

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/13/2013 11:03 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	0
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	0
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Personnel	10	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. CPP 1	1	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	0
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Invitational Priority	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>27</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - i3 Validation - 4: 84.411B

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

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional):

**General:**

NA scored by another reviewer

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:**

NA scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

NA scored by another reviewer

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:**

NA scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

NA scored by another reviewer

**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:**

NA scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

NA scored by another reviewer

**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:**

NA scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

NA scored by another reviewer

## 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 proposed project provides a logic model that clearly identified short term, intermediate, long term goals (Appendix D).

The evaluation plan specifies a series of evaluation questions to guide the evaluation and these questions are aligned to project goals (p. 28). The questions allow for the examination of final and intermediate goals which will allow the evaluators to gather important evidence to monitor barriers or progress toward goals. These data will also be important to other entities who seek to replicate this work.

The evaluation specifies a randomized control trial (p. 27) which includes a well-conceived plan for recruiting, retaining, and incentivizing both the treatment and control group teachers (p. 14). The evaluation also provides an appropriate strategy for replacing teachers who leave the study (p. 14).

Multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data will be gathered throughout the project which will allow evaluators to develop a full and clear picture of the intervention and outcomes (pp. 32-32). The data collection instruments are well-described. Many of the instruments have been previously administered and technical information has been collected (i.e., reliability, validity).

In order to measure the effects of the project, the evaluation will use an HLM model that will incorporate data from multiple sources. These analyses provide a rigorous method for examining the nested data collected (p. 32-33).

The evaluation plan clearly specifies a plan for disseminating findings to project staff which will allow monitoring the progress of the project to intermediate and long term goals (p. 27).

#### Weaknesses:

The project plans to use standardized test scores and writing prompts from year to year to monitor changes in student achievement (p. 12). It was unclear if the analyses would aggregate data across student grade levels and if so, it is analytically appropriate.

Student surveys provide important data for the evaluation (p. 31). The application might have been strengthened if the applicant discussed how they would ensure an adequate survey completion rate from students.

The evaluation questions (p. 28) seem to be somewhat misaligned with the project goals (p. 12-13). For example, several of the project goals are to improve sustainability but the evaluation questions don't appear to specifically focus or provide information regarding sustainability.

**Reader's Score:** 27

### 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:

NA scored by another reviewer

#### Weaknesses:

NA scored by another reviewer

**Reader's Score:** 0

#### 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:**

NA scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

NA scored by another reviewer

**Reader's Score: 0**

**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:**

NA scored by another reviewer

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/13/2013 11:03 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2013 10:57 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	0
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	0
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Personnel	10	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	26
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. CPP 1	1	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Invitational Priority	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>26</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - i3 Validation - 4: 84.411B

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

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional):

**General:**

N/A, scored by another reviewer

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, scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A, scored by another reviewer

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, scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A, scored by another reviewer

**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, scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A, scored by another reviewer

**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, scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A, scored by another reviewer

### 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 applicant provides a sound research rationale which places the current study in a literature context and shows how the present work will inform the field in substantive ways.

The research team has appropriate experience with earlier similar research that is a real strength, as exemplified in the clarity and detail provided in the research plan.

The proposal provides a detailed description of the choice of districts/ schools and how teachers will be selected and recruited into the program.

The key research questions as identified on page 28 are clear and important.

The methodology for addressing the research questions is detailed, including a list of student and teacher outcomes (page 21), data sources (page 28), a description of the randomization procedures (pages 28-29), discussion of the reliability and validity of measures used (page 29), and a description of how student and teacher data would be collected and scored (pages 30-31).

Given the randomized selection process and the degree of similarities between the treatment and control groups, the evidence produced by this study should be completely within the standards for the What Works Clearinghouse without reservations.

The applicant studies the outcomes at an appropriate level of scale using a data analysis technique for multi-level modeling to analyze student data nested within teacher data.

There is also provided here an extensive rationale to show that they will have adequate sample size, statistical power and effect size.

**Weaknesses:**

On pages 21-22, the proposal states, "The theory of change linking the Pathway teacher PD to change in student writing is based on research which suggests the three most critical elements in effecting change in student writing are (1) sustained teacher PD, (2) student pretest to inform instructional activities, and (3) summative measures to assess efficacy." The project design calls for five core components page 15 and 16, including 1) PD training, 2) student pretest with intervention, 3) technology tools, 4) coaching, and 5) counselors. The intervention is thus all five components, yet these latter three are added to the theory of change upon which the design is based and are not examined in the summative research methodology as independent variables. This means that they could become confounding variables in the study. For example, suppose there is a particularly good coach or counselor. The data collection and analysis do not take these potential confounds into account.

