

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

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	22
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - i3 Development - 12: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

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 applicant presents an i3 application that incorporates novel elements within a research based, theoretical model that have proven effective. Their project targets early childhood, school readiness, and intentional family support in the transition process from preschool to K3. Their proposal is informed by lessons learned from several prior projects For example, SPARK, a Kellogg Foundation funded project, focused on family engagement that supports school readiness was implemented by the United Way of Greater Atlanta and provides the applicant with strong prior experience and lessons learned that will be applied to this proposal. The applicant provides strong evidence that their prior experience led to statistically significant effects on their target population. Their approach offers a clear and consistent pathway for family engagement from preschool into their early elementary years. (p 1-4)

The applicant describes a strong and ongoing collaboration with the nationally recognized Parents as Teachers home visitation program. They document prior collaborative efforts that document their intent to use this project to support the development of family engagement tools and effective programming. This will be done through training and data sharing. (p 5)

The applicant offers compelling statistical evidence from their prior project implementation to support their ability to successfully implement their proposed project and to do so in specific and intentional ways that will be shared at the state and national level. As an example, the applicant will initiate and develop the National Family Engagement Council to share best practices and effective strategies. Such a council has the potential to contribute significantly to the field. (p 5)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

We have discussed this selection criterion, and I believe my perfect score is appropriate.

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 a project that clearly addresses Absolute Priority 6: Improving Parent and Family Engagement – Subpart A – Developing and implementing initiatives that train parents and families in the skills and strategies that will support their students in improving academic outcomes, including increased engagement and persistence in school. As described, the applicant intends to take PACE to the next level and provide a seamless support of services from preschool through grade 3. These services directly target support for parents to understand curricula and expectations and most importantly how to translate that into supporting their child's development. (p 8-10)

The applicant provides clear and coherent anticipated outcomes. These outcomes focus on Ready Parents, Ready Schools, and Ready Students. In combination, this approach is comprehensive, coherent and focused on specific and measurable outcomes and expectations for success. The proposed project employs multiple strategies that are anchored by research and evidence based practices and the applicant's prior success. Each goal is paired with related activities and relevant measures to assess project success. (p 12-15)

The goals, activities, and measures of success as presented by the applicant are clearly aimed at Absolute Priority 6. The applicant has further identified for each of their identified 3 goals relevant potential barriers and risks to achieving outcomes and modified key strategies to overcome them. Identifying and targeting these barriers and risks with goal specific strategies significantly enhances the applicant's likelihood of success. (p 12-15)

Weaknesses:

Given the prior experience with this model, it is questionable whether their goal of impacting by 5% (p 10-12) is aggressive enough given prior success with this model and an understanding of the population with which they will work.

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 provides a table for the management plan of PACE that is directly and clearly aligned with their 3 project goals. Milestones are provided along with the timeline, responsibility and outcomes. It is noted that the applicant demonstrates an ability to start significant delivery of services via home visiting curricula and K3 Incredible Years curricula as of March 2014. Their ability to manage this project and begin key interventions quickly has the potential of reaching families for an optimal length of time. This is accomplished through the PACE Management Team led by a full time Project Director. (p 15)

Two Key Councils will support the ongoing management of PACE – The National Family Engagement Council and the School Transition Council. This will assure alignment with other statewide initiatives such as the Quality Rating and Improvement System. (p 15-16)

The applicant has an intentional plan whereby feedback and outcome measures will be used to discern project progress. Monthly and quarterly meetings of the Management Team Council, School Transition Council and the National Family Engagement Council will be used to review data and reports for the explicit purpose of analysis of PACE progress, challenges, and need to alter programming to be most effective. (p 18)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

We have discussed this selection criterion, and I believe my perfect score is appropriate.

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 applicant provides narrative detail regarding key personnel for PACE including a proposed Project Advisor. Although the Project Advisor is only allocated as 0.15 FTE, this person has substantial experience with similar projects and is likely to support its successful implementation. The applicant proposes a national search for a full time Project Director. In lieu of an identified person, the applicant provides a job description that includes job specific criteria. Other positions, such as Transition Coaches and Referral Agent, are not named; however, the applicant provides a description of key job expectations. (p 19-20)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe how all key tasks will be implemented during the hiring process of the Project Director. No contingency plans are identified to ensure that all program aspects are able to be implemented should the hire of a full-time director take longer than anticipated. (not found)

Reader's Score: 8

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:

na

Weaknesses:

na

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	30
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	24
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	77

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - i3 Development - 12: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

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 applicant is implementing a comprehensive approach to improving student learning through coordination and integration of family engagement and family-school partnerships simultaneously to assist parents in achieving the goals of effective parental involvement policies, programs, practices and activities that will improve children's academic achievement and school readiness (p.1). Approach based on research and experience in effective implementation of school readiness and family engagement strategies (p.2).

