

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2022 02:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	28
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	68
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. COVID-19	3	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	2
<b>Total</b>	106	70

# Technical Review Form

Panel #18 - EIR Early Phase - 18: 84.411C

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

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

## 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:

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. (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The proposed robust project clearly exhibits a plan that builds on the existing strategies for creating trauma-informed school environments. The comprehensive proposal will use evidence-based strategies to change educator practices and effectively implement the model. The proposal states that they will use a comprehensive, sequenced, and collaborative structure for professional learning and development to embed a trauma engaged MTSS model into schools (e19).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

### 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: 28

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

#### Strengths:

The proposal clearly demonstrates a conceptual framework that is aligned to activities proposed by the applicants. For example, the training at the beginning of school is designed specifically to help educators understand trauma

**Sub**

and their role in supporting a TES. Also, all staff members at intervention schools will receive a universal training where they will learn about trauma and brain science, deconstructing trauma, and the components of the TS framework (e24).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

There are five goals of the proposed project that are clearly stated. The objectives and outcomes are concise and aligned to the inputs (e24).

**Weaknesses:**

Two of the outputs “increase in teacher confidence in skills” and “increase in teacher skill” will be measured in only one way. They will be measured using only self-reporting from school surveys. There are no other ways planned to measure these two significant outcomes. In self reporting there is a chance for personal bias and opinion to outweigh data. It is unclear how and if there is a plan for preparing for and mitigating bias in reporting (e29).

**Reader's Score: 3**

**3. (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. (15 points)**

**Strengths:**

The proposal will deliver comprehensive high-quality professional development to teachers and school personnel that is appropriate to support the needs of the target population. The professional development is specifically designed to help teachers support the needs of Alaskan children of color. The proposal's goals are attainable because the materials, coaches, and trainers were chosen to deepen educators’ understanding of the cultural and community context. All participating schools are considered rural and have a high proportion of students who are Alaska Native, students of color, and from low-income backgrounds. In addition, participating districts see low levels of proficiency in key academic areas. The high-quality professional development aims to create better school culture and thus improve student outcomes (e32).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:**

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Sub**

- 1. The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly encourages employing persons from underrepresented groups. For example, site-based coaches will be chosen for their coaching abilities and their connection to rural and Alaska Native communities. The team already includes several AASB staff members who are Alaska Native. They will directly support this project. Other members of the team have experience living and working in rural Alaska. The proposed staff of the program are highly trained and have expertise in their respective fields aligned to their roles in the plan. The proposal notes that the director and coordinator both have advanced degrees in social work as well as experience in SEL (e33).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

**Reader's Score: 10**

**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. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

There is a clear management plan in place that includes a detailed budget and timelines that will support the proposal in meeting its outcomes on time and within budget. For example, there will be published timelines for stakeholders. Grant team members and external partners will meet monthly to ensure timelines are being met and money is being allocated appropriately. Bi-monthly meetings are planned for the workgroup that will oversee inputs, implementation, and quality improvements toward achievement of the objectives. There are clearly defined roles and responsibilities for all team members (e36).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 10

**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). (20 points)

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. (5 points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

**Priority Questions**

## Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points).**

Projects designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students in middle school or high school that examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, including rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including one or more of the following:

- (a) Student-centered learning models that may leverage technology to address learner variability (e.g., universal design for learning (as defined in this notice), K–12 competency-based education (as defined in this notice), project-based learning, or hybrid/blended learning) and provide high-quality learning content, applications, or tools.
- (b) Middle school courses or projects that prepare students to participate in advanced coursework in high school.
- (c) Advanced courses and programs, including dual enrollment and early college programs.
- (d) Project-based and experiential learning, including service and work-based learning.
- (e) High-quality career and technical education courses, pathways, and industry-recognized credentials that are integrated into the curriculum.

#### Strengths:

n/a

#### Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

## Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID–19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through:

- (a) conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K–12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

a.) The applicant has convincing research that speaks directly to the needs of the children of Alaska. The applicant states Alaska school districts saw an increase in student mental health concerns such as isolation, trauma, depression, and anxiety. Project Transform addresses these needs through evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, including PD, coaching, professional learning communities, and reflective practices.

b.) The proposal is sound and incorporates evidence-based strategies for creating a trauma-engaged school with a flexible MTSS framework. The proposal plans for specific training for staff, leadership, and teachers in creating a trauma engaged school.

