

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2022 10:07 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

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	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. COVID-19	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	6
<b>Total</b>	106	74

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - EIR Early Phase - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

## 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 applicant proposes a kindergarten classroom academic program that accelerates math achievement, reduces challenging student behaviors in whole class settings, and increases teacher capacity to support students. The applicant lists low level of math performance and need for early intervention as evidence for significance of the proposed project. This project is building on ROOTS which is a successful small group intervention. The project will adapt ROOTS for whole class format. The applicant describes a promising new strategy based on existing strategies.

#### Weaknesses:

n/a

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)

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The project is based on M-SENS, ROOTS, and The Good Behavior Game. All concepts have been successfully implemented in the past and this proposed work will bring them together for a whole-class intervention. The applicant has provided high-quality frameworks that are the basis for the new intervention.

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**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 lists 3 goals along with objectives within each goal and lists out the outcomes for each objective. For example, creation of 50 whole class M-SENS lessons that integrate ROOTS lesson with whole class positive behavior supports. The applicant lists clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives and outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**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 describes the high-need (English learners, those with disability, living in poverty, students of color) kindergarten student as the target population.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not list specific accommodations being made in order to meet the student needs. For example, they do not list if content will be translated in Spanish for Spanish speaking students.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**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**

**Sub**

**qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant mentions that the team involved is diverse in age, gender, and race. The specific people listed as part of the team have relevant expertise to carry out the project.

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**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:**

The applicant has a detailed management plan . The plan lists goals, aligned objectives, measures, activities and start/end dates. The activities also list the person responsible for each.

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**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)**

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. (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:**

The applicant's proposal meets the requirements for part a by including ROOTS program as high-quality learning content and the behavior game will help engage disengaged students and both models together will address learner variability.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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 describes the ROOTS program as a way to accelerate student learning loss in mathematics. The applicant has conducted a needs assessment of teachers who want a behavior game incorporated into the curriculum in order to engage students successfully. The applicant clearly shows how this project will address the impact of the pandemic and help students most impacted.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/24/2022 10:07 AM





Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2022 08:42 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	23
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	9
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	57
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. COVID-19	3	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	4
<b>Total</b>	106	61

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - EIR Early Phase - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

## 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: 15

#### 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:

- Math Ready-Supporting Early Number Sense (M-SENS) is innovative because it adapts ROOTS, which is an evidence-based, whole number mathematics intervention at the small group level, to the whole classroom to ensure students typically at risk for falling behind in mathematics learning targets are better supported. Further, M-SENS integrates a positive behavior support component, the evidence-based Good Behavior Game, to improve students' behavioral skills. This integration was in response to a survey wherein 78% of teachers delivering ROOTS were negatively impacted by disruptive student behavior.

#### Weaknesses:

- The proposal does not describe how the foundation of their programming, ROOTS, differs from how math is currently taught. There are no clear advantages other than the small group setting, and the proposal does not detail how ROOTS will be adapted from the small group setting to the whole classroom setting.
- The applicant describes that ROOTS will "indicate statistically significant positive outcomes on a range of mathematics outcome measures" but does not provide further details that explain what the significantly positive outcomes are.

Reader's Score: 15

### 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: 23**

**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's quality framework is based on combining ROOTS with the Good Behavior Game, both of which are evidence-based and likely to meet the stated outcomes of the proposal.
- The proposal describes an comprehensive iterative approach to developing and refining the M-SENS program, implementing Brief Learning Trials (BLTs) in kindergarten classrooms to determine how well the program works before implementing the feasibility and pilot studies.

