

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2014 09:14 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

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	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 7: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

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 addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

To address the Absolute Priority 3 and AP6, the applicant sets forth an ambitious and achievable target to support the college readiness of 900 youth with disabilities in 9 rural counties (page 1).

This is an exceptional approach to preparing youth to be college and career ready. It is designed to improve high school graduation rates, increase student growth, decrease dropout rates and increase college enrollment and completion rates (pages 1-4). The strength of the proposal and significance is that the applicant has a proven record of success in increasing student achievement (page e54) and therefore increases the likelihood of success.

The approach is considered a unique and novel approach based upon several factors:

- It improves the college readiness skills of students with disabilities by developing self-determination skills
- It implements an approach not typically taught in schools and;
- It examines an approach where there is currently limited empirical data.

This application will address these issues (page 2). The application contributes to the knowledge base by providing short term outcomes as well as pre and post outcomes. The application will create measurements, be disseminated nationally and build professional development models (pages 3 and 4).

The development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field were evident. For example, coaching, mentoring and instructional practices are improved due to the professional development models recommended (page 3); there is a dearth of research regarding the use of self-determination as a learning theory (page 3-4).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The 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).

(2) 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.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

The project goal to improve the overall college/career readiness of students with disabilities is clear and coherent. The project articulates an explicit plan including objectives (page 13) outcomes (page 19) and student measures (page 25). The goals are supported by a description of project activities. For example, support teams will implement project goals on an annual basis and provide modeling, consulting, practice and release activities (page 14). There is a clear methodology that constitutes a complete plan for implementation.

Potential risks are noted (page 12). For example, one potential risk is not be able to meet the individualized and varying needs of students with differing disabilities. The strategy to mitigate those risks include the use of alternative assessments and design practices based upon students individualized capabilities and aptitudes (page 12).

The combination of these factors help to ensure the project will be able to achieve its goals.

Weaknesses:

A noted weakness in this application was related to a lack of information regarding how the staff would ensure successful implementation of home visits. There was no methodology/activities to determine the procedures they would follow.

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.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

The applicant describes a plan that articulates the key responsibilities of management staff. The responsibilities of the college/career coaches, school based support teams and development teams are well described (page 13). A detailed work plan delineates activities, persons responsible, performance targets and monitoring efforts (page 14). For example, the Project Director will conduct monthly, bi-monthly and quarterly meetings. Key partners have provided letter of support and have experience implementing the project on a smaller scale. The demographics of student population and partners is provided (page e60). For example

Procedures for feedback include weekly, monthly and quarterly meetings, videos, and self-assessments (page 14).

The Project Director will be working on the project full time and has previous experience managing large projects.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

This section was scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

This section was scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/19/2014 09:14 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2014 03:47 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

Reader #2: *****

	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	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 7: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

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 addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

This is a very focused project designed to provide supports to students with disabilities to become college/career ready through the use of one-to-one support and the use of an Individual Career Plan. It is a timely project that is tailored to students' needs and at the same time addresses the current focus of most high schools on post-secondary goals.

The proposal provides justification for the project goals and sets up a novel model for supporting students with disabilities. It is also significant that they are mirroring a program that is available for students without disabilities. The results of this project could certainly expand the knowledge base and impact practices in schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) 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).

(2) 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.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

The proposal provides very specific details about the project goals (pg. 7) which are projected student outcomes, as well as the activities that will take place to implement the program. A fully developed logic model is provided showing a well-thought out plan (Appendix).

The project describes a project design that is structured and prescribed, but also respects the unique differences found in schools and communities (pg. 8). The phased implementation plan is realistic and allows for adjustments to be made as lessons are learned (pg. 12).

The project includes information about risks and potential responses effectively. A chart is provided identifying potential risks and their planned responses to those concerns (pg. 12) making it evident this has received consideration.

Weaknesses:

In any project like this attrition is a concern. Details regarding how the project would keep students and families involved is not provided to adequate detail.

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.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope

as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

A detailed management plan identified project activities, timeline and staff responsibilities is provided making it easy to see the implementation plan. The plan is detailed to the point of replicability. The timeline provided is reasonable and achievable.

The project includes several organizations, all with the expertise and experience to successfully meet project goals (pg. 17). Letters of support are provided by key stakeholders indicating their commitment to the project.

The project uses a Continuous Improvement Cycle to monitor project operations. The project director is experienced and has the expertise to effectively manage the project.

This is a well thought out proposal and management plan showing a clear line of planning from design to implementation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2014 03:47 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 10:01 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

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	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 7: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

none noted

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 addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

The applicant addresses Absolute Priorities 3 (Improving Academic Outcomes for Students with Disabilities) and 6 (Rural) for their project. The proposal is centered upon providing support to approximately 900 students with disabilities living in rural Kentucky areas (p.1). The novel approach proposed includes creating and professionally developing targeted, focused teams to work one-on-one with students with disabilities. The intended outcome of this process is that exceptional learners from rural, high-poverty communities receive frequent one-on-one guidance and support. The expected outcome is that the students will develop the self-determination needed to set and achieve individual, personalized goals focused on their post-high school aspirations (p.4). No student is excluded - all severity of disabilities are included. The applicant reports that research reveals the significance of self-determination but is unclear how students with disabilities might deliberately acquire those skills (p.5). The applicant will draw upon existing partnerships and included a very detailed process on how they will collect and disseminate their findings to benefit all (pp.5-6).

Weaknesses:

none noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The 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).