Through engaging in this training they will also support the need of school districts to respond to challenges exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Weaknesses:**

a.) The application does not include any information about asset mapping that was conducted in the target communities.

**Reader's Score:**     **2**

---

**Status:**             Submitted  
**Last Updated:**    09/02/2022 02:21 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2022 02:06 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	16
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	64
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. COVID-19	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	3
<b>Total</b>	106	67

# Technical Review Form

Panel #18 - EIR Early Phase - 18: 84.411C

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

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

## 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:

Reader's Score: 16

#### 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. (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant satisfactorily lays out a clear coordinated model of evidence-based practices that build on existing strategies. Important to this assessment is the fact that the applicant proposed activities and strategies that are culturally responsive in that they are place-based and offer a culturally specific perspective to respond to the strengths and needs of underserved communities in Alaska (e21). The proposed model builds on the MTSS model, which has significant evidence of success, by building in two additional tiers of foundation: one rooted in family/community strategies and one focusing on teacher professional development and support. An important element to the project is that it is designed to address the weaknesses of the studies relative to professional development. For example, the applicant has embedded teacher coaching into the model, and addresses staff mental-health and well-being which can combat secondary trauma (e21).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to provide adequate data on the information that is available to substantiate the evidence upon which the proposed project is based.

Reader's Score: 16

### 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

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a well-thought-out and developed conceptual framework underlying the proposed research and activities. For instance, there is a considerable focus on building capacity as well as attention placed on the inputs with an important feedback loop to address weaknesses in inputs with ongoing evaluation and refinement (e24-e26). The goals are directly aligned to the strategies and objectives to illustrate expected short-term, mid-term, and long-term outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides an exceptional table of clearly aligned strategies and objectives to illustrate short-, mid-, and long-term outcomes. For example, each objective is linked to the tool of measurement which then illustrates the expected impact on the baseline to achieve projected target outcome (e151-e152).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (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. (15 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant cites and relies on a substantial body of evidence to illustrate that the design of the project is appropriate to successfully address the needs of the target population. For instance, the applicant indicates that the target population of Alaska Native students are more likely to experience trauma and have lower rates of academic proficiency and school-ready social-emotional learning skills compared to white students, but only 66% of Alaska educators indicate that they have the specific skills and strategies to help students who have experienced trauma do well in their school (e31-e32). The data is persuasive to suggest that there is the necessary tie between the needs of the target population and the design of the project, which includes considerable attention to addressing the needs of the teachers in addressing the needs of their students.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

## Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 8

### Sub

1. The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides ample information to indicate that it will encourage applications for employment from persons who are members of the target population. Further, the applicant also evidences that some of its staff to be involved with the project have many of the same experiences as the target population, such as being native to Alaska or having lived in the community for multiple years. The professionals proposed to fill the key personnel positions reflect an extensive set of skills with appropriate experience and training. For instance, the Project Coordinator has ten years of experience working in mental health, education, and with youth, is a licensed clinical social worker, and has experience working on MTSS, SEL standards, curriculum development, and cultural modifications (e34).

#### Weaknesses:

The scope of the project is extensive and the proposed staffing does not indicate even one full-time employee to have sole dedication to leadership over, as well as the coordination and facilitation of, the necessary staff, resources, and inputs to ensure the full extent of efficacy.

Reader's Score: 8

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 10

### 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. (10 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant proposes a detailed plan to ensure that it will achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. To meet the expectations of this selection criteria, the applicant reference strategies such as ongoing monitoring of budgets and spending and bimonthly meetings of a workgroup to oversee inputs, implementation, and quality improvement comprised of members who have experience successfully implementing

**Sub**

and evaluating an i3 grant . Additionally, the applicant clearly defines responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. For instance, the applicant provides tables and realistic timelines to illustrate an overview of the timeline and a more detailed timeline of the initial 8 months of implementation, describing events to prepare for the launch of the first cohort of the intervention sites for the Project (e37-e38).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**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). (20 points)**

**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. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)**

Sub

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

### Priority Questions

#### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

##### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points).**

**Projects designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students in middle school or high school that examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, including rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including one or more of the following:**