The applicant will develop, test, and implement strategies that will assist parents in understanding school readiness and the opportunities for services by building upon previous work with SPARKS, a W.K. Kellogg Foundation national school readiness program targeting children ages three through six at risk for being inadequately equipped to succeed in school. (p.1)

Building on research-based evidence, SPARKS provided services to families through the Parents as Teachers (PAT) home visitation model. (p.3)

School Readiness Councils established at several SPARKS partner schools. (p.3)

The applicant has received four Early Reading First program grants that included high quality professional development and coaching. In addition, a grant from the Annie Casey Foundation allowed them to conduct a Family Engagement Roundtable (p.3), which resulted in a model that included home visitation, school transition, and parent leadership development.

Research support evidence of efficacy and effectiveness of model—89% of parents demonstrated an increase in child development knowledge and parent life skills increased. Children readiness scores increased—100% of children scored “mastered” on Get Ready to Read Assessment as compared to an 89% pre-test rate. (p.4)

For many years the applicant has been an active partner in contributing to the advancement of practice in family engagement and family-school partnerships through its projects funded by the Kellogg Foundation, Annie E. Casey Foundation, PAT National Center, and Parent Services Project. (p.4)

Project has potential of involving a large number of strong partners with their own networks which can further disseminate findings. The applicant will develop a national Family Engagement Council to guide strategic direction and dissemination of best practices and partnerships that can be replicated nationwide. (p.4)

PACE model is evidence-based and designed to improve outcomes for students in the target population. The applicant presented evaluation data of the PACE model which found that parents who participated in the program reported positive changes in their beliefs and behaviors. The PACE model should provide a substantive contribution that is built upon an innovative and promising program that was developed through collaboration. (p.5)

Weaknesses:

Although applicant cited 3 research studies (i.e., Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, Chicago Parent Child Center), they did not compare their approach with what has been previously attempted nationally (p.2). Also, many of the interventions that they plan to use are not innovative (p.2).

Reader's Score: 30

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's proposed project addresses the absolute priority. The PACE Project is designed to achieve the primary goal of developing and strengthening partnerships among parents, teachers, administrators, staff, and the community to improve children's academic achievement. PACE best practices will be taken to the next level by implementing a continuum of parent and family engagement from PreK to grade three. The goals encompass the coordination and integration of existing services and programs, parent involvement and improved student outcomes for child care centers, family child care providers, and two elementary schools. (p.10, 11, 12)

The applicant is a strong, well run organization that has a system in place that measures whether the activities they conduct are having a clear impact on their targeted community. Additionally, they have developed a mechanism that provides solid feedback on how and where changes need to be made to make a program more effective. (p.10, 11, 12)

The logic model supports the fundamental components for managing the program. The program designers have a clear and reasonable process for measuring the change that occurs because of their program and a clear strategy which shows

that their program will make a difference. (p.10, 11, 12)

The applicant includes a description of the type of project activities that leads to understanding, clarity and insight for achieving the goals of school readiness and family engagement strategies, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks. (p.10, 11, 12)

Through team-building, the applicant will develop and adopt policies, programs and practices that enhance the connection to which parents are involved in their children's education. In order to achieve this goal, the applicant will create teams of parents, educators, and education administrators to actively collaborate to build parent-school partnerships. (p.10, 11, 12)

Applicant will work with partners throughout the system and across the community to ensure that the goals and objectives of the project are met. The applicant is developing training programs for parents placing emphasis on advocacy and leadership skills. Consistent with the findings from their previous work in school readiness and family engagement strategies, parent education activities will be designed to assist parents in their job of parenting, including components of teaching new skills to better support the growth and development of their children and implementing simple strategies within the context of routine activities to support their children's learning and development. (p.10, 11, 12)

Weaknesses:

