

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/13/2021 07:25 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Intercultural Development Research Association (S411C210149)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	50	0
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	21
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	21
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
1. CPP1	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>CPP2</b>		
<b>CPP2</b>		
1. CPP2	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>CPP3</b>		
<b>CPP3</b>		
1. CPP3	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>Total</b>	115	21

# Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - EIR Early Phase - 14: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Intercultural Development Research Association (S411C210149)

## 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:**

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 applicant proposes a cluster-quasi-experimental design (QED) to compare program outcomes (e.g., academic achievement and socioemotional learning) between participants in the proposed Youth Leadership Now (YLN) project and a matched comparison group of non-participants (pages e44-e47). The proposed impact study, if well implemented, should produce evidence about YLN's effectiveness that meets the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations.

The applicant proposes a rigorous matching procedure that aligns with WWC guidelines. Specifically, the applicant proposes a two-level matching procedure (pages e44-46) where the method of coarsened exact matching will be used to identify blocks of similar schools to serve as treatment and comparison schools, followed by matching of treatment and comparison students within each block (using student demographic variables and baseline scores). This is a superb matching process that ameliorates the issue of selection bias (a potential threat to the internal validity of quasi-experimental studies). In addition, the plan to establish baseline equivalence between control and treatment schools on each outcome, and adjust for covariates (if any of the baseline measures vary by 0.25 standard deviation units) is appropriate and contributes to the rigor of the study design (page e44). Overall, the proposed impact evaluation design is feasible and has the potential (if well implemented) to generate empirical evidence regarding the efficacy and impact of YLN.

In line with WWC guidelines, the applicant demonstrates that the power analysis is adequate and the sample size is sufficient for eliciting the minimum detectable effect size (page e131). In addition, the proposed analytical strategy (i.e., multilevel linear modeling) for the impact study is appropriate and in alignment with the nested structure of the data (page e132). Similarly, the proposed moderation and mediation analysis are appropriate and should provide insights into the mechanisms and factors that influence the impact of YLN on student outcomes (page e44). The applicant also demonstrates that the evaluation tools and measures are reliable and/or plans to conduct its own assessment of the tool's reliability (page e138).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not clearly demonstrate how the team will ensure successful recruitment (enrollment) of students into the elective course in the treatment school. On pages e44-e45, the applicant states that YLN Tutoring is an elective course; however, the applicant does not clarify if the elective course will be open to all 8th grade students in the treatment schools or if those students would need to meet certain eligibility criteria to qualify for enrollment in the course. On page e45, the applicant states that twenty-five students are expected to enroll in the course at each treatment school and schools "will determine the best way to select students for YLN," should enrollment exceed twenty-five; however, the applicant does not discuss how this may be a source of selection bias and a confounding variable in the study. Relatedly, the applicant does not discuss how the team will handle situations where enrollment in the elective course is not up to twenty-five (page e45)—all of these are potential threats to the recruitment plan and internal validity of the study.

The applicant identified the inability to successfully recruit twenty-four comparison schools as a potential challenge/barrier to the study (page e48), but does not discuss potential strategies for mitigation. This is a very significant potential challenge, especially as the applicant does not offer these schools an incentive to participate (e.g., promise of implementation of YLN in the comparison schools after the impact study).

**Sub**

**Reader's Score: 12**

**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:**

Overall, the applicant proposes a feasible plan for providing performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes (pages e41-e44). For example, the proposed iterative cycle of development, testing and refinement of course materials is appropriate for enhancing continuous quality improvement and for identifying challenges and barriers needing resolution (pages e41-e44). Likewise, the advisory board consisting of content and practice experts to provide guidance and feedback and formative evaluation using interviews and focus groups should provide information and feedback on the experiences of YLN teachers and students, and help to identify areas for improvement (pages e41-e44).

Moreover, the applicant proposes a well thought out implementation study that will assess fidelity across all four components of the proposed YLN program, i.e., student curriculum, teacher coordinator supports, mentor teacher supports, and the intergenerational educational learning (pages e47 and e133-e136). The fidelity study should provide feedback on the extent to which YLN was implemented as intended and enhance the understanding of the contextual factors that facilitated or inhibited successful implementation at each intervention site.

**Weaknesses:**

On page e43 (Exhibit 3), the applicant mentioned site visits, observations, focus groups, and interviews as sources of data for the implementation study but does not discuss sampling and analytical strategies and how the findings from these data sources will be triangulated with data from student and teacher logs.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates that the proposed project, if well implemented, has the potential to contribute to knowledge on how to use cross-age tutoring to build the leadership competencies of at risk youth. The study also has the potential to enhance understanding of the impact on student academic and socioemotional outcomes and provide an example of how such a program could be a relatively low-cost strategy for limited-resource school districts (page e48).

