

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2014 03:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel	25	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Priority Questions		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. Cost-Effectiveness/Produc	1	0
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
1. Enable Broad Ad of Eff Pr	2	2
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
1. Early Learning	0	0
Total	103	65

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2014 Validation Grant Review - 3: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Questions

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 national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.
- (2) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.
- (3) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address the unmet needs within the context of the absolute priority. Additionally, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the proposed project will address unmet demands and enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale. Applicants are also encouraged to explain how the applicant will ensure future scaling should the proposed project have positive results.

Strengths:

1. The Applicant clearly addresses how the Project will meet national need and the priorities it is attempt to meet. Applicant plans to teach teachers how to better incorporate CCSS into their teaching in order to raise student achievement and engagement.
2. Applicant provides documentation for the fact that, "the demand for CCSS-aligned curricula that engages – rather than alienates- teachers is well- documented (e23)
3. Applicant states that LDC already is utilized by New York City and Los Angeles Unified, and has the ability to scale nationally(e22-23) through more than 40 states, "LDC will be able to disseminate this effective work across the country through our partnering networks in 40+ states"(e23)
4. Applicant specifically addresses aspects of their model that make it appropriate for national expansion, such as "being structured but flexible...portable and constantly being improved upon...has a growing community of support and has a network of partners who communicate and support LDC implementation"(e29-30)

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

- (1) The 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.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to develop a clear set of goals as well as the applicant's plan for achieving those goals. In designing this plan, applicants should consider the risks that could prevent success and what strategies they will implement to counteract those risks to ensure the proposed project is implemented successfully and will achieve its goals. Further, applicants are encouraged to identify barriers to scaling the proposed project and address how they will overcome the identified barriers.

Strengths:

1. Applicant clearly and completely addresses Project Goals(e31-33), measurable objectives, and how objectives will be met.
2. Applicant clearly defines implementation activities and strategies and the reasons for adopting these strategies (e36-42)
3. Applicant Applicant clearly identifies potential risks to project success along with steps it is taking to mitigate those risks (e42-44)
4. Applicant address how the grant funding will help mitigate barriers to scale such as the fact that studies have shown that the Project is in, " need for more consistent high quality of teacher-designed modules"(e27) that they intend to achieve through coaching, jurying/feedback and teacher collaboration"(e27)
5. The "Gates Foundation formally and legally spun off its \$20 million+ of grant investment in creating and research-validating effective Common Core implementation resources"(e44) to the LDC Project. Applicant clearly identifies barriers that have prevented it from scaling more than it has in the past and identifies what the i3 funding will be spent on to help to overcome these barriers to scaling (e45-48)

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 clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

(3) The extent to which the project director has experience managing large, complex projects.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate both the successes and challenges of the project and use the lessons from their ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project to improve the project. Applicants also are encouraged to explain the organization's plan to operate the project at a national level or regional level during and after the life of the grant. Applicants are also encouraged to think about how the project director's past experience demonstrates an ability to manage large, complex projects, such as an i3

Validation grant.

Strengths:

1. Applicant identifies the responsibilities (e54-55); clearly states well-defined objectives (e49); the timeline and milestones for Grant activities (e50-52); matrices used to assess progress on modules and teacher use are identified, however (see below)
2. Project Budget is clearly presented.
3. Project Director, [REDACTED] is identified, his resume included, and he appears to have the necessary experience (e57-59).

Weaknesses:

1. For a Project that proposes to meet Absolute Priority 2, the Applicant does not clearly state matrices and annual performance goals for student achievement, engagement, or college and career readiness other than “statistically significant increase in student state test scores”(e49).
2. Tech costs of \$1.5 million over the course of the Grant seems excessive (e254)
3. The teacher stipend for this Project that is so heavily dependent on the extra work teachers are expected to perform (writing units, teaching units, meeting to collaborate on units) is only [REDACTED] per teacher per year which is insufficient (e261).

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The applicant should address whether the methods for evaluation would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards and how the evaluation design will ensure the project will be evaluated at the proposed level of scale. The response to this criterion should include a description of the proposed sample size and the estimated project impacts as well as the key components of the

proposed project for implementation. 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

Priority Questions

CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity - CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:
 - (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.
 - (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.
 - (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide--

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost-effective approach; and
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi - CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

1. Applicant states that its “curriculum design, implementation, and reflections process is both systematic and capable of rapid expansion” (e15).
2. Applicant plans to codify its “tools and resources to support teacher professional learning of CCSS”(e18)
3. By the end of the Grant, LDC plans to:
 - a. Validate and codify a set of professional development standards, processes and tools... to ensure LDC technical assistance is scalable
 - b. Expend its current online resources
 - c. Continue to build static coaching resources
 - d. Transform the static LDC coaching support into relevant and accessible asynchronous opportunities to support teacher LDC viral adoption nationwide (e20)

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 2

IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning - IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning

1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that improve the coordination and alignment between early learning and development systems and elementary education systems in order to improve transitions for children from birth through third grade.