A presentation was made on how the PACE program engages in a process of collaborative partnership-building with parents. Upon review of Ready Parent: Improve parent and family engagement in child's education, the 5% expected outcome is very low if parents have opportunities to develop relationships with the program and to participate in the transition process of their children into the local public school. If the PACE staff and partners walk the parents through the total process to eliminate any barriers that may arise because of cultural or language differences, the participation rate should be higher. (p.10, 11, 12)

Reader's Score: 24

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 includes an implementation plan that shows the timing of the major events, including a month-by-month schedule of activities (timeline and milestones) for completion of project activities (p.16). There was written evidence to support the integration of monitoring system components which supports the integrity of the record-keeping and reporting system.

The applicant has demonstrated a consistent history of securing sufficient funds to support programs and services for low-income children and families. The organization's executive leadership provides assurance of the organization's commitment to its successful implementation. (p.16)

The applicant also has demonstrated its organization's experience in collaborative programming and operations with public and private sector partners that deal with poverty problems. (p.16)

The applicant outlined the skills and experience of key personnel, educational achievement and responsibilities. Relevant experience in providing services to the underserved was outlined for staff members. The management plan is tied to the goals and objectives of the project. Commitment to project was evidenced by the signed agreements by partners. (p.16)

The applicant has strong linkages with numerous government, state, local and private entities to coordinate services. The applicant works with the National Family Engagement Council and the School Transition Council. Applicant has secured match from Whitehead Foundation (commitment letter of \$500,000 in Appendix) (p.17). The agency has developed an excellent relationship with the community and established many collaborative relationships, which were both formal and informal. These relationships have resulted in the development of more opportunities for families to receive comprehensive, child focused services. The partners are committed to working with and supporting families in collaborative partnership building. (Letters in Appendix)

A comprehensive monitoring system has been developed that will provide continuous feedback, i.e. School Transition Council meetings (monthly); evaluation team reports (quarterly); and National Family Engagement Council meetings (quarterly) (p.18). Project personnel from various agencies will contribute their expertise to the program with United Way of Atlanta acting as fiscal agent. Additional personnel will be hired. (p.18)

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant presents a clear timeline, the application does not adequately specify length of time of specific milestones. For example, all dates are beginning timelines and the application does not specify completion times. (p.16)

Health, dental and mental health services are such an important part of school readiness; however, there was no evidence of community partnership commitment from a medical/health service provider who provides complete physical exams and general care for children. (p.16)

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 applicant has identified the key individuals for the project, coordinating services and activities for participants and partners, and achieving performance targets. (p.15-16)

The key personnel identified for the project have demonstrated qualifications and years of experience to the program. (p.15-16)

The applicant includes the resumes of key personnel in an appendix to the application. (p.15-16)

Weaknesses:

Project Director has not been identified. For a project of this magnitude, it would have been advantageous to provide credentials of person who will actually run the day to day operations. (p.16)

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

(2) The extent to which the 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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	30
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	22
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - i3 Development - 12: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

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:

Applicant describes community need in detail (pg. 1).

Applicant cites track record of success in area of family engagement through other i3 grant projects successfully led previously (pgs. 1 & 2).

Applicant cites quantifiable outcomes from previous program interventions such as the PACE evaluation gains in parent knowledge and life-skills scores (pgs. 4 & 5).

Weaknesses:

Applicant states they are building on prior work done in same location with national partners (pgs. 1 & 2) negating the innovation of the proposed project.

Strategies suggested as innovations are known best practices, i.e. bridging child care facilities and schools for a continuity of educational experience, research-based approaches (pg. 2).

The applicant suggests that parent engagement and family-school partnerships are different, (pg. 1) but they do not state how they are separate goals.

The applicant states they will generate “new evidence” for the field, but they have already completed the first year of the project (pgs. 3 & 4).

The effect of parent engagement and family-school partnerships on child academic outcomes is not new (pgs. 4 & 5), nor are the combination of suggested interventions. The applicant fails to show that the execution of their proposal will generate unique information.

Curriculum and models being used for parent outreach (e.g., PAT and Incredible Years) are established and not exploratory or unique (pg. 9).

Interventions are not unique to the proposed program. The applicant fails to convince the reviewer that the proposed action steps will result in new understanding (pgs. 9-15).