**Weaknesses:**

- The proposal does not clarify the number of schools involved is not indicated in the narrative, only number of kindergarten classrooms.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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 proposal clearly states 3 goals: (1) develop and refine the M-SENS program, (2) test the feasibility of M-SENS in authentic school settings, and (c) pilot M-SENS to test its' promise to improve student outcomes.
- The proposal clearly states the objectives that are in direct alignment with the proposal's stated goals and outcomes.
- The proposal clearly describes 3 key outcomes: "(a) accelerated student mathematics achievement, (b) reduced challenging student behaviors in whole-class settings, and (c) increased capacity of teachers to support student early mathematics and behavioral needs."
- The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

**Weaknesses:**

- The proposal states this intervention will have lasting effects on mathematics learning and behavioral skills, but no specific outcomes or measures are presented.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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 accurately describes the needs of at-risk students and strategies to mitigate learning and behavioral issues. Strategies include addressing the needs of at-risk students early, using a whole class approach, engaging frequently with the students, assuming that all students do not have prior understanding of whole numbers, the use of visual representations, mathematics vocabulary, and encouraging mathematic discourse.
- The proposal clearly states that M-SENS will be built upon evidence-based practices that focus on high-needs kindergarten students.
- The applicant describes implmenting M-SENS within 2 school districts, Springfield Public Schools (SPS) and Oregon City School District (OCSD), where the students consistently perform under 30% for mathematics proficiency levels.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

- There is mention of serving students who are English learners, have disabilities, living in poverty, and students of color, but no specific strategies of how to engage these students.

**Reader's Score: 11**

**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 states a strategy for recruiting and hiring from groups that have been traditionally underrepresented and that the team itself is "diverse in terms of age, gender, and race and includes persons from groups who have been traditionally underrepresented based on those categories."
- The experiences of key project personnel are extensive, relevant to the proposal activities, and will likely add significant value to the project's overall impact.

**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: 9**

**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)**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

- The timeline clearly describes goals, objectives, measures, activities, start and end dates, and responsible personnel that seem can be reasonably managed and accomplished within the specified time periods.

**Weaknesses:**

- There is no specified communications plan.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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

Sub

**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:**

- The applicant clearly presented strategies to address the needs of at-risk students early, such as the
  - o targeted whole class approach
  - o assumption of no prior whole number understanding
  - o frequent, high quality instructional interactions
  - o visual representations of mathematics ideas
  - o use of key mathematics vocabulary, and
  - o engagement in productive mathematical discourse.

**Weaknesses:**

- There is no mention of accommodating any other special needs (i.e., language barriers) the students may have.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**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 clearly demonstrated evidence-based instruction supports for professional development by conducting a survey that revealed that public school leaders agree or strongly agree that COVID-19 has negatively impacted students' behavioral development, and in response included a behavior program to address the classroom management challenges that teachers have reported.

**Weaknesses:**

- There is no evidence of the applicant "conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments" to determine the extent of disengagement and mitigation strategies.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/22/2022 08:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2022 10:47 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

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

	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	24
<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	64
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. COVID-19	3	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	5
<b>Total</b>	106	69



# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - EIR Early Phase - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

## 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 applicant presents an excellent approach for this proposal. This proposal seeks to adapt an existing math curriculum (ROOTS) with positive behavior supports called Math Ready-Supporting Early Number Sense (M-SENS). Roots is a 2016 strategy studied by Clarke et al. which focuses on 50 lessons of small-group learning and will be expanded to better support students in high-risk schools. There were three key areas: 1) Counting and Cardinality, 2) Operations and Algebraic Thinking, and 3) Number and Operations in Base 10. The applicant proposes that positive behavioral games and practices promote good classroom behavior be integrated in support of kindergartener mathematics instruction and learning.

#### 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: 24

#### 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)

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant does an excellent job of presenting the early childhood pedagogical approach to mathematics instruction, whole class behavioral supports, and teacher training and coaching. The overall conceptual framework is solid with multiple aligned subcomponents presented in the application with strong details presented.

