

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2013 04:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	19
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP 1	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Invitational Priority	0	
Total	103	72

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Validation - 5: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.

(2) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Strengths:

The project proposed by the applicant is likely to have the estimated impact due to the:

- emphasis on robust partnerships (including the partnership between Jacksonville State University and Piedmont City Schools) described on pages e18 and e19;
- research from Simmons 2013 showing that the CORE Active Learning Model shows significant gains in technology use, critical thinking, problem solving, and overall classroom success in one semester on page e21;
- and a moderate level of effectiveness required for each component of the CORE model.

On page e20 the applicant clearly describes the unmet demand for the proposed project by stating that "one in four rural students does not graduate from high school." The applicant continues to make a compelling case for the significance of this project by citing the data from Winterboro High School (CORE partner) showing increased graduation and college acceptance rates after implementing technology and PBL in their classrooms described on page e20.

The applicant makes a compelling argument for the feasibility of regional expansion by detailing how Jacksonville State University has partnered with "a growing number of PK-12 school systems" on page e19, and by developing "guides, systems, and validated research measures that can be replicated more broadly" on page e23.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant has sought ways to improve the replicability of the CORE model, most notably through the partnership with the American Association of State Colleges and Universities described on page e23, the CORE model is predicated on having a college or university partner with local school districts. If this project produced favorable outcomes

it seems as though national expansion would be feasible because of all the outcomes listed under strengths. However, the pool of state colleges and universities that have the capacity and willingness to implement the CORE model could limit national expansion.

Reader's Score: 19

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit plan or actions to achieve the goals, including identification of any elements of the project logic model that require further testing or development.

(3) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Strengths:

The objectives stated by the applicant on pages e29 through e36 are clear, logical, and directly related to the project logic model. These objectives directly align with the national need for improving graduation rates and college and career readiness. The proposed project clearly addresses the priorities the applicant is seeking to meet through a multifaceted approach of partnerships, technology integration, project based learning, support for teachers, and a dual enrollment program. Additionally, the inclusion of change management described on page e36 is a unique component that sets the CORE model apart from other technology integration professional development models and helps the applicant overcome the barrier of failed change initiatives that have hindered previous efforts.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a very detailed project timeline of activities on page e307 with objectives and the personnel responsibilities clearly stated. By having the “Core management team, including evaluators, will meet twice annually to review the project plan, formative data, and the results from the fidelity of implementation study” (page e39), the applicant has shown how the metrics will be used to monitor progress on an ongoing basis. Since JSU has “developed and implemented CORE with no new funding” (page e37) the administrative structure is in place to effectively carry out the management plan. The budget narrative form on pages e344 through e368 provide a detailed description of the multi-year financial model that clearly aligns with the objectives on pages e29 through e36.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. In determining the quality and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

(1) The adequacy of the project's staffing plan, particularly for the first year of the project, including the identification of the project director and, in the case of projects with unfilled key personnel positions at the beginning of the project, that the staffing plan identifies how critical work will proceed.

(2) The qualifications and experience of the project director and other key project personnel and the extent to which they have the expertise to accomplish the proposed tasks.

Strengths:

With the majority of the project staff already in place, the applicant clearly has an adequate staffing plan. As the applicant states on page e40, the project director has been “coordinating the activities of CORE since 2010 and is largely responsible for the development of the multi-faceted partnership.” The project director, coupled with an assistant project director, project manager, evaluation director, and analyst have all been identified by the applicant on pages e40 through e42 and have a wide range of skills and experiences to support the growth of this project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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 Evidence Standards without reservations.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

(a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.

(b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

(c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Strengths:

The project described by the applicant seeks to substantially improve student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs through the use of partners and the codification of the CORE program. The applicant provided a detailed breakdown of the cost per student for the treatment and control groups starting on page e346 of the budget narrative document. This breakdown demonstrates the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices. The budget narrative provides examples of one-time costs versus ongoing costs. Additionally, JSU's willingness to provide ongoing financial and administrative support for this project after the grant ends helps to increase the likelihood of sustainability (page e37).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

(a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

Strengths:

The applicant describes the research supporting the current iteration of the CORE model and the practices within that model that are ready for broad adoption on pages e24 through e29. The applicant describes the fidelity of implementation study on page e43 that will identify components of the CORE model that are crucial to its success and sustainability. In the process of conducting a randomized controlled trial in 70 high schools in 18 districts, the applicant has clearly committed to implementing the practice in a variety of locations during the project period. Lastly, on page e23 the applicant describes a series of steps to ensure that the CORE model can be replicated broadly, including “materials, guides, and validated research measures.”

