

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 10:49 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Reader #1: *****

	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	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	12
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	71

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - i3 Development - 14: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

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 GROW program takes a coordinated approach with proven programs focusing on Project Based Learning with a STEM focus. It is also supported by a identifiable Family Involvement focus delivered with a personalized 1:1 environment. It builds on a proven program already in place. Project based learning support extends throughout the program.

Weaknesses:

There is no identifiable component to meet the needs of internet connectivity away from the school campus'. The cost per student ranges from \$1,500 to \$2,000 for the 5 year project which may not be realistic for other organizations looking to replicate the success of the GROW program.

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:

Technology integration is evident in all content areas in this inclusive effort to bring together different models of innovative instruction which are the absolute priority of technology integration to teach hard to teach subjects.

Weaknesses:

The goals and objectives are not all fully developed and linked or based on the academic success of the students. Further, the project infers risk but does not specifically outline strategies for risk management.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

(2) The 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:

Responsibilities for the management of the program are clearly outlined and include the stakeholders. The project provides documentation of support from key partners and stakeholders.

Weaknesses:

While the family component is identifiable, the management of the 24/7 access beyond smartphones access is not clearly outlined. Not all matrix mentioned to measure progress or success are clearly developed. For example the evaluation of the habits of mind component is not clearly described.

Reader's Score: 12

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:

With the combination of the staff in place and the clear job description for staff to be hired, this is a clear plan for the project. The team in place has documented experience in innovative instructional pedagogies and methodologies. The partnership with Buck Institute for project based learning and ongoing support shows a commitment to excellence in this aspect of the project.

Weaknesses:

The core team is located at the University and the project does not identify other team members from the schools/programs with direct contact to students.

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:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/23/2013 10:49 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 02:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	34
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	14
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - i3 Development - 14: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My reviews reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to these criterion.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

This proposal builds on a 3 year successful program implementation (data p. 8).

GROW will address K-20, providing mentors from the university to increase systematic transitions to STEM career opportunities (p.2) for a large Hispanic number of students who are also high ELL. The differentiated model being used with individualized, technology assisted assessments will increase student proficiency.

"Habits of Mind" by Art Costa in the STEM area will add understanding of how to analyze and create cultural assimilation behaviors. This has the possibility of building resiliency in students of culturally diverse backgrounds within the limited culturally represented, STEM careers. Thus, the knowledge of these behaviors will increase the transition success of marginalized student populations. This coupled with the translation services for parents to support their children's learning has the potential to increase greater success of minority, ELL students in STEM fields through replication and scalability to a larger region with similar demographics.

By providing portable technology and translations software to support family involvement and understanding this model has the possibility of replication of a successful intervention and adding value through a model for replication across ELL student communities.). 13

This is a model of large scale technology immersion and portable devices in STEM with a high ELL, minority population with K-20 impact. The project has the capacity to contribute significant information to the field based on the diverse population, size and scope of the project, and focus on Habits of Mind to increase critical thinking behaviors. It also will monitor student progress and assist with family involvement for extended technology and learning support to students. This will provide information on how to effectively implement a model to assist non-English speaking parents with supporting their children and learning English themselves.

Weaknesses:

Whether the technology access for home use is 3G or is wireless @ home internet is not clear. This is significant if the students do not have access to technology at home via internet with laptops the parents could have access using iPhone type devices Anytime/Anywhere to access the learning program and translation software services. If this is not available the project could be limited in the measurement of parent and family support to students.

Reader's Score: 34

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

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

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

Strengths:

: Absolute Priority 7: Personalized learning and engaging learners in digital practices to develop an effective technology assisted, data driven instructional model to increase student achievement is clearly supported by the project design. The data driven and articulated SMART goals are clear in the logic model. The results of the continuous improvement data loop are used to inform instruction. This design provides individualized student data to inform continuous monitoring and realignment of instruction P. 14,15, and 16. This is a significant contribution to the field as the use of data to continuously adjust instruction for individual students using technology is a method needed to effectively shorten the learning cycle for students, and to accelerate the learning cycle for educators. This coupled with the project implementation in an ELL, Hispanic population will provide a successful model across culture.

P. 15-16 provides the online PLC option model and information on how the PLC will be implemented and monitored to increase effective analysis of individual student programs through professional discourse.