- (a) Student-centered learning models that may leverage technology to address learner variability (e.g., universal design for learning (as defined in this notice), K–12 competency-based education (as defined in this notice), project-based learning, or hybrid/blended learning) and provide high-quality learning content, applications, or tools.**
- (b) Middle school courses or projects that prepare students to participate in advanced coursework in high school.**
- (c) Advanced courses and programs, including dual enrollment and early college programs.**
- (d) Project-based and experiential learning, including service and work-based learning.**
- (e) High-quality career and technical education courses, pathways, and industry-recognized credentials that are integrated into the curriculum.**

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

##### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty (up to 3 points).**

**Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID–19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through:**

- (a) conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become**

disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K–12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

(a) The applicant suitably ties in and connects its efforts to engage teachers in self-assessment, as a means for a needs assessment, which is integral to the core of its model, the “Transforming Schools” framework. The supporting data and proposed interventions offered by the applicant aptly address an approach to ensure teachers feel adequately prepared and supported in engaging student acceleration in learning to meet challenging academic content (e20; e148).

(b) A substantial portion of the applicant’s proposed project is based in the Transforming School Framework, which identifies and builds upon the strength of professional development, coaching, and ongoing support for educators . For instance, the applicant will address students’ needs by providing, among other interventions, professional development and intervention supports for educators (e20).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/02/2022 02:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2022 02:22 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	16
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	64
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. COVID-19	3	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	2
<b>Total</b>	106	66



# Technical Review Form

Panel #18 - EIR Early Phase - 18: 84.411C

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

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

## 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:

Reader's Score: 16

#### 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. (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicants' Transforming School model builds upon already existing evidence that shows that social and emotional learning (SEL), schoolwide trauma informed approaches and positive school climate are all linked to improved academic achievement. The applicants' model will build on the existing evidence base for creating trauma informed school environments and use evidence-based strategies for changing educator practices to effectively implement the project. These approaches include professional development and intervention support for educators, coaching, professional learning communities and reflective practices. The model encompasses 11 components of a trauma engaged school model and culturally specific perspectives designed to respond to the strengths and needs of underserved communities in Alaska (e20-e21).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not adequately present data and comprehensive information about the existing practices in which it is building upon. Furthermore, the applicant provides very little data to support the possible success of the model.

Reader's Score: 16

### 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

**Sub**

**1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project's conceptual framework is logical and presented with clarity. The relationship between project inputs, goals, and strategies to achieve goals and hypothesized outcomes is coherent. For example, the project aims to build the schools' capacity to implement a TES approach. Then, they will improve educators understanding of trauma-based approaches. They will support educators to use trauma engaged practices and finally improve and reduce disparities in student academic behavioral and SEL outcomes. They will also develop, refine and evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the model (e25).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The goals are clearly stated and measurable. Each of the 5 goals provides a clear indication of what the project is trying to accomplish. Furthermore, the objectives are precise, time-based, measurable actions that support the completion of each goal. For example, in trying to achieve goal number 1 which is to build capacity of schools to implement trauma engaged TES approach, the Applicant provides specific objectives in which to achieve the stated goal such as offering technical assistance, training and coaching to school administrators and school-based teams. Such an objective is measurable by identifying the number of participants that will be trained etc (e28).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**3. (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. (15 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's proposed project design presents effective strategies to build capacity of schools, help educators improve their understanding of the subject matter as well as their roles and reduction of disparities in students. With at least 2 in 3 children in Alaska having been exposed to traumatic experiences in childhood and with rural students and students of color having more likely experienced trauma during COVID pandemic, project Transform provide a mulitiered system that address student mental health and learning barriers using evidence based trauma-informed professional development and intervention support for educators (e20).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 8

Sub

1. The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)

**Strengths:**

The applicant has a plausible plan to hire staff members who have qualifications and experience within Alaska. Furthermore, the applicant has a plan to hire members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. This is highlighted from the fact that site-based coaches will be chosen for their coaching abilities and their connection to rural Alaska. The key personnel is experienced and has relevant experience to the proposed project. The Director has 25 years of experience handling federal grants while the project coordinator has ten years of experience in mental health, education and youth work.

**Weaknesses:**

It is not clear from the project if some or all key project personnel will be full time employees of the project.

