outcomes are clear and well defined. A baseline will be defined in the first and second year to measure progress over the five years of the project to ensure program goals and objectives are met. For example, the first goal is to design and implement ICAN courses to increase high-need students’ access, participation, and academic achievement in online courses in College Math and English.

**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 project design is appropriate and will address and serve the needs of the target student population of low-income, academically disadvantaged students. The applicant provides data to document need for program services. The ICAN project will focus on strategies and methods to enhance academic performance in College Math and English courses with online curriculum re-design for online teaching and learning, Dual Enrollment opportunities to earn college credit while satisfying high school graduation credits, avoiding the barriers of remedial college courses; and embedding effective SEL practices to ensure that students’ social and emotional needs are addressed, and the academic success gaps are reduced. The program meets the needs of the target population, and the project design incorporates methodologies and strategies that are supported by academic research to reduce the existing gaps and promote graduation for low-income student populations in need of academic support.

**Weaknesses:**
No weaknesses 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:** 20

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 clear and effective management plan that describes the appropriate resources and quality of management team to deliver a successful program. An organizational chart is provided, showing the ICAN Project Leadership Team and Technical Assistance staff.
The contributions of the partners to the success of the program are described with evidence of their high qualifications for their roles in executing program goals and objectives. For example, Jobs for the Future will manage and oversee ICAN; leverage its national expertise in Dual Enrollment, college access and completion, and systems design to create ICAN courses that lead to postsecondary credentials; administer the competitive HS selection process. Responsibilities are clearly defined. The applicant provides a very detailed table showing milestones, date due, responsible parties, objectives, and performance measures. The budget plan indicates the appropriate budget line items and timeframe to ensure the program will finish on budget.

**Weaknesses:**
The applicant does not provide information as to how the objectives are targeted, therefore it is not possible to determine if the objectives will be achieved.

**Reader’s Score:** 6

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

   **Strengths:**
   - The qualifications for the Project Director and other key staff are excellent with the appropriate formal training and work experience in fields related to the objectives of the project and experience in designing, managing, or implementing similar projects to provide the needed leadership. The Director will dedicate 30% of the time to the program the first year and 25% after that. The partners bring a highly qualified team with exceptional capacity, deep expertise, and the reach needed to successfully implement and scale ICAN.

   **Weaknesses:**
The applicant does not provide individual responsibilities for the key staff.

   **Reader’s Score:** 4

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 is reasonable, cost-effective, and adequate to support the potential significance of the project and is well-documented, organized, and adequate to support the proposed services and activities. Costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives and scope of the project. The expenditures and personnel funding and support are clearly identified, and the costs are reasonable given the depth of direct support that includes TAs provided to educators and schools, the frequency of meetings to accelerate learning, the development of tools and resources that will be publicly available or replication in the field. ICAN will serve about 1,200 students at an average cost of $3,333 per student.

   **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 indicates that there is a general agreement among all stakeholders to maintain constant lines of communications through regular formal and informal inquiry processes, ongoing collaboration, and routines for seeking and using feedback, input, and data to strengthen operations. Bi-weekly meetings will address project management and implementation issues such as barriers or difficulties in implementation with recommendations for improvement. A quarterly email to all ICAN HS and colleges will provide updates and welcome feedback.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses 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 meets this competitive preference priority by proposing a project that addresses the needs of target students and educators impacted by COVID-19 by including online courses with teaching and learning strategies based on revised and articulated and coordinated curriculum; high quality dual learning programs and imbedded socio-emotional learning skills development to support autonomy in learning, collaborations, problem solving, engagement and active learning

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score: 5
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 meets this Competitive Preference Priority by providing equity in access and critical resources to high-need students defined as low-income and students of color by increasing the number of target students participating in online, dual enrollment courses that incorporate the development of social-emotional learning (SEL) strategies.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5
**Technical Review Coversheet**

**Applicant:** Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411C210117)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Significance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Project Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Design</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources &amp; Management Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources &amp; Management Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Resources &amp; Manag. Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Project Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Evaluation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority Questions**