P. 11 identifies and articulates the goals to be addressed. The goals as implemented minimize the clearly identified and understood risks, and the barrier strategies are appropriate and addressed to minimize the risk.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The chart on p. 19 identifies the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis and annual performance targets to monitor the project against the goals. This model provides a method for measuring change and growth management will be supported through clear data analysis at the student and learning community level for both staff and parents.

P. 19-20 ETI is experienced in the evaluation analysis to provide independent and regular feedback of i3 for continuous improvement and monitoring to adjust and manage growth. This leadership team is experienced to adjust the implementation cycle based on the ongoing data cycle results. Thus, effectively and quickly monitoring data to increase results.

All partners at the university and in-kind contributors are committed to expanding the model to K-20 which was previously implemented over 3 years. The chart on P. 20 illustrates this commitment.

Weaknesses:

The metrics in the plan are effective to measure student progress, however the metrics for measuring the Habits of Mind behaviors to increase critical thinking are not clear. If this is important to monitor and review throughout the proposal for the continuous improvement cycle with all students clarification is needed. This is significant to measure the growth of diverse student motivation and resiliency factors. This information would be a significant contribution to the field if monitored and instruction adjusted based on the student perception and factors effecting student motivation.

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:

All personnel are highly qualified and experienced to meet the challenges identified in the plan and connected to the community to implement the strategies identified to reach the goals. P. 21 (See background and previously led projects, as well as the education background of the Chief Academic Officer, Chief Technology Director and Project Director). All three personnel have implemented the initial project, led staff and school professional development (PLC's) in the K-20 span, integrated university partners for effective continuous improvement and data analysis, and designed and implemented successful technology implementations across diverse, language communities.

The two level research evaluation monitoring design includes UPSI and then the EPI research firm in the process of providing the necessary evaluation information to address the questions in the study. This will provide the necessary data for continuous improvement and adjustment. These two groups provide a national and regional level of comparative data and analysis and the on-going student data analysis by the Technology Director, coupled with the monitoring and implementation skills of the director and Chief Academic Officer of the PLC's will ensure a continuous improvement, data analysis and adjustment of instruction cycle to effectively achieve increased student results.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 02:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 12:13 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	15
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - i3 Development - 14: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Novel approach is combination of strategies of K-12 personalized learning environments, tech-rich environment, STEM immersion, and family integration (p 5). These strategies have been implemented independently of each other previously.

The project's contribution to the field of study applies to areas of P-20 immersion in educational technology, STEM-integrated curricula, PBL, and family involvement (p 6).

The program will have an overall impact on closing gaps for high-risk youth and continuing trajectory of success for high-performing students. Past growth from foundational implementation indicates significant reduction in achievement gap, which allows for positive speculation regarding potential gains for proposed implementation (p 8).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

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

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

Strengths:

LMS, Learning Lab/STEM Exploratory, and devices combine to address AP 7A (p 11).

Applicant indicates project goal is to promote long-term replicable improvements in student academic outcomes through effective use of technology (p 13) by analyzing how teachers teach and how student learning is impacted. A comprehensive logic model with timelines, actions, and appropriate performance measures is provided (p 14). Barriers and potential solutions for each goal activity are identified (p 15-16). Integration of ISTE Capstone, Habits of Mind, and Knewton support the P-20 success of the project (p 2, 4) as does the robustness of the teacher PD component and family involvement.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Clear and detailed management plan is provided with timelines and benchmarks as well as responsible parties; feedback for improvement is built in to assessments (p 17-18). Partners have committed appropriate human and financial resources (p 18-19).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

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

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

Strengths:

Project director and coordinator are indicated, as is technology coordinator. All are experienced and have appropriate backgrounds (p 21).

Weaknesses:

No school participants are indicated.

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 12:13 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/20/2013 11:54 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	15	0
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Personnel	10	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	7
Total	100	7

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - i3 Development - 14: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

NA-Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA-Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the 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-Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA-Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

(2) The 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-Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA-Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

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

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

Strengths:

NA-Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA-Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The evaluation plan will collect and analyze both summative and formative information (p. 21). This will provide important information to the project staff on the progress towards interim and final goals, as well as assist in the identification of any barriers to implementation.