The planned implementation evaluation study also has the potential to increase our understanding of the factors that facilitate (or inhibit) the efficacy of cross-age tutoring as a tool for promoting the socioemotional learning of at risk students (page e41-e44). The proposed dissemination strategies (e.g., concept papers, implementation guides, practitioner-based research briefs; pages e25 and e48) are appropriate for sharing lessons learned from the program with a wide array of education stakeholders.

**Weaknesses:**

None

**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:** 10/13/2021 07:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/14/2021 03:07 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Intercultural Development Research Association (S411C210149)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	19
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Sub Total</b>	50	49
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	25
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	25
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	0
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
1. CPP1	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>CPP2</b>		
<b>CPP2</b>		
1. CPP2	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>CPP3</b>		
<b>CPP3</b>		
1. CPP3	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	84

# Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - EIR Early Phase - 14: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Intercultural Development Research Association (S411C210149)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 19

#### Sub

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

#### Strengths:

The applicants seek funding to develop and evaluate an innovative, field-initiated cross-age tutoring, mentorship, and community-based action program for middle-school students from low-income families that are deemed as at-risk of dropping out (pp. e14-e18). The program is novel in its multi-pronged, 'strengths based,' and community-embedded approach to foster a strong sense of belonging for students of color, students at risk of isolation (particularly in the context of COVID) and drop-out (pp. e20-e25). The Youth Leadership Now is built on strong evidence on the positive impacts of professional learning communities, cross-age tutoring, teacher mentorship, and youth participatory action projects (pp. e27-e34) and responds to practice guide recommendations from the What Works Clearinghouse (p. e32).

#### Weaknesses:

None.

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 dissemination plan reflects a sense of urgency brought on by lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. Ambitiously, the Youth Leadership Now team plans to disseminate on a quarterly basis: concept papers, guides for implementation, and practitioner-based research briefs (p. e25).

#### Weaknesses:

The dissemination plan does not include dissemination of findings to national policy and academic audiences (e.g., via conference presentations and/or journal publications) (p. e25). At the same time, this likely reflects a clear and intentional prioritization of affecting change at the community and local level.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

Reader's Score: 30

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 conceptual framework is well-informed by the most current empirical and conceptual literature on its intervention components (e.g., cross-age tutoring) and thoroughly grounded in the concept of 'academic mindset,' that may be particularly important in the success of students of color (pp. e22-23). The strength of the applicants' conceptualization of academic mindset is that it widens the individualized focus of many social emotional learning interventions and measures to encompass the broader social contexts and narratives that students labeled 'at-risk' negotiate as they work to define and experience themselves as capable and successful (pp. e. 23-24).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

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 project's four goals (e.g., "to develop and establish and 8th grade local elective Youth Leadership Now class...") are clear and well-grounded in their conceptual framework (pp. e34-e35). The associated objectives are actionable and their milestones and corresponding measures are designed to ensure excellent monitoring of progress toward the goals (pp. e35; pp. e112-e129).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

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 applicants note the Youth Leadership Now is specifically designed to meet the needs (foster an academic mindset, increase sense of belonging) of students identified as at-risk and from low-socioeconomic backgrounds (pp. e21-e23). The applicants establish the importance of targeting academic mindset through interventions shown to have significant positive impacts on students at-risk (pp. e27-e34). Students will be selected to participate based on their 'at-risk' designation in the context of attending schools and district that serve very high levels of Latinx students who meet this criteria (p. e35-e36). Further, this project shows promise for not just meeting the needs of

**Sub**

individual students, but also the schooling needs of families and communities (p. e32).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**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**

**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 management plan is thorough, detailed, and clearly delineates responsibilities (p. e38, pp. e112-e129, Appendices J.1 and J.2). Activities such as, "tutors, their families, mentors, teacher coordinators and other school staff will attend two Education CAFÉ meetings in the fall and two in the spring" in the implementation year between 9/1/2025 and 4/30/2025 are clearly demarked and assigned to appropriate teams (in this case, the Professional Development Team) (p. e126). The Intercultural Development Research Association has a long and successful history of successfully developing, implementing, and disseminating youth and community education interventions in the region, nation, and across the globe, including cross-age tutoring (pp. e24-e25) and intergenerational community action models (pp. e31-32).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The project personnel are experienced educational interventionists, curriculum developers, and researchers (pp. e38-e41). They each have at least 10 years of experience in their respective areas and with particular respect to each of the intervention elements. For example, Project Director Cantu directed and managed the successful international tutoring program on which the cross-age tutoring program for the proposed project will be based. Given the innovative inclusion of youth participatory action, it is a particular strength the project team includes Professional Development Specialist Quintanilla-Muñoz who has extensive experience designing, implementing, and evaluating youth-led equity projects (p. e.40). External Evaluator Litwock is well-qualified and has experience on current and prior EIR evaluations (pp. e40-e41).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**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:**