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that incorporate high-quality early learning components that are aligned with the early learning, elementary and secondary education systems in participating schools and help ensure that all children, especially those from low-income families, enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

General:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/19/2013 04:14 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2013 11:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP 1	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Invitational Priority	0	
Total	103	69

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Validation - 5: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.

(2) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Strengths:

CORE has shown success already in rural districts and demonstrates a model to address college readiness in the region and state level for this applicant. The model demonstrates potential for scalability nationally by having success with implementation 18 regional public systems in Alabama, including the import of 1:1 initiative on pg. 4. This model addresses college readiness with dual enrollment, which demonstrates another component of strength for narrowing achievement gaps. Outlined studies and success of professional development contribute to the further potential of scalability in this project. In addition the partnership of JSU and PCS with experiences for over two years gives substantial credibility and potential strength for further scalability (pg. 4)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit plan or actions to

achieve the goals, including identification of any elements of the project logic model that require further testing or development.

(3) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Strengths:

Six CORE components set clear goals needed to build capacity for the program. Appendix J includes a plan with significant tasks and responsible key personnel to provide additional strength in the project plan. A network of partners and developed materials, guides, and systems has been established and show levels of scalability. Logic model provided on pg. 15 demonstrates correlation between the goals and actions. In addition six aligned goals, including staff support, professional development, and sustainability address the possible barriers with success. Collaboration and supportive partnerships have already been established providing funding and lowering student-cost ratios (pgs. e36/e37 21-22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

Strengths:

Key responsibilities are strategically outlined, including an outside evaluator (ICF) on pg. 23. Strength lies in the management team that is already in place, as well as many of the various departments already supporting the current CORE program. Well-defined objectives (Fig. 4) included in the infrastructure on pg. e38 help to expand the capacity of the project at the national level. A detailed project timeline of activities (pg. e307) demonstrate a well-defined five-year plan with identified key responsibilities to support the project-operating model. Having support of the AASCU will provide further expansion nationally by further aligning the regional universities with developing partnerships of other private and public schools in the state (pg. 4).

Weaknesses:

No clarity or coherence to the operating model is referred to. Annual performance targets to be monitored are minimally addressed in the management plan; which limits the assessment of progress.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. In determining the quality and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

(1) The adequacy of the project's staffing plan, particularly for the first year of the project, including the identification of the project director and, in the case of projects with unfilled key personnel positions at the beginning of the project, that the staffing plan identifies how critical work will proceed.

(2) The qualifications and experience of the project director and other key project personnel and the extent to which they have the expertise to accomplish the proposed tasks.

Strengths:

A detailed staffing plan for the first year of the project is identified, as well as a project time line for key components. Key personnel are identified and outlined in the Infrastructure diagram on pg. e23. Further roles are identified within the timeline of activities on pg. e 307 to demonstrate strength of the personnel and their prospective duties. Details of the project director and other key personnel demonstrate expertise. It is identified on pg. 25 that much of the project management is already in place functioning in their respective roles, which gives ease to the implementation and strength to the project model.

Weaknesses:

More elaboration of other project team members is needed to describe their duties or how critical they may be to the success of the proposal.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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 Evidence Standards without reservations.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:
 - (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.
 - (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.
 - (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Strengths:

Criterion is met the budget narrative. Improving cost effectiveness drives this application and funding is supported with implementation of this project. Utilizing community based partners helps to maintain outcomes without increasing per-student costs.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:
 - (a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.
 - (b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.
 - (c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.
 - (d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

Strengths:

Criterion is fully met by addressing this personalized system. The CORE model has outlined materials and training for development. Sustainability is addressed by identifying critical components that includes addressing the high-needs of students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that incorporate high-quality early learning components that are aligned with the early learning, elementary and secondary education systems in participating schools and help ensure that all children, especially those from low-income families, enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

General:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2013 11:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2013 04:42 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP 1	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Invitational Priority	0	
Total	103	71

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Validation - 5: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.

(2) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Strengths:

Applicant indicates an unmet demand of K-12 schools implementing technology plans for career and college prepared students, with a focus on rural populations. (p e16). Many rural districts/schools face the same barriers, such as lack of access to networks due to location, often in addition to lack of finances, as well as teacher preparation and K-12/college and/or career partners. (p e16). The proposed program of implementing the CORE model with its attendant components focusing on whole-system change, sustainability, partnerships, PD and system-wide change management, place-based learning (for rural locations), and partnership with AASCU, will enable the applicant to expand from current partnerships to all of Alabama and serve as national support center. (p e23)

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit plan or actions to

achieve the goals, including identification of any elements of the project logic model that require further testing or development.

