

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/26/2013 04:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	84

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - i3 Development - 10: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

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 extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project will substantially improve on the outcomes achieved by other practices, such as through better student outcomes, lower cost, or accelerated results.

Strengths:

The proposed project, Exc-EL, will impact all EL students, 738, in three school districts. While the RTI system has been used with other at-risk groups of students, it has not been expressly used for EL, especially at the middle and high school levels, typically. In addition to using the RTI system with older, EL students, this project would focus on schools with low, but diverse, numbers of EL students (p. 2), and it would help these schools develop teams where EL students would be closely monitored as a part of mainstream classes (p. 6). The data gathered from this project could help other similar schools and districts implement similar programs in order to boost the performance of EL students. Finally, using the RTI model could save money by reducing the number of special education referrals and by eliminating duplication by fully integrating community services across multiple districts (p. 8).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 35

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 absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(3) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Strengths:

The project, Exc-EL, will align curriculum and instruction across six schools grades 6-12 (p. 8). The four goals, which are clearly articulated, directly support Absolute Priority 5a (p. 9). The applicant has also identified six specific activities that will ensure that the goals are met. The description of the activities on pages 11-15 is thorough and tied coherently to the project's goals as well as to Absolute Priority 5a. The applicant identifies four key risks to the project and offers strategies to mitigate them (p. 15-16).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 25

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 extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The plan includes objectives and outcomes for each of the four goals. There is a timeline and a list of personnel who are responsible for each objective (p. 17-20). There is a definite commitment from the school districts and community partners regarding the Exc-EL project. There is a clear procedure for ensuring feedback and improvement in the project (p. 19-20).

Weaknesses:

A few metrics are mentioned in the plan, such as number of school teams participating in professional development and increased proficiency for EL students on state assessments (p. 17), but it is unclear how items such as "EL students receive needed supports" (p. 19) and "EL students indicate they are well known by teachers in their school" (p. 18) will be measured and when they will be measured. While the procedure for ensuring feedback is clear, it does not give specific details regarding the work that is to be accomplished in the schools, and instead it deals solely with the evaluation piece (p. 19-20).

Reader's Score: 14

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.

Strengths:

The staffing plan is complete and in place. The individuals involved have extensive experience in their respective fields as well as, in some cases, experience working with each other. The applicant provides information not only of its staff, but also of the key individuals at the district and community partners' levels (p. 22-23).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

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 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.

(3) 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:

Addressed by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

Addressed by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/26/2013 04:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/25/2013 10:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - i3 Development - 10: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

No statement

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project will substantially improve on the outcomes achieved by other practices, such as through better student outcomes, lower cost, or accelerated results.

Strengths:

•The applicant has provided documentation to support its past success in working with EL students and implementing projects that increase their achievement and teacher quality (Appendix C- G). These accomplishments are demonstrated in the project model, goals and objectives page, 8, 9 10, 11-14, 16 & 20. The proposal application could add to practices and theories because of the past experiences of the applicant.

•The applicant has partnered with agencies that have provided successful support for ELs and teachers through professional development activities, cutting edge projects and trainings, and resources (Appendix F, G). The involvement of these partners with this project should yield results that will add to practices that exist and provide data that others can use that may be interested in implementing a project similar to this one.

•The applicant has outlined in the Logic Model, goals and objectives, documentation, selection of staff and partnerships. Results of the proposed project should extend and add to practices, theory and knowledge related to ELs academic achievement (appendix, e59).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 35

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 absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(3) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Strengths:

- The applicant proposes implementing a framework of tiered interventions that will strengthen educator's knowledge and skills in working with ELLs.

- The applicant has stated that small learning communities for students will be created, with a common team of teachers.

- Interagency and inter-district teams will leverage and share resources to be used with at-risk EL students and their families. This framework was clear, concise and succinct.

The project's results should aid in improving academic success for students and produce better, skilled educators.

- The applicant has clearly outlined and defined objectives, goals, activities and milestones to be implemented and evaluated (pgs. 9-14, as well as in Appendices, C.D.F, G). Following the process identified by the applicant in all of these areas, students should excel academically and teacher quality should be improved and strengthened.

- The applicant has identified potential risks to the success of the project (pgs. 15 & 16). Included are strategies that will be used to address and alleviate each.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 25

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 extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation

of the proposed project.