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/04/2014 03:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2014 01:23 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Priority Questions		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. Cost-Effectiveness/Produc	1	0
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
1. Enable Broad Ad of Eff Pr	2	2
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
1. Early Learning	0	0
Total	103	72

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2014 Validation Grant Review - 3: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Questions

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 national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.
- (2) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.
- (3) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address the unmet needs within the context of the absolute priority. Additionally, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the proposed project will address unmet demands and enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale. Applicants are also encouraged to explain how the applicant will ensure future scaling should the proposed project have positive results.

Strengths:

- 1) The applicant makes a clear case for the need of the project to meet the national need and priorities. For example, the applicant points out that proficiency in literacy are an area of national need and priority. The need for a strong curriculum to meet Common Core Standards, teacher expertise, and student engagement are areas that the project will address since the U.S. is lagging behind other developed countries in proficiency levels.
- 2) The literacy project appears to have been successfully implemented in several school districts across the nation with positive results. Expanded growth of the LDC has shown that teachers and other school officials rated the project very high in key areas the project is addressing including teachers' perceptions of students improving understanding of content and improvement of students' writing skills. This and a recent evaluation on the impact of LCD strongly indicate the favorable ability of the project to reach the proposed level of scale.
- 3) Through its online resource library, teacher community, and private sector support such as the Melinda and Bill Gates Foundation, the project has developed a culture in which it can expand nationally. The structure of the project is conducive for teachers to share and obtain best practices from one another.

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses
- 2) No weaknesses
- 3) No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The 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.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to develop a clear set of goals as well as the applicant's plan for achieving those goals. In designing this plan, applicants should consider the risks that could prevent success and what strategies they will implement to counteract those risks to ensure the proposed project is implemented successfully and will achieve its goals. Further, applicants are encouraged to identify barriers to scaling the proposed project and address how they will overcome the identified barriers.

Strengths:

1) The applicant provides a clear and coherent plan for the project with specific goals and objectives and a detailed description of the activities designed to align and implement the LCD services to Common Core curricula. The applicant has identified potential risks and the solutions in addressing those risks are clearly described. The applicant's goals and objectives support a complete plan designed to increase student literacy proficiency, train highly qualified teachers in classroom LCD instruction, and garner district and school level for implementation.

2) The applicant identifies several areas that i3 grant funds will be used to address to fully implement the LDC project services including continuous professional development and resources for teachers. Grant funds will be used to test the validity of the project to improve practices and the identification and complete description of all potential barriers and the solutions are clear.

Weaknesses:

1) No weaknesses

2) No weaknesses

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 clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

(3) The extent to which the project director has experience managing large, complex projects.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate both the successes and challenges of the project and use the lessons from their ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project to improve the project. Applicants also are encouraged to explain the organization's plan to operate the project at a national level or regional level during and after the life of the grant. Applicants are also encouraged to think about how the project director's past experience demonstrates an ability to manage large, complex projects, such as an i3 Validation grant.

Strengths:

1) The applicant's management plan conveys the key responsibilities of the project and has clearly stated goals and objectives. The plan includes a timeline, accompanied with milestones, for each year of the grant and the metrics such as students' state test scores, data on students' literacy skills, teacher efficacy is clearly described. The metrics relate to the annual goals and will provide important assessment information on the progress the project is making.

2) The financial and operating plan is coherent for implementing a project of this size and scope. The applicant has clearly detailed the staff, school districts, and partner roles will be to ensure a successful start-up in Los Angeles and New York. The plan appears to contain the components necessary for a national program due to the structured system in place and the success of the projects in other school districts across the nation.

3) The project director has education and experience to lead large and complex organizations. He is the founder and CEO of LDC and brings a wealth of experience including holding leadership roles with large organizations such as the New York City Department of Education and the Princeton Review. He has managed budgets in excess of \$24M and supervised 75 while with the NYCDOE.

Weaknesses:

1) No weaknesses

2) No weaknesses

3) No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The applicant should address whether the methods for evaluation would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards and how the evaluation design will ensure the project will be evaluated at the proposed level of scale. The response to this criterion should include a description of the proposed sample size and the estimated project impacts as well as the key components of the proposed project for implementation. 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

Priority Questions

CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity - CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

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

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

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide--

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost-effective approach; and
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

The applicant did not respond to this criterion

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to this criterion

Reader's Score: 0

CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi - CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

(a) The applicant has clearly identified the practice (LCD) to increase students reading and math literacy proficiency as well increases college attendance for students who received the practice. The LCD program is already widely used in school districts and is planned for expansion in New York and Los Angeles. Toolkits and web-based materials as well as formalized training to codify the practice is well-designed by the applicant. The applicant makes a strong case for aligning LCD with the Common Core Standards generally adopted by the targeted school districts.

