

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2013 03:09 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

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

	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	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	19
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<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	1
<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>71</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - i3 Validation - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

## 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 provided an extensive narrative that supports the evidence that the project will impact students' success. The demands for technologically proficient students are high with the implementation of PARCC, and this project will address those demands. Furthermore, the applicant provided information about the feasibility for national expansion through a proven process of using SRI's Discipline of Innovation (pg. e22).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant did not have any weaknesses.

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 applicant thoroughly addressed the national needs addressed by this project, provided a concise and clear set of goals along with a quality implementation plan to achieve the goals by utilizing a valid logic model that uses feedback from teachers to continuously improve the design of the SunBay curriculum (pg. e28). The applicant effectively addressed how the grant funds will be used to address barriers to scaling through the utilization of SRI's Discipline of Innovation process (pg. e22).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not describe an explicit plan to recruit additional schools as indicated on pages e28 and e29. Further explanation of how the "established SRI recruitment procedures" would be utilized would have strengthened this application.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**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 provided a complete management plan articulating key responsibilities; objectives; timelines; milestones; metrics to assess implementation progress and fidelity; and, annual performance targets. Additionally, the applicant had a comprehensive financial and operational model, including the use of feedback for continuous improvement, to support the project at the regional and national levels.

**Weaknesses:**

The roles of the university partners were not clearly explained. The lack of clarity for the roles of the University of Florida and the University of South Florida St. Pete was the only weakness in this criteria area.

**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 applicant adequately describes the staffing plan, including the identification of key members of the leadership team. The plan did not appear to have any unfilled key personnel positions. The qualifications and experience of key project personnel are consistent with the requirements of the project and are capable of providing the leadership necessary to meet the project goals.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not have any weaknesses in this area.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

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

**(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

## Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

### Strengths:

The applicant has effectively provided evidence that the SunBay project would improve student outcomes without significantly increasing per-student costs through an innovative use of technology. The overall plan was strong. The applicant provided a coherent budget, a clear explanation of one-time costs compared to ongoing costs, and a project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness.

### Weaknesses:

The applicant did not have any weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 1

## Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

### Strengths:

The applicant provided comprehensive evidence that supported the broad adoption of the project including a clearly described operational model. The information provided through the application effectively supports the need to evaluate different forms of implementation, including the adaptability to different learning environments and diverse learners. The applicant also provided extensive information about the development of training materials, student materials, and other supports to assist in providing a high level of quality implementation with fidelity. Finally, the applicant described a high quality plan to assess the ability to replicate and adapt the project in a variety of locations using practices developed through the implementation of the i3 supported project.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not clearly address how the project would address all students, including traditionally high performing groups. While this was a weakness in the plan, there was sufficient evidence to earn full points on this competitive preference priority.

**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:**

The applicant did not address the Invitational Priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/21/2013 03:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/17/2013 11:22 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

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	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	17
<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	1
<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 #6 - i3 Validation - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

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

##### General:

The applicant provides a proposal to integrate technology into middle school mathematics by using the SunBay approach with a validation project. The approach is, in part, an outgrowth of previous large-scale research in Texas and the content based, in part, on the pacing guides of a school district committed to the approach. The applicant proposes to recruit 9 participants in year one and 9 additional participants in year three from the state of Florida, serving the project participants with a proposed operations center in Saint Petersburg, Florida, created explicitly for the grant. Two district superintendents (Broward County and Palm Beach County) provide letters of support for their districts to participate in the proposed project. The remaining districts are not yet recruited. The final project evaluation plan will be completed within 100 days of the start of the project.

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:

The applicant details previous large-scale success of the SunBay Mathematics approach in the state of Texas (using end of unit proximal measures, page 21). The applicant presents a compelling case that the proposed validation study of the SunBay Program and potential scaling to benefit middle school mathematics students in as many as 22 states and the District of Columbia (page 19) if schools/districts in those states choose to purchase the program and fully implement program fidelity.