Project costs are reasonable and well-prioritized given the intensive and targeted nature of the intervention and its likely impacts beyond individual students (e. 41). The applicants estimate costs at \$900 per student and anticipate full implementation costs beyond the grant funding period to be around \$12,000 per district or school, which means a much lower per pupil cost assuming interventions are school or district-wide (p. e41). The Intercultural Development Research Association is committed to an in-kind match contribution of \$66,000 in the first year and “looks forward” to possible matched contributions in Years 2-5 (p. e107).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The development process is clearly iterative and involves cycles of development, testing, and refining/improving (p. e42). Responsibilities and processes for these cycles are detailed and clear and include quarterly external reviews from the Advisory team (p. e42, pp. e112-e115). The expert Advisory team will explicitly review intervention documents and processes to ensure they are “based on current research, are responsive to equity needs and the COVID-19 context” (p. e112).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**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).**

Sub

**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 applicants demonstrate that students in the study region (West Texas) are disengaging from school, an effect precipitated by the pandemic. They note the "tremendous pressure" COVID-19 has added to students' experiences of schooling (p. e37). They suggest that more standard approaches to increase individual student 'motivation' are not up to the task of supporting students who may be (rightly) questioning the extent to which they (can) belong in schools (p. e37). The project is specifically designed to address this need, to foster a sense of student belonging, but also in a way that holds potential for transforming school, family, and community relationships (through the Education CAFÉs) (pp. e18, e35-e38).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

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 Youth Lead Now project specifically centers students labeled 'at-risk' and from low-income families and includes multiple mechanisms for raising these students' school performance and sense of belonging (pp. e18-e19). The project is intentionally oriented to equity, including opportunities for youth and community members to engage in participatory action projects together to improve schooling (p. e18-e19).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

Reader's Score: 5

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/14/2021 03:07 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/15/2021 05:48 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Intercultural Development Research Association (S411C210149)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	19
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Sub Total</b>	50	49
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	25
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	25
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	0
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
1. CPP1	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>CPP2</b>		
<b>CPP2</b>		
1. CPP2	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>CPP3</b>		
<b>CPP3</b>		
1. CPP3	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	84

# Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - EIR Early Phase - 14: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Intercultural Development Research Association (S411C210149)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 19

#### Sub

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant presented a project that is a new strategy that is designed to cause students in at-risk situations to feel they belong in school with a mentoring section that will propagate creating institutional practices to increase academic mindsets (e 21). The applicant noted that Youth Leadership Now provides a four-pronged approach to addressing socio-emotional learning (SEL) and noncognitive factors through tutoring (e 21). The design is to place 8th-grade students who are deemed at-risk as K-1 tutors, provide mentor experiences for these tutors as they transition from middle school to high school, and produce professional learning communities (PLCs) for mentors on the power of using asset-based practices with students in at-risk situations in order to facilitate institutional transformation (e 21).

#### 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 proposed to present information immediately in formats that facilitate research into practice (e 25). Concept papers on project designs, research basis, and project components will be disseminated quarterly (e 25). Also, practitioner-based research briefs designed to assist instructors and administrators in implementing project components will all be disseminated quarterly (e 25).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

More details are needed to demonstrate how the applicant will disseminate final findings on a national level and within the educational community (e 25).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 30**

**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 conceptual framework underlying the proposed research is built around the key components of cross-age tutoring, PLCs, teacher mentors, What Works Clearinghouse Guidance documents, the Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA) intergenerational Education CAFÉ', and youth action research equity projects (e 26). It was noted that the Youth Leaders Now design team will develop the curriculum for students and supports for the adults involved throughout the year (e 26). It was also noted that the team will develop professional development modules for teacher coordinators and mentors (e 27).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were 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 identified clear goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project (e 35). For example, the Young Leaders Now project will serve 650 at-risk 8th-grade students by developing and establishing an 8th grade local elective Youth Leadership Now class with 20 curriculum units, accompanying professional development, and materials to increase student positive academic mindsets (e 35). Also, it was noted that as an outcome for objective 3, after a year of participation in Youth Leaders Now, 8th-grade students will show a 40% decrease in absenteeism compared to non-participating students (e 114). Another outcome for objective 3 is after a year of participation in Youth Leader Now, 8th-grade students will show a 35% increase in middle school Texas exams for 8th-grade math and English language arts compared to nonparticipants (e 114).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were 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 design of the proposed project will address the needs of the targeted population (e 36). The applicant identified data from the results of COVID's impact on education that illustrated the targeted area serves higher numbers of Black and Latino students and demonstrated decreased participation rates in academic assessments for elementary, middle, and high school levels (e 36). It was noted that participation declined (e 36). For example, science assessments declined by 33%, Math by 32%, reading by 31%, and writing assessment by 37% (e 36). The data reflects high levels of student disengagement (e 36).