Strengths:

- The applicant has included a Management Plan that has identified key staff and personnel. Resumes of those partners are included in the appendices of this application. The experiences and skills of the identified staff should increase the chances of this project being successful.
- Center X will lead the project. Documentation of their successes in the field of EL instruction is included in the appendices. The resources and partnerships of Center X highlighted in the appendices should support the fact that the results of the project plan will be useful to others working with ELs.
- Several charts are included in the application that highlight the action steps that will be used to ensure the success of the proposed project. (pgs. 16 -20 and appendices). The steps outlined in the project should lead to achievement of students and teachers.
- MOUs and letters of support are located in Appendix G. These show the commitment of the partners to the success of the project proposal.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

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.

Strengths:

- The staffing plan is included. Key staff is identified.
- Resumes of partners are included. The experiences and skills of the identified staff should increase the chances of this project being successful.

Weaknesses:

None 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 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.

(3) 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:

Review conducted by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Review conducted by another reviewer

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/25/2013 10:14 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/25/2013 12:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	85

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - i3 Development - 10: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

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 extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project will substantially improve on the outcomes achieved by other practices, such as through better student outcomes, lower cost, or accelerated results.

Strengths:

This significance of Project Exc-EL is based on the premise that middle and high school English learners "lack the academic language required for school success even after many years of ESL support (p. 3)." This coincides with the earlier work of Jim Cummins regarding the lack of developing cognitive academic language proficiencies for second language learners.

That the approach of this project is unique is demonstrated by the combination of several important initiatives:

1. The creation of small learning communities will allow for more personalized instruction and allow ELLs to be mainstreamed in academic content areas with native English speakers (p. 4). This has the potential of providing ELLs with more cognitively attainable English models to aid in their acquisition of English and with academic content.

2. The development of a 3-tiered RTI (Response to Intervention) system will provide for different levels of instructional interventions to match student needs (p. 4). The rationale behind the selection of this approach is based on previous successful RTIs with developing readers (p. 5). By initiating a similar process for ELLs, the project has the potential of making a significant contribution to the development of a pedagogical repository for teachers of ELLs (p. 5). This RTI repository initiative provides a seamless integration of "teacher skill" with "student achievement (p. 7)." It is also evident, as the applicant notes, that the development of a repository of successful interventions will eliminate some of the "trial and error" approaches that are costly to students.

Weaknesses:

none

Reader's Score: 35

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 absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(3) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Strengths:

Absolute Priority 5 and its sub-part are fulfilled through the implementation of tiered RTI interventions, personalized supports for ELL students and community partnerships that help in sustaining project goals.

The delineation of four project goals and four student outcomes (p. 9, e15, 11-15) are comprehensively aligned with specific actions and activities. Several of these actions/activities that have not been previously noted, warrant additional recognition:

1. Through professional development on on-site support, the project will develop a cadre of educators and community partners who develop expertise in ELL instructional approaches. Noteworthy is the fact that this cadre will be drawn from core content area teachers, as well as "special" teachers, support and administrative staff, paraprofessionals, and an ESL teacher or specialist (p. 11). The inclusion of these diverse personnel roles mirrors the inclusion of ELLs in mainstream academic subject classrooms.

2. While the first 3 years of the project encompass staggered training and implementation activities, the last 2 years of the program design are devoted to ongoing training and support (p. 12). By not trying to fill every year with a new implementation cohort, the applicant demonstrates a more pragmatic realization of building on intended project accomplishments.

3. Applicant foresight is demonstrated with the inclusion of school change coaches from the Center for Secondary School Redesign to assist in the transformation of traditional school structures into small, personalized communities, in addition to addressing potential barriers to ELL success (p. 13).

The applicant describes several potential risks to project success and provides specific strategies for mitigating those risks.

Weaknesses:

none

Reader's Score: 25

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 extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The project provides an extensive, clearly stated schedule of how project goals will be met throughout the duration of the grant award. The responsible stakeholders who must carry out each activity (16-20) are included.

The inclusion of an external evaluator adds to the project's potential significance (p. 19-20).

Intent and expected outcomes are clearly articulated for all participants, thus indicating the appropriate purposefulness of the Management Plan (p. 17-20).

As part of the Management Plan, continuous assessment of project effectiveness will comprise an integral part of the Project Evaluation. Fidelity of implementation for teachers, as well as with students, will be ascertained through qualitative interview and on-line survey protocols (p. 25). Additionally, the comparison of project participants with students from other surrounding districts (p. 25) will provide another measure of continuous project effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

none

Reader's Score: 15

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.