##### Weaknesses:

no weaknesses noted

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 applicant sets forth five project goals and a Plan of Action with milestones assigned to project personnel. Multi-year project design is a strength along with technology-based instruction. The applicant provides recent and convincing research of the effectiveness of the SunBay technology (pages 24-26) and proceeds by linking the use of this technology to support the unmet national need to support the Common Core standards. Each of the project goals will be evidenced by the completion of action items explained in the narrative (pages 29-32). This also includes an action item for the expansion of the literature review of the project (page 30, action 3.a) as the codification of best practices in the TPD Framework.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant has the commitment of two districts in Florida as evidenced by the letters of support from the superintendents (pages 118-120, appendix). However, "9 schools will be recruited in year 1 and at least another 9 in year 3" is tenuous with no contingency plan presented should the applicant not be able to recruit the additional sixteen districts with recruitment targets ". . . of schools that represent the state's diversity and that serve high-need students" (page 30). Currently the applicant has 11% of the necessary schools committed to the study and proposes to expand operations into St. Petersburg, Florida (page 37, item 5b) to serve the committed applicants (Palm Beach and Broward Counties). Sufficient detail is not provided as to how the applicant intends to meet the proposed level of scale during the project period to recruit the number of participating schools set forth in the project design.

**Reader's Score: 17**

**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 management plan is complete, detailed, and articulates the roles and responsibilities of key personnel and provides well-defined milestones in a timeline of activities for the project while operating at the regional level during the project period. Feedback for continuous improvement is included in the management plan.

**Weaknesses:**

The roles and responsibilities of the university partners as related to their role in the grant lack sufficient detail. Specifically (pages 26, 29, 35) there is mention of, “. . . we provide certificates or master’s degrees to “teacher leaders” . . . “ (page 26) Based on this statement, it appears SRI will confer master’s degrees to teacher leaders and “university partners will provide TPD to schools as they do today . . .” (page 40, lines 12 and 13). The University of Florida letter of support (page 121, paragraph 3) indicates “access” will be provided to interested teachers and “regular professional development offerings” along with “innovative” professional development. USFSP indicated a partnership with a district not identified as a participant in the study and indicate a commitment to “Validating the Sunday Middle School Digital . . .” and to a “closer alignment of content in the certificates and master’s degrees . . .” (page 123, paragraph 4 of letter of support from USFSP) As a result of the above references, the roles and responsibilities of the university partners are unclear.

**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 project’s staffing plan identifies key project personnel with strong credentials and records of professional accomplishments. There is sufficient detail and description to support a diverse, professional, and expert group of professionals that will support the project and the identified critical work of the project.

**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

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant explains how student outcomes will be improved with the cost-effective use of technology. The investigative process of producing a cost-effective method of delivery is included.

**Weaknesses:**

Options for the district to self-select cost effectiveness options are part of the project narrative; however, it is unclear how the fidelity of the project is maintained when the options include additional variables for analysis such as some groups "shifting from paper to digital workflows" (page 18, paragraph 2, line 4) while the Absolute Priority 4c is "integrating technology (page 18, paragraph 2, last sentence)." Sufficient evidence is unclear as to how variables will be controlled given the multitude of options for districts.

**Reader's Score: 1**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

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

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

**Strengths:**

A strong modular structure is articulated in the narrative. The applicant proposes a well-developed, broad adoption.

**Weaknesses:**

Sufficient detail is not provided to indicate how the SunBay approach supports various teaching and learning environments as well as address diverse populations of middle school students. For example, how can the approach be adapted to high achieving Asian populations and at the same time be adapted to low achieving Hispanic populations, etc.?

**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 proposal

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/17/2013 11:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2013 02:15 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

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

	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	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	19
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<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	1
<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>	103	72

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - i3 Validation - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

## 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:

There is a significant need for schools to have access to math curricula that match the conceptual understanding and math practices aligned to the Common Core State Standards for Math. SunBay Mathematics is a technology-based approach to middle school math that can aid students by improving math outcomes while reducing costs by “increasing collaborative learning on shared tablet devices, shifting from paper to digital workflows, and blending online and in-person teacher professional development” (p. e18).

The use of SunBay Mathematics would have the added benefit of preparing students to take online assessments, which will prepare them for the PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career).

SRI International has a proven process (Discipline of Innovation, p. e22) in place for national expansion of educational programs that are found to be successful in studies. This track record provides assurance that a smooth expansion will be possible upon completion of the study.

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 goals of this project are clearly outlined with multiple steps described for each goal that provide clear action items and feedback/revision loops. This multi-year project design addresses the need for validating the effectiveness of SunBay Mathematics over a number of regions and districts, conducting evaluations, refining practices and developing toolkits and training.

This is an excellent use of technology-based instruction as math concepts are more easily grasped when interactive models and simulations are presented to students.

#### Weaknesses:

Applicant could have described more clearly the recruitment process for schools to participate in the study. It is unclear whether there are other schools interested in participating in the study, or how long it will take to recruit additional schools. This could have a significant impact on the timeline.