**Weaknesses:**

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: 25**

**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 provided a chart that identified activities and the timeline for completing the tasks (e 39). For example, it was noted that the development of goals 1 & 2 will be implemented between January of 2022 and the Fall of 2023 (e 39). Also, the analysis will take place from the Spring of 2026 to December of 2026 (e 39). The applicant identified key personnel and their responsibilities (e 39). For example, it was noted that implementation activities will be carried out by the professional development and implementation team (e 39). The team is to be led by the director in collaboration with the professional development specialists, ESC19 specialists, and district and curriculum personnel (e 39).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided detailed information about key personnel and their relevant training and experiences (e 40). For example, the proposed Director of Operations and Educational Practices at IDRA has extensive experience in developing and managing youth projects (e 40). Intercultural Development Research Association's professional development specialist will assist in creating products and processes for Young Leader's Now's PLCs and mentoring support (e 40). It was also noted that the External Evaluator is a senior methodologist with expertise in evaluation design, research methods, data analysis, and dissemination of technical results (e 40).

**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.**

**Strengths:**

It was noted that the cost associated with the development and implementation years will be \$900 per student (e 41). It was also noted that once the program is developed, piloted, and tested, the professional development cost will vary per time allotted and by capacity building of teacher coordinators and mentors at participating districts (e 41). Professional development and costs to access professional development modules and curriculum materials will be assessed after the completion of the grant (e 41). However, the applicant noted that, based on previous experience, the costs per year are about \$12,000 (e 41).

**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 Youth Leaders Now full management plan includes details of continuous feedback activities throughout the development and piloting cycle (e 42). The applicant noted that the process follows the steps of preparation, design, testing, pilot, and refinement (e 42). The applicant identified the use of the same iterative process to create the first draft of the teacher coordinator and mentor professional development modules and online and onsite professional development modules (e 42). It was also noted that the curriculum development specialist will lead the development and implementation of technical assistance teams to create materials, manage timelines, and oversee continuous

**Sub**

feedback processes (e 147).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were 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:**

Sub

**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:**

Research and survey questions revealed the current state of education in Texas during the pandemic and existing equity barriers students experience included education equity, home stressors, at-home learning, and discipline in school (e 33). It was noted that key findings included three out of four students reported struggling with mental wellness, and virtual learning produced additional barriers (e 33). It was noted that academic engagement, supplementing family's income, and dealing with personal healthcare needs were all issues students dealt with during the pandemic (e 33).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were 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 proposed that the project is designed to address the needs of underserved students most impacted by COVID-19 by re-engaging students and their families (e 18). It was noted that the design will strengthen relationships between educators, students, and families, by engaging students, families, caretakers, educators, and administrators in the implementation of innovative practices (e 18). It was also identified that the basic experience of Young Leaders Now is cross-age tutoring (e 18).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 10/15/2021 05:48 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/14/2021 10:53 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Intercultural Development Research Association (S411C210149)

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

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

# Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - EIR Early Phase - 14: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Intercultural Development Research Association (S411C210149)

## 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: 20**

**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 applicant clearly describes the project evaluation design and identifies how the design will provide evidence to meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations, with a clear explanation for why the design is with reservations as opposed to without reservations (page e45).

The applicant thoroughly describes the two-level matching procedure on both the school- and student-levels, and they clearly delineate the key characteristics and variables that schools and students will be matched on (pages e45, e46).

The applicant provides detailed explanations, analytic models, and assessment rubrics for key aspects of the evaluation design and analysis, including power analysis assumptions, hierarchical model parameters and definitions, and indicators and thresholds for the fidelity measure (pages e131-e137).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not have a prescriptive plan to guide schools on selecting and enrolling 25 students in order to reduce selection bias and meet minimum sample sizes. There is no detailed information on the student selection process nor is there a discussion of selecting less than 25 students (page e44, e45).

**Reader's Score: 12**

- 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 indicates that the pilot study phase of the project will include an iterative process of implementation and feedback review for the curriculum modules (pages e118-e123), as well as interviews, surveys, and focus groups of teachers and students to gather feedback and assess progress towards achieving project goals and objectives (page e43).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant clearly identifies several project implementation challenges that may happen, but it does not adequately discuss how they plan to address or mitigate all of the challenges, including low teacher participation and recruiting enough comparison schools (pages e47, e48).

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a thorough demonstration of how the peer tutoring aspect of the project can increase student motivation, student leadership, academic mindset, and academic achievement (pages e17, e20, e48).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not adequately describe how the current research project builds on or extends previous research and programs, such as Valued Youth Partnership (pages e24, e25) and teachers as mentors, to increase knowledge of effective strategies for youth leadership and academic mindset development (page e30).

**Reader's Score:** 4

**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:** 10/14/2021 10:53 PM