Reader's Score: 30

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 Community consulted as to the selection of school sites to be included which suggests sensitivity to and respect for the community knowledge base, and should elicit buy-in from community stake-holders for the project (pg. 9).

Goals are explicit and stated with measurable outcomes attached (pgs. 10 & 11).

Action steps including appropriate personnel are clearly defined in tables on pages 12-15.

Caseloads for intervention team seem appropriate (pgs. 12-15).

Weaknesses:

The yearly outcomes target is low at- 5% (pg. 10). It does not represent a statistically significant change given the scope of the project. A 20% or better gain would be expected when implementing a large-scale, well-funded intervention.

Reader's Score: 22

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:

Timeline table is explicit and logical (pgs. 16 & 17).

Applicant verifies matching funds from other entities (pgs. 17-18).

The list of partner agencies are appropriate and impressive (pgs. 17-18).

Dissemination of project outcomes is stated as widespread (pg. 17).

Quarterly evaluation reports and other data collection strategies are planned (pg. 18).

A system for dissemination and utilization of data for informing the program rollout is planned (pg. 18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

We have discussed this selection criterion, and I believe my perfect score is appropriate.

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:

Applicant agency makes strong case for own sustainability/efficaciousness (pgs. 18-19).

Implementation team is adequate in number and experience (pgs. 19-20).

Roles of partner agencies' personnel are clear (pgs. 19-21).

Weaknesses:

There is no mention of provisions for interim project leadership in the absence of a chosen project leader.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

(2) The extent to which the 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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	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	15
Total	100	15

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - i3 Development - 12: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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 proposed evaluation plan includes clear key questions that effectively address the project design and will provide measures of its outcomes (page 21).

The applicant provided specific information about data sources that will be used for each key question and included a schedule for their collection (page 22). Data sources are appropriate for each question and their identification demonstrates the applicant is prepared to collect the necessary data.

The applicant provided a clear and comprehensive plan for data analysis. Their study design is appropriate for the project and will provide valuable information about its results. The evaluation plan includes provisions for accurate data collection through blind administration of PreK assessments (pages 23-24).

The evaluation's sample size and the minimum detectable effect size are adequate for the expected project impact (page 24).

The applicant's plan for data analysis is comprehensive, including a growth curve analysis and multivariate latent growth curve analysis. These aspects will provide valuable information about the relationship between specific project components and results attained (page 24).

The applicant plans to revisit measures of implementation fidelity annually, showing its diligence in implementing the project as presented in the proposal (page 25).

The proposed project's evaluation plan addresses key indicators, including Reach, Dosage, Quality, and Responsiveness. Because the applicant has identified core elements and how it will evaluate them, it will be feasible to ascertain the significance of each (page 25).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	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	15
Total	100	15

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - i3 Development - 12: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: United Way of Greater Atlanta (U411C130102)

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

The applicant provides strong evidence of the clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation as well as evidence of the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed. The research questions focus on the bottom line: how this program's effects translate into academic achievement among PreK-3 grade students (p 21). The mix of qualitative and quantitative data instruments offers multiple opportunities to assess the program's features, including significant formative assessment opportunities through testing and surveys (p 22).

The applicant provides strong evidence of the clarity and credibility of the analysis plan, including information regarding the proposed sample size, the minimum detectable effect size, and the analytic approach utilized to address the research questions. The stratified sample size of 250 families and two different sets of 250 control families represent a significant population on which to test the project's effect (p 23). The proposed minimum detectable effect sizes for Questions 1 and 2 are significant and the project's impact will be determined through descriptive statistics, logistic regressions, and a well-explained and justified multivariate latent growth curve analysis (p 24).

The applicant provides strong evidence of the evaluation plan's clear articulation of its key components and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. The applicant proposes 18 different, measurable outcomes for the program, including indicators addressing increased parental knowledge, referrals, family participation, and gains in academic and social skills; the 360 degree approach allows for a deep analysis of those factors most conducive to student achievement (p 10-11). The applicant will review best practices and develop fidelity implementation measures based on reach, dosage, quality, responsiveness; a sample model shows impressive detail in measuring those concepts (Appendix J). The logic model on Appendix D, pg 4 is well-organized, and the results to date discussed on Appendix D, pg 10 show moderate effect sizes, a good indicator of the likely success of this initiative.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/23/2013 09:42 AM