Given the nature of the population, the target geography and the differing educational needs of English language learners, it would have been appropriate to elaborate more on generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project across diverse student population groups.

On pages 31-32 and elsewhere, the applicant provides a description of the project implementation evaluation, focusing on the sources of data. What is lacking in sufficient detail is how the data will be collected, analyzed, and disseminated back to all project staff and teachers for feedback and improvement, and a measureable threshold for acceptable implementation of all five core components.

**Reader's Score: 26**

**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:** 08/15/2013 10:57 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2013 07:33 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	18
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	18
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Personnel	10	10
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. CPP 1	1	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	2
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Invitational Priority	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>68</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - i3 Validation - 4: 84.411B

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

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

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:

A wealth of study related research in support of the project was presented. Studies have shown that poor writing continues to be an indicator of a lack of reading comprehension, particularly amongst ELL's. Despite the difficulties with quantifying writing, the project has outlined a curriculum that will aid teachers and students with improved writing conventions. The project is based upon a scale up of events, rather than an initial full implementation. The applicants took time to research a scientifically documented measure to adapt and expand upon in their region in hopes of garnering evidence to allow for a national expansion of the project. Finally, the project seeks to reach ELL's in various locales and those students representing a diverse range of languages.

#### 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:**

The idea to replicate an existing project that has demonstrated regional success is an intelligent move that increases the likelihood of widespread implementation. The applicant provided a good description of the strategies and interventions in layman's terms. The step by step outline of the program training allows the reader to visualize what a typical implementation will look like in the classroom. The technology based applications of the project contribute to the national feasibility of the project. In addition, the creation of an online professional learning community which allows for unlimited access to ongoing training and information makes nationwide adaptability easier.

**Weaknesses:**

There was no mention by the applicant of any foreseen or known barriers to the scalability of the project to a regional or national level. An outline of goals and objectives and their relationship is needed in the proposal.

**Reader's Score: 18**

**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 quality of Professional Development training available to project participants will help to ensure adaptability of the project. The grid that outlines the timeline and responsible persons for the life of the grant provide a great visual of the project's scope and sequence. Finally, the detailed tables outlining the budgets, job expectations, and duties for the project staff help to alleviate most any question that one would have.

**Weaknesses:**

The statement concerning the secondary benefit of students as it relates to per student costs on page e39, was a bit confusing as to what the actual cost equated to which could indeed affect the reduced cost per student advantage (i.e. signify that it is not a significant option).

**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 staff established experts within the related field to become a part of their team and work accordingly. None of the individuals selected are new to conducting research, and they can demonstrate proven past successes in the field of educational research

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**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:**

NA; This criterion has been scored by another reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

NA; This criterion has been scored by another reviewer.

**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 writing project shows promise for ELLs based upon its description. This is an area that is often neglected in the instruction of ELL's.

### Weaknesses:

There is no mention of increasing or decreasing student costs nor, maintaining the current level of student achievement; the requirement is the do one of the three.

Reader's Score: 0

## 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 project is a replica of a previously initiated 8 year project with a current plan to stretch over a 4.5 year period of time. Considering the success and information derived from the model study, it is highly likely that this project will experience similar success.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/21/2013 07:33 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/13/2013 08:53 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	18
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	18
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Personnel	10	10
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. CPP 1	1	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	2
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Invitational Priority	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>65</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - i3 Validation - 4: 84.411B

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

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

## 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 applicant provides a significant amount of evidence about the promise of this program which supports the statement that this program is likely to have the estimated impact (pages 1-10). Specifically, the applicant provides evidence from a longitudinal quasi-experimental study which showed that the program proposed in this application had moderate effects. This study was deemed to "meet evidence standards without reservations" by the What Works Clearinghouse (page 1). The fact that the proposed program has demonstrated effectiveness which has been shown through rigorous research provides strong evidence and support that the proposed project will have the estimated impact.

Moreover, this project proposes to meet the unmet demands for ELLs across a larger number of school districts using the i3 funding (page 10) whereas the previous implementation was only able to be done in a small number of sites. The applicant is clearly proposing to provide support to more districts through this project. Given the evidence of the positive outcomes of this project described on pages 1-10, it is likely that expanding into these other districts with the support of the i3 grant will both meet the unmet needs for students at the level of proposed scale.