Reader's Score: 19

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.
- (2) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

#### Strengths:

The applicant has experience with successful management plans, which has allowed them to refine process and to be very successful in a number of areas of research, including education.

- Roles and responsibilities are clearly outlined.
- A very detailed 4 year timeline describes activities and identifies milestones

- All aspects of the project, from financial to software issues, will be measured
- Targets are defined
- Operating model is planned
- Partners are identified

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

An established team is already in place, including project supervisor, evaluation director, implementation leaders, district coordinators, improvement manager, design lead, data manager.

District technology and math coordinators will be identified at each district, with funds in place to hire replacements if districts choose to do so.

The applicant can fill openings within 3 months.

**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:**

Evaluated by another evaluator.

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**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:**

A robust investigation is planned to determine the most cost-effective method of delivering the SunBay Mathematics program, using a variety of assessment measures and data to analyze results and make improvements. This is a three year plan of continual modifications, analysis and revision to determine the most cost-effective method of delivery, which will then be used in the national expansion of the program.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 1

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant acknowledges the difficulty teachers have with adopting the new practices required by the CCSSM. Through 5 years of study, they have found that modules provide the most successful means of assisting teachers teach the new pedagogy. SunBay has a modular structure that will allow for a smoother and more facile adoption of the program for teachers nationwide. By combining the SunBay curricular moduls with the PD partners in this proposal (Lastinger Center), the barriers for adoption have been minimized.

**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:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/21/2013 02:15 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2013 10:00 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

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	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	30
<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>30</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - i3 Validation - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

## 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:

score submitted by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

score submitted 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:**

score submitted by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

score submitted 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:**

score submitted by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

score submitted 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:**

score submitted by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

score submitted 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 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 evaluator has previous experience with an i3 project and has a data manager position included in the proposal. The applicant proposes two evaluation questions on outcomes. The questions will be addressed through a quasi-experimental design using clustered randomized trials. Randomization is described (pp. 25 & 26). The designs meet the What Works clearinghouse evidence standards without reservation (pp. 25 & 26) as the applicant addresses each of the WWC criteria for meeting evidence standards without reservation and should produce evidence of the projects effectiveness if implemented as designed. The discussion of pathways for outcomes and implementation problems from prior research should help in further understanding of maintaining fidelity of implementation to improve outcomes. Including an additional rubric with the Instructional Quality Assessment (IQA, pg. 29) for observation should provide further information on implementation factors that may impact outcomes.

The data collection plan on page 30 aligns with evaluation questions and seems thorough and realistic. The instrumentation to address outcomes are clearly presented on page 28 and incentives to increase response rate are also included in the evaluation design. Likewise, the inclusion of the Local Average Treatment Effect (LATE) should detect differential implementation impacts on outcomes. All data analysis methods align with evaluation questions and address validity issues.

#### Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 30

### 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:** 08/19/2013 10:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2013 08:46 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

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

	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	30
<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>30</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - i3 Validation - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: SRI International (U411B130019)

## 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:

1. The choice of evaluator is a strong one in that they have a substantial amount of experience conducting high quality program evaluations that are comprised of both quantitative and qualitative components. This is necessary to be able to answer both of the core research questions, the first being quantitative and the second being more qualitative.
2. The key questions under investigation are important, relevant, and clearly outlined. The first setting provides the stage for a cluster RT that meets WWC evidence standards (though setting two will not be RCT). Care has been taken to outline ways in which barriers in evaluation will be overcome. The use of both student assessment data and teacher surveys is commendable. An interrupted time series design is ideal for examining this data b/w groups longitudinally.
3. Appreciate the inclusion of IRB submission and development of data sharing agreements in the planning phase.
4. The sample, which is large, draws from high needs areas that serve a varied demographic population. This should help the results generalize to a broader population upon conclusion of the study. The proposal does a good job at highlighting the plans to examine impact as a factor of these variables to determine how/if they play a mediating role.
5. The evaluation plan is clear and succinct. It outlines previous effect sizes that were seen in previous studies in Texas. The effect sizes expected are clearly delineated and the proposal is successful at outlining the power analysis.
6. The evaluation clearly outlines its expected measureable impact: An increase of .20 standard deviations. The use of the LATE estimator (pg e49) clearly outlines how analyses will take fidelity of implementation into account.

#### Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 30

### 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, scored by another reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A, 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:**

N/A, scored by another reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A, 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:**

N/A, scored by another reviewer.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/19/2013 08:46 AM