Reader's Score: 8

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

Reader's Score: 10

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. (10 points)

**Strengths:**

The project's objectives, timelines and milestones are clearly defined. The budget narrative is clear. The budget cost is broken down in terms of personnel cost, fringe benefits, travel cost, supplies, construction cost, contractual cost etc. In order to achieve the objectives on time and within budget, the Applicant's key personnel have an effective oversight in making sure that staff members, evaluators and education agencies have clear timelines and deliverables. (e166).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses.

Sub

Reader's Score: 10

**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). (20 points)

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

**Priority Questions**

## Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points).**

Projects designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students in middle school or high school that examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, including rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including one or more of the following:

- (a) Student-centered learning models that may leverage technology to address learner variability (e.g., universal design for learning (as defined in this notice), K–12 competency-based education (as defined in this notice), project-based learning, or hybrid/blended learning) and provide high-quality learning content, applications, or tools.
- (b) Middle school courses or projects that prepare students to participate in advanced coursework in high school.
- (c) Advanced courses and programs, including dual enrollment and early college programs.
- (d) Project-based and experiential learning, including service and work-based learning.
- (e) High-quality career and technical education courses, pathways, and industry-recognized credentials that are integrated into the curriculum.

#### Strengths:

N/A

#### Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

## Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID–19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through:

- (a) conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K–12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

The applicant adequately presents how the project addresses the challenges of isolation, trauma, depression and anxiety exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic among the rural students, students of color and students from low-income backgrounds.

The Applicant's TES model uses evidence based instructional approaches and supports which include coaching, ongoing support for educators etc. Project transform uses a comprehensive, sequenced, and collaborative structure for professional learning and development to embed a trauma engaged Multitiered Systems Support (MTSS) in schools. Thus, the Applicant adequately addresses requirement ( B).

**Weaknesses:**

The Applicant does not present evidence of community mapping and needs assessments on underserved students which include the assessment of the extent to which underserved students have become disengaged from learning because of the pandemic. Rather, The applicant performed needs assessment on the impact of COVID on educators by conducting surveys on educators in which 58% of Alaska educators reported that during the pandemic they felt overwhelmed trying to support students and 72% continue to feel worn out in their work in ways that interfere with the other parts of their life (e20).

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/02/2022 02:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2022 12:45 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	24
<b>Total</b>	30	24

# Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - EIR Tier 2 - 9: 84.411C

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

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

## Questions

### 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: 24

#### 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). (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The application proposes a school-level randomized controlled trial to examine the impact of the Project Transform on student outcomes (e.g., achievement, school engagement, and social and emotional competencies). The proposed impact study, if well implemented, has the potential to produce evidence about the intervention's effectiveness that meets the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations.

In line with WWC guidelines, the application demonstrates that the sample size is sufficient, and the statistical power is adequate for eliciting the minimum detectable effect size. Moreover, the application describes a meaningful approach for addressing potential attrition and missing data. For example, the plan to monitor both cluster and student level attrition is superb and aligns with WWC recommendations. The proposed analytic approach (i.e., multilevel regression analysis) is very appropriate for the nested nature of the data where students and teachers are nested within schools. This analytic approach will allow for an estimation of the presence and size of school-level variations in intervention effect.

#### Weaknesses:

The proposed impact study does not include the teacher outcome variables mentioned in the logic model and proposal narrative. Specifically, the logic model indicates that the teacher outcomes (e.g., enhanced confidence to implement trauma-engaged practices) will mediate the impact of the intervention on student outcomes (e.g., school engagement and improved social and emotional learning). However, the proposed impact study does not mention if (and how) this mediation will be assessed empirically. This is a significant omission given that teachers are the direct recipients of the intervention and the extent of the impact of the intervention on students will logically depend on the extent to which teacher outcomes are achieved.

The application does not explain specific differences between "business-as-usual" and the intervention (i.e., Project Transform). The application states that schools in the control group will receive "business-as-usual" opportunities. However, it is not clear if "business-as-usual" includes any of the eleven components of the Transforming Schools framework. As stated in the application, the framework was developed in Alaska; hence, it would be important to



**Sub**

clarify how the proposed intervention differs from current practices in the participating schools.