#### Weaknesses:

The plans for national expansion are unclear. This is a project that requires money, training, and time. Based on these factors the applicant has not clearly demonstrated how national expansion might be provided. Although the applicant indicates that "the NWP infrastructure extends our capacity to expand the project to all 50 states through the 180 site network" (page 11) whether that is feasible or not is unclear from the proposal. Although the technology described later in the proposal (page 19) is mentioned as a way to support national scalability, the applicant does not provide enough detail to know whether or not the proposed technology will support such expansion in a successful way.

Reader's Score: 18

### 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 proposed project directly addresses the absolute priority as well as a national need with regard to focusing specifically and explicitly on the writing and language development of ELLs at the secondary level. The focus on writing at the secondary level is particularly important because this is a significant area of need for ELLs. In addition, the applicant proposes that this project may be one way to decrease the higher levels of ELLs dropping out of high school because their needs are not being met (page 11).

The applicant describes a clear set of goals on pages 12-13 and then outlines a set of key activities with a timeline to achieve those goals on pages 13-22. The applicant provides an explicit plan and actions to achieve the goals as well as a logic model to guide the project.

The applicant includes a clear plan to sustain this project within the districts who will participate in the project on page 22 as well as throughout the activities described on pages 13-22. The project focuses on building capacity within the districts to sustain this program beyond the scope of the grant, which is a clear strength.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly describe or discuss the barriers to scaling in the application. It is unclear whether this model is scalable at a national level without the money and support that would be provided by a grant like the i3 grant. In addition, the applicant does not clearly address the barriers to scale that the grant will be used to address.

Reader's Score: 18

### 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 includes a timeline, which indicates the key responsibilities of the project director and other key management personnel (page e230). The objectives are outlined in the timeline and are connected to activities of the project. The key responsibilities of the project team are outlined in the timeline and are connected to the larger objectives.

The applicant includes an operating model for how the project activities will be conducted throughout the course of the grant (page 24). The applicant indicates that there will be regular meetings between the various members of the leadership team on a regular basis and that there will be regular contact between those leadership team members at the various sites who are a part of the project. This plan for regular communication and operational discussions indicates that the project will be successful in terms of operations. In addition the proposed operational plan indicates that the management team will achieve the proposed expansion of the project across the districts included in the application.

**Weaknesses:**

It is not clear how the applicant will use information and data collected throughout the project to make improvements to the project. Although measures of efficacy are mentioned on page 22, it is not clearly explained how these will be used to inform the project or to make improvements to the implementation.

The timeline on page e230 does not clearly articulate how the goals mentioned on page 12 will be accomplished. In other word, the objectives and activities included in the timeline are not connected to the larger goals of the project which does not make it clear how the applicant will achieve those goals.

**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:**

The qualifications of the individuals involved in this project are strong. They clearly have the experience and background in understanding the instructional and academic needs of ELLs as well as the capacity to conduct this project in a successful manner.

The organizational chart lists the key personnel and the staffing plan represented here is appropriate.

The applicant includes references to strong partnerships that have existed prior to the grant application which indicates promise that all will have a vested interest in the success of this project (pages 25-27)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**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, scored by another reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A, scored by another reviewer.

**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:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

**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 indicates that there is a plan for sustainability which includes building capacity within the districts who participate in the program (page 22). This is promising in terms of sustainability of the project beyond the scope of the grant.

The applicant indicates that a set of tools will be developed to support implementation with effectiveness and fidelity (page 19).

The applicant has selected diverse locations during the project period.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide evidence about the way in which the project will provide opportunities to formalize practice in order to prepare for broad adoption. The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence to make it clear how the program will be made available for scaling on a national level beyond the scope of the grant. Although the applicant indicates that tools and learning community will be developed (page 19) these are not discussed in sufficient detail to warrant understanding whether they are promising of success.