**CPP1**

| **CPP1**                                     |                 |               |
| 1. CPP1                                      | 5               | 0             |
| **Sub Total**                                | 5               | 0             |

**CPP2**

| **CPP2**                                     |                 |               |
| 1. CPP2                                      | 5               | 0             |
| **Sub Total**                                | 5               | 0             |

**CPP3**

| **CPP3**                                     |                 |               |
| 1. CPP3                                      | 5               | 0             |
| **Sub Total**                                | 5               | 0             |

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - EIR Early Phase - 15: 84.411C

Reader #3: **********
Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411C210117)

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:
   N/A
   
   Weaknesses:
   N/A

Reader’s Score: 0

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:
   N/A

   Weaknesses:
   N/A

Reader’s Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

Strengths: N/A

Weaknesses: N/A

Reader’s Score: 0

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

Strengths: N/A

Weaknesses: N/A

Reader’s Score: 0

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: N/A

Weaknesses: N/A

Reader’s Score: 0

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

   Strengths:
   N/A

   Weaknesses:
   N/A

   Reader’s Score: 0

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

   Strengths:
   N/A

   Weaknesses:
   N/A

   Reader’s Score: 0

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

   Strengths:
   N/A

   Weaknesses:
   N/A

   Reader’s Score: 0

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:
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 clearly indicated that a quasi-experimental design would be implemented for the impact study and a randomized controlled trial for the proposed project (p.e38). The applicant explained that five types of evaluation questions would lead the proposed project (confirmatory, exploratory, moderation, mediation, and implementation) (p.e39). The applicant indicated that 20 high schools would be recruited to participate in the proposed project. High schools offering DE courses in English (Grade 11) and math (Grade 12) with at least 20 students in the appropriate grade enrolled in each dual enrollment (DE) course each year would be selected and randomly assigned to control and treatment conditions within district blocks (p.e40-e41). The applicant indicated that attrition is expected to be low allowing to follow the students and to conduct intent-to-treat analyses (ITT), baseline equivalence would assess the analytical sample of the outcomes (p.e41). The methodological information included two-level hierarchical modeling with students nested within schools to estimate the treatment effects. The applicant also provided an MDES for the student outcomes analyses is 0.28 (p.e108), data sources to be collected (e.g., district administrative database, school characteristics, and survey data) (p.e109). The applicant presented the reliability of the student-level Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and school climate data to be collected such as academic self-esteem (r = 0.85) and self-efficacy (r = 0.85) (p.e109). The applicant clearly showed a timeline for the data collection including instrument, time in the year for data collection, respondent, instrument description (p.e110-e111) activities, description, timing (p.e111-e112), and evaluation timeline including the evaluation activities (p.e113). The applicant clearly provided information to meet the WWC standards based on the methods of evaluation proposed.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not clearly explain the dosage of the professional development to build online dual enrollment (DE) instructional skills and Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) skills.

Reader’s Score: 14

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 clearly indicated that ICAN’s yearly formative evaluation structure; and regular communications, ongoing collaboration, and routines for seeking and using feedback, input, and data to strengthen operations would be implemented to generate feedback and periodic assessment to monitor the adequate implementation of the proposed project (p.e37). Moreover, the technical assistance team would meet bi-weekly; the community of practice members would meet annually to discuss success and challenges of the proposed activities; ICAN high school (HS) would meet monthly to provide feedback; quarterly emails requesting feedback to all ICAN partners; and evaluator's formative evaluation to monitor the implementation progress of the proposed activities (p.e37). The applicant indicated that the fidelity of the implementation rubric and threshold of implementation would be completed during years 1 and 2 of the proposed project. The applicant clearly detailed the strategies to collect information as feedback and improvement of the proposed project. For example, site visits, professional development interviews; students' focus groups and surveys; and student surveys containing the SEL measures (p.e43).