(3) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Strengths:

Through its combined components of partnership building, technology, PBL PD, classroom support, dual enrollment, and change management, implementation of the CORE model has a complete and well-rounded approach to addressing the indicated needs and priorities . (p e36). A clear set of goals and plans addresses technology infrastructure needs, as well as educational technology needs in the form of multi-faceted PD offerings that include the opportunity for teacher certification. (p e33). All parties are involved, from superintendents to district and school level admin, to teachers. JSU also provides online support and tech assistance, as well as an existing resource in the Faculty Commons. (p e34) The aspect of dual enrollment and college/career readiness is taken a step further by the availability of scholarships (p e37). Finally, JSU will leverage students involved in the IT and education programs as interns (p e32); this serves a dual purpose of educating those who may support the program in the future as school/district employees locally or elsewhere in the nation where the CORE model is going to be implemented. Grant funds will assist JSU in designing and validating the CORE model to be implemented nationwide in the hopes of addressing the two main barriers of a 70% rate of failure for change initiatives and sustainability. (p e36-37).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

Strengths:

Program and personnel are already in place and functioning on smaller scale for past three years. (p e38). Delineation of responsibilities and objectives is clearly laid out in the CORE Infrastructure (p e38, figure 4) and a clear and well-defined timeline with milestones is provided. (Appendix J, p e307-309).

The applicant's budget narrative provides a clear and coherent outline for project operation over the years of the grant. The involvement of the AASCU and JSU's previous presentations of the CORE model at the AASCU conference ensures potential future expansion partners are already familiar with the project and most already have the resources needed to implement CORE with only a slight redefinition of existing roles. (p e39-40)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not indicate how ongoing progress will be assessed, which is one of the indicated factors the Secretary considers for this part of the grant.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. In determining the quality and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

(1) The adequacy of the project's staffing plan, particularly for the first year of the project, including the identification of the project director and, in the case of projects with unfilled key personnel positions at the beginning of the project, that the staffing plan identifies how critical work will proceed.

(2) The qualifications and experience of the project director and other key project personnel and the extent to which they have the expertise to accomplish the proposed tasks.

Strengths:

The staffing plan has several strengths, including that most of the key positions are already in place and functioning in their designated roles. Appropriate staff who need to be hired have been identified, as well as how the positions will collaborate and team together to best support the project (p e40).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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 Evidence Standards without reservations.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

- (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.**
- (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.**
- (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.**

Strengths:

Each individual school system is responsible for tailoring a sustainability plan as part of the program. (p e17).

Appropriate activities to decrease cost include networking and developing partnerships with private industry partners in order to free up school funds to be reallocated to technology purchase and change-sustaining resources and activities . (p e17).

A project evaluation indicates a cost of \$41/student/year; predictions for scaling up indicate the ability to serve twice as many students at 1/3 the cost . (p e22-23).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

- (a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.**
- (b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.**
- (c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other**

supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

Strengths:

The practice the applicant proposes for broad adoption is the CORE model, which has a need for formalization and codification to enable its ability to identify, share, and sustain effective practices that support and sustain system-wide change. (p e17).

The focus on whole system change management when applying the CORE model is critical to its success, sustainability, and adaptability as it recognizes that for true impactful change to happen it cannot be limited to a phase (i.e., not sustainable) or locale (i.e., certain classrooms/populations only). (p e19).

The description of the CORE model (p e24-29) and accompanying logic model (p e30) indicate that the program would be easily replicable by others, as will be done during the second phase of the project, which focuses on recruiting national CORE “incubators” to replicate the model . (p e18).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 2

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

- 1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that incorporate high-quality early learning components that are aligned with the early learning, elementary and secondary education systems in participating schools and help ensure that all children, especially those from low-income families, enter kindergarten ready to succeed.**

General:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/20/2013 04:42 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/16/2013 02:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	0
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP 1	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	2	
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Invitational Priority	0	
Total	103	29

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Validation - 5: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.

(2) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit plan or actions to achieve the goals, including identification of any elements of the project logic model that require further testing or development.

(3) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. In determining the quality and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

(1) The adequacy of the project's staffing plan, particularly for the first year of the project, including the identification of the project director and, in the case of projects with unfilled key personnel positions at the beginning of the project, that the staffing plan identifies how critical work will proceed.