**Weaknesses:**

The application seems to be disjointed and does not connect the two major parts of this project together. It is unclear how class positive behaviors will be integrated seamlessly into mathematics instruction for kindergarten students even though it was determined to be a need by teachers in previous iterations of the ROOTS.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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 three stated goals and related objectives and outcomes are very good in clarity and measure. The goals are: develop and refine the M-SENS program, test the feasibility of M-SENS in authentic school settings, and pilot M-SENS to test improvement on student outcomes. Key outcomes are accelerated student mathematics achievement, reduced student behavioral issues, and increased capacity of teachers to teach kindergarteners mathematics. The presented measures are well-aligned with the goal and objectives. The applicant presents small evaluations within each goal that support the achievement of the overall program goals with the data collection and timeline.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant asserts that this kindergarten instructional innovation will have lasting effects on mathematics learning or behavioral aspects, however there are no outcomes that will measure the subsequent years academic achievement, continued interest, or behavioral changes.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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 proposed project does a very good job focusing on the needs of the targeted students who are at high-risk of mathematics difficulties. The applicant does a very good job of connecting mathematics learning at a young age with increased equity in mathematics, especially for English language learners, students with disabilities, students in poverty, and students of color. Since the target schools have 30% or higher students at risk, helping classrooms as a whole will also consequentially benefit those students with the greatest need.

**Weaknesses:**

The solutions presented in the application do not directly connect student mathematics high-risk needs with high-risk behavioral activities for the specific benefit of the targeted population. It is unclear how the integration of both aspects of this project will interact with each other and the overall impact on high-risk students.

**Reader's Score: 11**

**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 project's personnel identified in the proposal is excellent. The applicant's key personnel identified on the Senior Leadership Team have superior credentials in teaching and behavioral interventions. All the leadership team members have experience to lead the innovation. The applicant states that the team includes members who are diverse in age, gender, race, and traditionally underrepresented. RAND was identified as the external evaluator and evaluation team members are well qualified in mathematics learning evaluations.

**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:**

The management plan presented in the application does an excellent job of aligning the goals and activities with the timing and responsible organization. The proposed project staff are qualified to fill their roles and contribute to the overall project management. Yearly timelines with project goals and objective are clear and well-presented.

**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)

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:**

The applicant does an excellent job of addressing the needs specifically student-centered learning and leverage learner variability through the behavioral aspects of the kindergarten classroom as identified by the teachers. This project is project-based in learning mathematics and provides high-quality early childhood education in mathematics through the three key areas.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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 proposes a project that minimally addresses the learning gaps presented by COVID-19. There is a statement about this approach being able to address the learning needs of all students to have access to high-quality mathematics instruction. Research on ROOTS, the first iteration of this project, indicated the potential to address COVID-19 gaps in learning. The applicant specifically included behavioral interventions as identified by the teachers and school

leaders.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not completely address the specific needs of the students who were negatively impacted by COVID-19, such as the asset mapping or needs assessments.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/22/2022 10:47 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/28/2022 01:03 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

**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 #9 - EIR Tier 2 - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

## 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 applicant describes methods of evaluation that, if well implemented, could produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet WWC standards with or without reservations. Examples include plans to conduct a randomized control trial using a blocked randomization design. Details that describe a power analysis are provided, along with a statistical model that will be used to address relevant research questions. A strength of the proposal is a description of a plan to use instruments to measure mathematics and behavioral outcomes that are supported by evidence of validity and reliability. Another strength of the proposal is a description of the research questions to be addressed.

#### Weaknesses:

Details are limited regarding how the applicant plans to conduct some components of the evaluation. For example, it is unclear how or if the applicant will account for attrition and contamination. It is also unclear if the schools selected for the outcomes study will have participated in the project in anyway during the Brief Learning Trial. Details regarding the potential for confounding factors are not provided.

Reader's Score: 16

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 describes evaluation methods that are likely to provide performance feedback that will allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Examples include a plan to collect data from teacher surveys, instructional logs, coaching fidelity forms, and interviews with program staff. A strength of the proposal is a plan to engage with and seek feedback from an Advisory Board annually to help guide the project.



Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**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 applicant provides two detailed tables that clearly describe core project components (Table 1) and goals, objectives, and outcomes (Table 2). Details are provided regarding plans to measure implementation using teacher-reported instructional logs, coach fidelity forms, and teacher surveys. A strength of the proposal is a description of each of these instruments that includes details about how they will be used in the evaluation. One threshold for acceptable implementation is described in regard to having teachers in the treatment group deliver 90% of the M-SENS lessons.

**Weaknesses:**

Mediators are not clearly described. A logic model, that clearly describes key project components and how they relate to expected outcomes, is not provided. Details are limited regarding thresholds for implementation. It is unclear what the expectation of fidelity is for implementing the intervention, other than delivering lessons. It is unclear how informal observations will be used to determine fidelity.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/28/2022 01:03 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/27/2022 10:15 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

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

	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 #9 - EIR Tier 2 - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: University of Oregon Foundation (S411C220100)

## 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:

There were strengths with the applicant's description in the evaluation section related to how the evaluation team will attempt to meet What Works Clearinghouse without reservations. The research design being planned is a randomized control trial (RCT), with blocking at the school level (pg. 21). The implementation of the intervention will be staggered, with an estimated 630 intervention students in Year 1 and an additional 1,260 intervention students in Year 2. The applicant provided several essential components related to the evaluation plan, (a) the key research questions which will guide the evaluation, both impact and implementation questions that are directly related to assessing the intervention; (b) the applicant provided an acceptable power analysis with appropriate minimal detectable effect sizes (MDES) for the impact analyses (pg. 24). The sample sizes provided are appropriate to achieve an acceptable level of power of .80, which is the acceptable standard in research; and (c) the type of quantitative analysis being a two-level model given the nested nature of the data students within classrooms within schools. When there are nested data, such as students within classrooms within schools, the most appropriate statistical analysis is a two-level model.

#### Weaknesses:

Given the applicant's focus on a randomized control trial, many details were missing in the evaluation section related to understanding all the requirements related to meeting WWC without reservations. For example, it was unclear in the narrative why students who are control students would also be given the intervention. On (pg. 22), the applicant mentions that both groups of classrooms will implement the intervention. Without understanding what is meant by both classrooms, this can present a significant challenge is estimating the impacts of the intervention. Another aspect of WWC not addressed was how attrition will be managed and assessed; a discussion related to differential and overall attrition is required. Furthermore, the applicant did not discuss how contamination would be mitigated, or if contamination is not an issue for this proposed intervention, the applicant should have provided an argument for this case. Providing more details on the project's effectiveness would have strengthened the evaluation section.

Reader's Score: 16

Sub

**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 provided a sufficient formative evaluation discussion. The applicant's data collection will utilize teacher surveys mainly. This is appropriate given that teachers are the main target of implementing the interventions. Other data will come from observation data about the implementation of the intervention. The applicant identified two appropriate implementation evaluation questions (pg. 21). The first question is related to the dosage of implementation, and the second question focuses on barriers of implementation. The applicant did discuss an acceptable timeline for data collection when meetings will occur to examine the data collected, and how the data collected would be converted to reports used to provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses noted.

**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 applicant (pg. 22) provided details about the measured outcomes. The information provided face validity and at least one of the WWC requirements for reliability. For instance, the applicant will primarily utilize the Screener for Early Number Sense. It has demonstrated test-retest reliability of .95 and predictive validity of .79. Both of these are acceptable statistics for meeting WWC. The applicant has a plan to gather, assess, and determine acceptable implementation. The applicant will assess adherence, dosage/exposure, quality of delivery, and participant's responsiveness to the intervention. These are all important components of implementation fidelity. The applicant indicates the potential measurable thresholds for implementation fidelity, such as 90% of the lessons will be delivered to the intervention students. The applicant has a plan based on the collection of different data to determine future implementation threshold minimums.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant failed to articulate key project components in the evaluation plan. Finally, the applicant did not discuss mediators that could be associated with explaining any variation in the intervention estimates.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/27/2022 10:15 PM