(2) 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.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

The goal for this project is clearly stated: "We will improve the overall college/career readiness of students with disabilities in each participating school "(p.7). The applicant provides a detailed list of objectives (p.7) which are in alignment with the program goal. They also include evaluation questions and how they propose to answer these questions . These are aligned with their stated goal (p.19, pp.22-24). They also include a detailed work plan with timelines and responsibilities (pp.15-16) and a fully developed logic model that organizes the project succinctly (Appendix D). They identify 7 potential risks and offer solutions and mitigations for each (p.12).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide any information on the processes they will utilize regarding how they will increase parent involvement.

Reader's Score: 28

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.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed

project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a clear and concise plan for executing the proposed project. They address the key responsibilities of all required staff for execution of the project and include detailed timelines and milestones (pp.13-17). They provide details regarding the specific contributions of key partners for the required matching of funds. The application include letters of Commitments and Agreements from all involved parties (Appendix F). They provide vitas for all known staff who will participate and job descriptions for all project personnel whom will be involved in this project(Appendix F). The information provided supports the adequacy of the staff to effectively run and supervise this project. A graphic is included that details the continuous improvement cycle model they will utilize for this project (p.21). They also include details of all activities and the ensuing schedule and staff responsible to collect and disseminate data throughout the duration of the project (p.18).

Weaknesses:

none noted

Reader's Score: 20

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.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 10:01 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2014 08:29 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

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	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	11
Total	100	11

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 7: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

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 addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The 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).

(2) 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.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The key evaluation questions provided are important, clear, and appropriate (p. 19). The key questions address impact of the program on student behavior and teacher perceptions. The key questions also assess program fidelity and teacher buy-in. All of these components are important for assessing impact and replication. The key components are presented and linked to the outcomes (pp. 22-24). The measures intended for quantitative analysis are listed and described in the proposal (pp. 22-24). These measures seem strong as they include state standardized tests of achievement and widely used and previously measures such as the PBIS to assess student behavior (pp. 22-24). The sample size is reported (p. 20) as well as the minimum detectable effect size (MDES) (p. 20). The evaluation teams selected appear skilled and capable of carrying out the evaluation plan presented (p. 25).

Weaknesses:

More detail about the power analysis would strengthen this proposal. The MDES is provided but the proposal does not provide information on the needed/expected power level or sample size. Moreover, the student behavior data is collected solely from teachers (p. 22). It is important to collect student behavior data from students as well. Moreover it is important to capture student exploration and process behavior (e.g., creating a resume, searching for a job, visiting schools, completing an application). There is no mention of capturing these exploratory actions or process behaviors that support career and college goals. Finally, since a substantial portion of the evaluation is qualitative with a separate evaluation team dedicated to the qualitative data (p. 25), it seems appropriate to thoroughly outline this portion of the plan (p. 21). Interview data will be gathered from teachers and students but is not clear if these are structured, semi-structured, or open interviews. It is also not clear what types of questions will be asked. More detail is needed to fully assess the appropriateness of this method.

Reader's Score: 11

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2014 08:29 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2014 01:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

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	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	12
Total	100	12

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 7: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Green River Regional Educational Cooperative (U411C140061)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The 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).

(2) 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.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

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

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

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

(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.

The proposed four evaluation questions address the goals and objectives of the project activities which aim to improve the overall college/career readiness (CCR) of students with disabilities. The questions examine the extent project activities are improving participating students' perceptions and behavior, teacher perceptions, increasing the number of students meeting state CCR standards, implementation fidelity across all schools, and the extent students, teachers, coaches feel the project is helping participating students achieve their CCR goals. The questions are clear and align with the goals of the project and the selected priority #3 (pg.19). A quasi experimental evaluation design is proposed where students with disabilities in participating schools are compared to matched comparison schools using propensity score matching (PSM) based on school level data from the Kentucky School Report Card (9 schools- 900 students in intervention group, 9 schools -900 students in comparison group, total 1800 students -18 rural high schools in Kentucky). Appropriate attributes for matching are identified to include student, teacher, school characteristics, and baseline achievement scores (pg. 20). The QED is an appropriate design to answer the proposed questions if implemented correctly and using PSM to select the comparison group matches/balances the intervention and comparison groups on a large number of covariates without losing a large number of observations.

(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.

This section was well outlined. The analysis plan addresses most of the key areas of concern in a QED design and outlines how qualitative and quantitative data will be analyzed. Logistic regression or hierarchical generalized linear model (HGLM) for assessing student outcomes are proposed for quantitative data. Both methods are rigorous and HGLM takes into account the nesting of data within clusters (pg. 20). The applicant has also estimated the minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact and provided sample sizes. A description of how qualitative data will be analyzed is provided to include use of fidelity checklists for implementation and for school observations applying inter-rater reliability among observers to ensure consistency (pg. 21-22). Outcome measures for both quantitative and qualitative data are described.

(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

This section is well described by the applicant. The proposed acceptable implementation threshold is 75% of available measures (pg. 21). Oxley's Continuous Improvement Model illustrated by the applicant will guide the implementation. In addition to fidelity check lists, school observations and field notes will guide the implementation. The applicant has provided a detailed table of outcomes/measures, implementation targets, and analytic approach.

(4). The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

This section is also well outlined with sufficient resources identified to carry out the evaluation effectively. The applicant proposes to use two external evaluators- The Center for Research in Education Policy (CREP) at the University of Memphis (for quantitative data) and the Collaborative for Teaching and Learning (CTL) (for qualitative data). This will enhance the validity of findings. The qualifications of the evaluators are provided and the cost of the evaluation included in the budget.

Weaknesses:

Attrition and incidences of missing data are a constant threat to experimental designs and more so for special or at risk populations such as this one. The applicant did not address these threats in the analysis plan.

Outcome measures: More details (e.g. samples) are needed on the outcome measures including their psychometric properties which provide good information on the validity and reliability of the measures especially when looking at student and teacher outcomes.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/16/2014 01:05 PM