(2) The qualifications and experience of the project director and other key project personnel and the extent to which they have the expertise to accomplish the proposed tasks.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.
- (2) 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 Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.
- (5) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measureable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

- The evaluation plan includes two phases, implementation and impact (p. 27). A logic model is provided that details the questions for both aspects of the evaluation (p. 28 & 31). The questions in both phases are clear, specific, and measurable. The questions appear to be relevant to the objectives of the program and should provide sufficient evidence as to whether the program is effective and scalable.
- The data collection appears to be suited to answering the questions presented, and are also detailed in the logic model (p. 28 & 31). By presenting a well-detailed logic model that shows the steps of the evaluation and the expected data collection points, it provided a clear picture as to the process-outcome relationships.
- The design for the implementation phase will involve both descriptive quantitative data and qualitative data. And the design for the impact phase will include a randomized control trial (RCT) study (pp. 30-31). While RCTs are not always easy to conduct in multi-site school studies, when matched properly, it is an effective quasi-experimental design and should yield valid results that will demonstrate any possible differentiation of effects.
- The sample of 70 high schools in 18 districts appears to be sufficient to meet the WWC Evidence Standards (p. 30). The evaluators selected for this plan have described the steps in terms of sampling and power analysis that according to the WWC will provide evidence of effectiveness.
- The instruments that will be used for assessment purposes are presented and appear to be appropriate for its intended purposes (p. 33). The evaluators selected for this project appear to have the required expertise and experience to conduct an evaluation of this size and scope. It is also a positive point that the firm that has contracted to conduct this evaluation has consulted with WWC since its inception (p. 27). The projected cost of the evaluation appears to be within the normally accepted range (Budget Narrative).

Weaknesses:

- Although the plan describes the various instruments that will be used in collecting assessment data as well as process data, there does not appear to be any evidence of validity and reliability presented. This is the only weakness

that is observed in the narrative, and it may be a minor oversight, based on the overall quality of the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 29

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

- 1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:**
 - (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.**
 - (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.**
 - (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

- 1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:**
 - (a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.**
 - (b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.**
 - (c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.**
 - (d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

- 1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that incorporate high-quality early learning components that are aligned with the early learning, elementary and secondary education systems in participating schools and help ensure that all children, especially those from low-income families, enter kindergarten ready to succeed.**

General:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/16/2013 02:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/17/2013 09:36 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	20	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	0
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	28
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. CPP 1	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. CPP 2	2	
Invitational Priority		
Invitational Priority		
1. Invitational Priority	0	
Total	103	28

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Validation - 5: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B130037)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.

(2) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit plan or actions to achieve the goals, including identification of any elements of the project logic model that require further testing or development.

(3) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. In determining the quality and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

(1) The adequacy of the project's staffing plan, particularly for the first year of the project, including the identification of the project director and, in the case of projects with unfilled key personnel positions at the beginning of the project, that the staffing plan identifies how critical work will proceed.

(2) The qualifications and experience of the project director and other key project personnel and the extent to which they have the expertise to accomplish the proposed tasks.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.
- (2) 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 Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.
- (5) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measureable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The project proposes an experimental evaluation study that includes random assignment of schools to treatment condition (p. 30). Because of the ability of this design to control for major threats to internal and external validity, it can provide evidence of effectiveness that will meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations. The third-party evaluator is well qualified to implement this evaluation design.

The random selection of schools will be stratified based on four categories (p. 30). The application of stratified sampling will allow the analyses to estimate effects for each of the four stratification categories as well as overall. In addition the analyses will examine a number of interaction effects to explore the impact of a number of subgroup variables as well as to study the impact of CORE on academic engagement and efficacy (pp. 34-35).

The project's impact evaluation will focus on one confirmatory research question and 7 exploratory research questions. The focus on a single confirmatory question will reduce the likelihood of spurious findings of significance due to multiple hypotheses testing alone (p. 31).

The proposal includes a table that shows each impact question, data sources, timeline, and how the data will be analyzed (p. 31). The key question to be examined in the confirmatory question is the impact on college and career readiness (p. 31).

The analyses of the CWRA+ scores will utilize a multi-level model that will include covariates to improve the precision of the estimates of the project's effect (p. 33).

A power analysis indicated that the expected sample size is sufficient to detect meaningful minimum effect size differences of approximately one-fifth of a standard deviation (pp. 33-34).

Teacher laptops and classroom supply budgets will be provided to the control group classroom teachers as incentives to encourage control school/teacher participation (p. 17).

The evaluation study design includes plans to assess treatment fidelity which is an important factor in a solid evaluation

study (pp. 28-29). The data from the implementation studies will be shared during twice-annual meetings which will allow the information to be used to inform program course correction (p. 29).

At approximately 8 % of the total project costs, the evaluation budget appears sufficient to support the comprehensive evaluation study that is proposed for the project.

Weaknesses:

While teachers will be trained to administer the CWRA+, no plan was provided to collect evidence of the reliability of the administrations.

Student surveys are to be administered to assess student engagement, sense of self-efficacy as well as other outcomes (p. 32). No information was provided about the reliability and validity of the survey instruments.

Reader's Score: 28

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:
 - (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.
 - (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.
 - (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:
 - (a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.
 - (b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that incorporate high-quality early learning components that are aligned with the early learning, elementary and secondary education systems in participating schools and help ensure that all children, especially those from low-income families, enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

General:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/17/2013 09:36 PM