**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:** 08/13/2013 08:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2013 06:41 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	19
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	18
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Personnel	10	9
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. CPP 1	1	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. CPP 2	2	2
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority</b>		
1. Invitational Priority	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>67</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - i3 Validation - 4: 84.411B

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California (U411B130029)

## 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 4 .5 year project, serving 105,000 students (grades 7-12), is built on a strong and convincing theoretical and research foundation. For example, the project builds on a model demonstrated by longitudinal research studies (13 years) to effectively improve academic performance of high need students as well as suggestive evidence of long-term positive impacts on students' access and persistence in college. (e18) Furthermore, the research was deemed by the IES What Works Clearinghouse to meet evidence standard without reservations,

The applicant organization has a 12-year track record and a What Works rating for the model to be used, which demonstrates it is likely to have the estimated impact on teachers and ELs in other service areas. The increasing size of the EL population and growing achievement gap demonstrates an unmet demand for high quality PD and curriculum materials to enhance the academic outcomes for ELs. (e26)

The application demonstrates its capacity for both a significant contribution to the field and effective national dissemination of the expected outcomes. For example, the applicant organization has the capacity to expand throughout California through a 180-site network already in place. (e 27) The project will also expand upon the technology tools supporting the intervention offering equitable access for all students and teachers. (e27)

##### Weaknesses:

The application lacks sufficient discussion of how costs for the two key components to the projects proposed expansion plan (Technology and training) might affect national scalability for the project.

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 project has identified six specific goals with designated approaches for fulfilling them. (e 29)

The application includes a clear discussion with specific steps and activities for how the project will fulfill its goals within a reasonable timeline and division of responsibilities among all the partners and implementation sites. (e 29)

The application clearly explains additional strengths of the design to ensure the project's success. For example, the project design includes strong support components for schools, teachers and students such as the use of technology and a comprehensive online learning environment and resources. (e34)

The project activities are tightly aligned with evaluation and research components involving all partners. (e 29) The project activities are also aligned with the i3 program priorities (e 31) including cost effectiveness (e38)

The applicant organization has clear plans for addressing the issues of sustainability, scalability and identified barriers. (e 38) These plans use multiple strategies. For example, the project will support district and school site participants in the first 3 years so they are prepared to lead their own PD in year 4 for planned scale-up training district wide. Other vehicles for scaling up include the 13 additional sites of the project partners and the 180 related sites in other states. (e 38)

#### Weaknesses:

The project's goals and expected outcomes lack measureable objectives and milestones. The application does not fully explain the project metrics by which it can measure the effectiveness of its activities and performance, or assess its progress towards meeting project goals.

Reader's Score: 18

### 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 project design is clarified with a succinct and clearly laid out work plan aligning the project components (management, evaluation, professional development, internal assessment) along the 4.5 year timeline to ensure fulfillment of all the project's activities in a coherent and responsible manner by each partner. (e 230)

The applicant organization has included specific examples of the various tools and products to be utilized by the project, thus demonstrating the project's readiness to be implemented immediately and carried out in a timely manner to fulfill its goals. (e 233)

The project includes a detailed multi-year financial and operating model for the project and for each of the partners. (e252-299) The application discusses the project's capacity to operate at national and regional levels by the end of the grant. (e26)

The application clearly describes the management team, how they will work together and how they will interface with the other team efforts at the implementation sites. The application explains how the various operational teams (site, staff, partner) will work together with specific meeting schedules (e.g. six times per year, quarterly etc.) for each group and each component of the project. (e 40)

### Weaknesses:

The project work plan (e230) is not explicitly aligned with the project goals or measurable outcomes.

Reader's Score: 19

## 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 application explains the complexity of how the multiple partners and personnel will fulfill their roles. The application includes a visual organization chart displaying how the roles of the various partners will relate to the overall project management design. (e229)

The application identifies the project's key personnel from each partner within each component of the project. The key personnel are identified by name, their qualifications and specific roles and responsibilities to clarify how critical work will proceed. (e 40)

### Weaknesses:

The project-staffing plan does not explicitly address the day-to-day clerical and communications tasks required for operating this complex project.

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, scored by another reviewer

#### Weaknesses:

N/A, scored by another reviewer

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 applicant did not select this priority to be served by the project

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not select this priority to be served by the project

**Reader's Score: 0**

**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 technology-based components of the project address this priority by developing tools and a learning community that will provide teachers with sustained, anytime, anywhere access to the key components of the Pathway PD training and curricular materials to support implementation of Pathway practices with fidelity. The project also provides sustained access to online student learning tools that can be used independently by students and in a variety of formal learning settings with diverse student populations. (e 35) Furthermore, the applicant's national infrastructure extends the project's capacity to expand the project to all 50 states through the 180-site network. (e27)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**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:**

Not applicable to this project.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/12/2013 06:41 PM