The evaluation includes specific research questions that will guide the data collection and analysis (p. 23). These questions also align to important project goals which will help ensure that the evaluation collects data to inform the implementation and impact.

The evaluation plan includes a specific dissemination plan for providing information to the project team (p. 20). This dissemination effort will allow staff to monitor the progress of the project and to inform any program modifications.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan will use multiple instruments to collect data including surveys, interviews, and focus group protocols (p. 22). However, there is limited information available on the content of the instruments, the frequency of administration, the establishment of reliability and validity of the instruments, and the sample for each instrument. These details are important because they establish that the collected data will be of high quality.

The evaluation plan specifies conducting content reviews (pp. 23-24). However, there are no details provided on how these reviews will be conducted such as what documents might be reviewed, what they will be reviewed for and who will conduct the reviews. These details are important to build an understanding the rigor of these reviews.

The evaluation plan provides no details on how the formative data will be analyzed. The formative component of the evaluation and the rigor with which it is accomplished is critical to the success of the project. The applicant could strengthen this section of the evaluation by providing a description of the analytic methods for the data they will collect (p. 23-24).

The impact section of the evaluation discusses conducting a multi-level regression but includes limited information (p. 25). It would strengthen the application if additional details were provided regarding the variables that would be included in each level of the model, and the degree to which data would be aggregated across grades or individual models will be generated for each grade level and content area. Further, it was difficult to ascertain how the impact evaluation would match schools and how the matching process would be assessed to ensure its adequacy.

The evaluation plan includes a sample size discussion for grades K-12 with a minimum detectable effect size (p. 25). However, it is unclear how the evaluation plan will analyze this large cross-grade sample because it appears as though the evaluation plan will only conduct impact analyses on separate and smaller samples. For example, one impact analysis will address only grades 3-8 while another impact analysis will only address the use of ACT scores. It is important to ensure that there are sufficiently large samples of students for each of these analyses to detect changes in outcomes.

The application discusses conducting an impact analysis by comparing students in the GROW program with Arizona statewide averages (p. 25). It would strengthen the application by including additional details on how this comparative

information would be generated and how the analyses would be conducted. This is important because it will ensure these analyses are rigorous and will supply meaningful data to the project staff.

Reader's Score: 7

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/20/2013 11:54 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2013 11:29 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Reader #5: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - i3 Development - 14: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: University Public Schools, Inc. (U411C130060)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project will substantially improve on the outcomes achieved by other practices, such as through better student outcomes, lower cost, or accelerated results.

Strengths:

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 evaluation plan includes all the necessary components of an adequately designed evaluation. The evaluation questions address project implementation strategies that are expected to lead to improved educational outcomes for all students and closing of the student achievement gaps. The applicants include evaluation formative and summative assessments, key evaluation questions, and evaluation and survey instrumentation plans. For example, the evaluation methods include surveys, focus groups, observations, and interviews. The evaluation activities are embedded in the project timelines table.

The minimum effect size and power analysis reported is acceptable to for meeting strong evidence standards and appears to be achievable. The quasi-experimental research design is sound and appropriate for the evaluation of the proposed project. The mixed method data collection approach including both quantitative and qualitative data will be promising in adhering to strong evidence standards for credible research. The hypothesis that "GROW" will have a positive impact on math and reading scores for the participating students is an additional strong component to this evaluation plan. The chart on pages 23(e39) and 24(e40) clearly delineates how technology, software development, academic outcomes, teacher development, and parental involvement data will be collected: either by surveys, focus groups, interviews, content reviews, or administrative data tools.

Weaknesses:

The project goals are not in alignment with the component goals on page 14(e30) and the key evaluation questions, the evaluation methods and the evaluation timeline as presented. The evaluation plan does not provide sufficient details to determine the extent to which the evaluation plan is implementable as submitted. The research methodologies are not fully explained. The data analysis tools are not discussed thoroughly. For example, the annual performance measures chart and the benchmarks on pages 17 & 18 should be included in the evaluation analysis to show how these performance measures and benchmark will be assessed. The evaluation plan does not provide sufficient data analysis details to determine whether it is highly likely to be implementable and effective in determining the extent to which the project has achieved its goals and objectives.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/23/2013 11:29 AM