Weaknesses:

No weakness 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 applicant clearly provided information about the Dual enrollment (DE) intervention. The intervention reported positive effects for five domains (college degree attainment, college access and enrollment, credit accumulation, and completing high school (HS), and general academic achievement (High school)), potentially positive effects for three domains (staying in high school, college readiness, and high school attendance), and no discernment effects for general achievement in college (p.e22). The applicant clearly explained that the proposed project would increase knowledge regarding the dual enrollment intervention utilizing online courses integrating SEL strategies (p.e24).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness 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:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader’s Score:** 0

**CPP2 - CPP2**


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:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A
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:
N/A

Weaknesses:
N/A

Reader's Score: 0
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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 applicant provided a sufficient description of the promising new strategies for the proposed project. The applicant states on page e16 that the project ICAN will improve by increasing college and career readiness for high need students. The strategies that will be used include designing and implementing ICAN courses to increase academic achievement in dual enrollment courses in math and English, increasing Social Emotional Learning (SEL) skills, providing professional development for teachers, and disseminating best practices.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses were 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 a sufficient description of the methods that will be used to disseminate the project. Activities include ICAN partner presentations at conferences and providing information about the proposed project on websites and social media. The applicant states on page e25 that the ICAN Course Blueprint and SEL Playbook will be disseminated.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses were noted.
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:

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 provided a detailed description of the ICAN conceptual framework. The applicant states on page e26 that ICAN partners will redesign Dual Enrollment (DE) courses, embed SEL strategies in course instruction and provide training, coaching, resources, and tools for educators. On page e27, the applicant states that a communications toolkit and an SEL Playbook and related materials will be developed. The SEL playbook will help educators design and deliver ICAN courses.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses were noted.

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

Strengths:
No strengths were noted.

Weaknesses:
The goals, objectives, and outcomes outlined on pages e28 to e30 are not measurable. The applicant presented a series of statements such as: “Increase the number of high-need students who enroll and successfully complete online DE in core courses that are vague and do not provide specific information regarding the outcomes that will be achieved.

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 provided a detailed description regarding how the proposed project will address the needs of the target population. Statistics were cited on page e30 regarding the percentage of high school students that are enrolled in remedial courses, the graduation rate for students of color, and the percentage of students of color enrolled in DE courses. The ICAN project will focus on reducing barriers for high-need students by providing access to online courses and embedding SEL skills into the online program.
No weaknesses were 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:** 20

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 presents a management plan that describes how objectives will be achieved. The responsibilities and timelines of the activities are listed. Project tasks include training for educators, the development of tools such as the communications tool kit, the SEL playbook and the ICAN Course Blueprint. Dissemination activities are included such as presentations at conferences.

**Weaknesses:**
The objectives listed on pages e29 to e30 are not measurable. Milestones are not included in the management plan.

**Reader’s Score:** 6

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

**Strengths:**
The applicant provides a clear description of the qualifications and experience of key project personnel. The key personnel are experts in DE, grant management, SEL and career pathway coaching, education innovation, technology supported learning models and professional development.

**Weaknesses:**
No weaknesses were 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.
The applicant presented a detailed budget on pages e115 to e119 outlining reasonable costs for the proposed project.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses were 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 provided a clear outline of the strategies for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement including a yearly formative evaluation, a monthly formal and informal inquiry process, an annual community of practice meeting, and a quarterly email to all ICAN high schools and colleges that will provide updates and an opportunity for feedback from the schools. Project leadership team meetings will be held to review progress towards goals, objectives, and outcomes.

Weaknesses:
The proposed project objectives are not measurable; therefore, it is unclear how effective the proposed procedures for feedback and continuous improvement will be.

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

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]
The applicant states on page e27 that during COVID-19 pandemic educators lacked resources and structures to design and deliver online courses for underserved students. The ICAN project will provide professional development and resources for educators that will help them improve their skills and deliver effective instruction for high-need students.

**Weaknesses:**
The applicant failed to provide statistics to support the statement that educators lacked resources and structures needed to provide effective instruction for underserved students during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Reader’s Score:** 3

**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 ICAN project is designed to provide equal access to educational resources for underserved students by offering high quality online dual enrollment courses in math and English.

**Weaknesses:**
No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader’s Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted
**Last Updated:** 10/08/2021 08:44 AM