Strengths:

Four key personnel have worked together for 10+ years and all have had extensive experience in professional development and on-site coaching. Each of their individual backgrounds verify their adequacy for the project's staffing needs.

The selection of the Principal Investigator adds to the project's proposed impact. Based on the individual's work with the Black Male Institute and with UCLA's Academic Advancement Program, described as the "nation's premier retention program for underrepresented students, his investigative expertise will be a valuable asset for the project.

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 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.

(3) 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:

This section will be evaluated by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/25/2013 12:31 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2013 05:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	0
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	10
Total	100	10

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - i3 Development - 10: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

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 extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project will substantially improve on the outcomes achieved by other practices, such as through better student outcomes, lower cost, or accelerated results.

Strengths:

Reviewed by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Reviewed 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 absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(3) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Strengths:

Reviewed by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Reviewed 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 extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Reviewed by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Reviewed 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.

Strengths:

Reviewed by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Reviewed by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

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 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.

(3) 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 overall evaluation design is a multi-method longitudinal analysis, which is appropriate for a study that includes multiple data collections on the treatment group. The multi-site quasi-experimental matched comparison design strategy is a strong approach in analyzing student performance outcomes in matched schools (treatment and control). (pg 25)

The evaluation questions (pg e155) are aligned with the project goals, and include both quantitative and qualitative measures in pre-post intervention data collection. That should provide sufficient data using a logical, appropriate strategy to produce quality data for analysis.

The application includes sufficient information about the sample size and effect size to determine they are appropriate for the project, and should provide reliable data for analysis.

The application includes a table (pg e156) that provides general information on the evaluation questions, the data sources and measures that will be used for the particular question, and the analytic strategies associated with those data and measures.

Weaknesses:

It is not completely clear which analysis method will be used with particular measures and data sources (pg 24). In the table on page 24, it appears that quantitative analyses include only teacher interviews, and no analytic methods are shown for the focus groups of educators. In addition, the table presents observation as an analysis method, when it is a type of measurement.

The application is not clear regarding interim data collection at the end of years 1, 2, 3, and 4. The information provided on page e158 notes pre- and post-intervention data collection, with no timeline or table specifying the month and grant year in which that would occur. Overall, more clarity and specificity are needed regarding the timeline of evaluation activities and data collection in each project year. That would clarify the vague "during the course of the study" statement on page e160.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/24/2013 05:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2013 06:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	0
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	8
Total	100	8

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - i3 Development - 10: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U411C130104)

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 extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project will substantially improve on the outcomes achieved by other practices, such as through better student outcomes, lower cost, or accelerated results.

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 absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(3) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

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 extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

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.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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 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.

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

Strengths:

- 1) Clear, testable research questions based on consideration of implementation & efficacy of proposed Rtl intervention.
- 2) Mixed methods experimental design is appropriate w/ efficacy study based on quasi-experimental matched design.
- 3) Research team is qualified and budgeted amount seems reasonable for the evaluation component of the grant.

Weaknesses:

- 1) It is unclear how qualitative and quantitative data will be used collectively to address research questions, as well as communicated to the research team.
- 2) Overall, the identification of the data (observations, interviews) is vague. The evaluation plan would greatly benefit by a description of the data, why it is being collected, and how used with other data types to address the research questions.
- 3) No discussion is provided in the evaluation section on the statistical analyses that will be used to address the research questions. It is difficult to judge the extent to which evaluation findings will be relevant & useful without information on how the data will be analyzed.
- 4) The evaluation indicates that surveys will be used but unclear what constructs/variables they will be used to measure. This is especially the case for Quest 3 on engagement, self-regulation, & attitudes towards college. That is, will existing scales be used or will new ones be developed? Such info is needed & would greatly strengthen the evaluation plan.
- 5) The evaluation plan needs to support or justify why data lends itself to address identified research questions.
- 6) Please provide a discussion on the criteria for acceptable levels of implementation and/or efficacy of project.
- 7) The evaluation plan indicates that regression will be used but no indication of quality of the measures to be used in project or why analyses discussed are appropriate/relevant.
- 8) The evaluation plan would be strengthened with the inclusion of a timeline for when activities will be completed.

Reader's Score: 8

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/24/2013 06:18 PM