The application does not describe how the study team will handle potential contamination between the control and experimental groups. It is not clear if control and intervention schools in each cohort will be from the same school district. The evaluation plan does not discuss how the team will address situations where teachers in the intervention schools may unknowingly share information and tips about the intervention with teachers in the control groups.

**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. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes a feasible plan for providing performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the proposed Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle is appropriate for enhancing continuous quality improvement and for identifying challenges and barriers needing resolution. Moreover, the proposed fidelity of the implementation study, if well implemented, has the potential to provide useful data on the extent to which the intervention was implemented as intended and inform the team's understanding of the contextual factors that facilitated or inhibited successful implementation at each school or school district. For example, Research Question 9 has the potential to generate meaningful data for identifying and understanding the core program activities and components that are associated with improvements in teacher practices and teacher outcomes. Overall, the applicant raises important implementation questions that should provide feedback for program improvement.

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 5**

**3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, and a measurable threshold for implementation. Specifically, the evaluation includes a table that identifies and shows logical connections among objectives, measures, and baseline and target values for each project goal. For example, for the objective regarding improvements in student, staff, and family perceptions of school climate, the application proposes to increase the percentage of students who respond favorably to the school connectedness survey from 49% in the baseline to 60% post-program implementation. This implementation target value is feasible and realistic for the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

There are a few inconsistencies between the outcomes and mediators mentioned in the proposal narrative versus the evaluation plan. For example, the project narrative and the logic model identified improvements in teacher knowledge of trauma-engaged and social and emotional learning practices and enhanced teacher confidence in trauma-engaged practices as expected short-term outcomes and potential mediators. However, the evaluation plan does not discuss how these teacher outcomes will be measured and/or if (and how) these mediating variables are related to the implementation threshold.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

---

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2022 12:45 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2022 03:42 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	26
<b>Total</b>	30	26

# Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - EIR Tier 2 - 9: 84.411C

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

Applicant: AASB (S411C220010)

## Questions

### 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: 26

#### 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). (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant outlines an evaluation plan that would allow for meeting What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations for both research question 1 and 2. EdNW, the external evaluation firm, will conduct a randomized control trial (RCT) whereby 20 schools will be randomly assigned to either participate or serve as a business-as-usual comparison for each cohort year (pg. 21 application; pg. e40 packet). For research questions 3 and 4, the evaluation design will allow for meeting What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations, given the school-level outcome data planned for analyses (pg. 21 application; pg. e40 packet). One strength of this proposal is the plan for including school administrative data (e.g., standardized assessments in reading and math; attendance; demographics) which are always relevant for various stakeholder groups (e.g., policymakers, school boards, educational researchers).

#### Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan does not include any outcome measures for teachers in the impact evaluation. Because any change in students' outcomes requires initial changes for teachers, as per the project's logic model (Figure 2), the absence of teacher-level outcomes for the impact evaluation limits the ability to interpret program outcomes.

Reader's Score: 17

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

#### Strengths:

This application includes a plan for one school to serve as a pilot (pg. 21 application; pg. e40 packet); this is excellent for developing a strong foundation for the project delivery. In addition to the pilot study, with planned feedback and revisions, the evaluation plan includes focus groups and interviews with practitioners (e.g., teachers and administrators) so that the project team can receive timely and comprehensive feedback from those personnel closest to the implementation (pg. 25 application; pg. e44 packet).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score:** 5

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

**Strengths:**

The application includes a range of data sources for program components (e.g., self-assessments, teacher reflections, meeting agendas, etc.) that will offer strong insight on each of the major project components. The variety of data sources (e.g., self-report and more objective measures) (p. e44 packet) is strong and will be useful for refining the program and overcoming challenges to implementation and successful outcomes. Table 3 (pages 9-12 application; pages e28-e31 packet) offers a clear description of the program measures. Additionally, the logic model is strong and indicates key components and mediators (e.g., educators' use of the program; educators' understanding of trauma).

**Weaknesses:**

The implementation thresholds are not yet established (p. 25 application; pg. e44 packet). The evaluation team plans to work with the project team to co-create implementation thresholds. There is potential for a lack of agreement among stakeholders, and it is not clear that the evaluation team has established a lower bound for acceptable implementation thresholds.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/07/2022 03:42 PM