(b) The applicant's evaluation plan is broad and should assess nearly all facets of the LCD program. From the implementation phase to the impact the practice has on students, the evaluation plan has been carefully designed to reach the intended outcomes and sustain itself over time and within various (different) settings and diverse student populations.

(c) The applicant has a clear plan in developing materials and other resources for educators to successfully implement the practice. Logically, the applicant will disseminate materials and toolkits only coupled with training support to ensure fidelity.

(d) The applicant is clear in its plan to assess the replication and adaptability of the practice in a number of locations across the U.S. including Los Angeles and New York. The evaluation plan is designed to assess all of the materials and resources on the proposed outcomes as well as the implementation of the practice in various settings and locations. The evaluation plan is supported by independent researchers who are charged with assessing the detailed components of the practice.

Weaknesses:

- (a) No weaknesses
- (b) No weaknesses
- (c) No weaknesses
- (d) No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2

IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning - IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning

1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that improve the coordination and alignment between early learning and development systems and elementary education systems in order to improve transitions for children from birth through third grade.

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2014 01:23 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/08/2014 04:45 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Priority Questions		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. Cost-Effectiveness/Produc	1	0
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
1. Enable Broad Ad of Eff Pr	2	2
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
1. Early Learning	0	0
Total	103	71

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2014 Validation Grant Review - 3: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Questions

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 national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.
- (2) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.
- (3) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address the unmet needs within the context of the absolute priority. Additionally, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the proposed project will address unmet demands and enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale. Applicants are also encouraged to explain how the applicant will ensure future scaling should the proposed project have positive results.

Strengths:

Applicant provides a convincing demonstration of how American students lag in essential literacy achievement, including on international exams, and that effective implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) (including high standards, teacher efficacy, and student engagement) is a national need across 40-some states. (pages e2-3) Applicant directly addresses and supports its priority of building practitioner expertise in the design and implementation of CCSS-aligned teaching tasks, instructional plans, scoring of student work, and calibrated jurying processes and protocols. (pages e17-18) Applicant reviews its history in these areas and several past qualitative and quasi-experimental studies of the program showing evidence of improving teacher literacy instruction and student achievement. (pages e23-28) The project has a high likelihood to have the estimated impacts, and national expansion is feasible with evidence of strong impact from the proposed evaluation.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

- (1) The 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.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that

prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to develop a clear set of goals as well as the applicant's plan for achieving those goals. In designing this plan, applicants should consider the risks that could prevent success and what strategies they will implement to counteract those risks to ensure the proposed project is implemented successfully and will achieve its goals. Further, applicants are encouraged to identify barriers to scaling the proposed project and address how they will overcome the identified barriers.

Strengths:

Applicant provides an exemplary plan for addressing its goals, project goals, and risk mitigation. The project goals are clearly identified, including measurable objectives and what evidence will be used to meet those objectives. (pages e32-33) A theory of change, including intermediate outcomes and long-term impact is clearly visualized. (page e34) The plan for achieving those goals is clear and complete and covers a range of activities including helping teachers adapt their CCSS-aligned reading/writing teaching tasks to address specific student needs; creating a host of tools and modules for teachers developing instructional plans that are vertically and horizontally aligned; providing professional development and implementation strategies for teachers; and developing administrator and teacher capacity, among others. (pages e35-42). Applicant identifies three essential conditions that could provide barriers to project success and addresses how the proposed project will mitigate each potential risk. (pages e42-43) The applicant provides a particularly thorough chart of each identified past barrier and how grant funding under this proposal will help to fund solutions, allowing scale to be reached. (pages e45-46)

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 clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

(3) The extent to which the project director has experience managing large, complex projects.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate both the successes and challenges of the project and use the lessons from their ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project to improve the project. Applicants also are encouraged to explain the organization's plan to operate the project at a national level or regional level during and after the life of the grant. Applicants are also encouraged to think about how the project director's past experience demonstrates an ability to manage large, complex projects, such as an i3 Validation grant.

Strengths:

Applicant provides a thorough and complete management plan articulating key roles and responsibilities of program personnel, 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. (pages e48-56) Applicant clearly identifies how the different strands of its funding (district funding supports, applicant funding, and federal grant funds) will interact and provide resources for leadership support, teacher training, teacher leader capacity building, and national dissemination. (pages e56-57) The project director is exceptionally well qualified to lead a project of this size and scope, having served as executive director of the New York City school system and a senior executive at a nonprofit where he oversaw 75 public schools. He has experience leading multi-year strategic business planning processes and large grant implementation. (pages 57-59)

Weaknesses:

A potential weakness is that some of the budget line items seem high, for example technology costs. (pages e254) The budget may also have provided for too little per teacher for professional development activities outside the Summer Institutes. (pages e252-53)

Reader's Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The applicant should address whether the methods for evaluation would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards and how the evaluation design will ensure the project will be evaluated at the proposed level of scale. The response to this criterion should include a description of the proposed sample size and the estimated project impacts as well as the key components of the proposed project for implementation. 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

Priority Questions

CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity - CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

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

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

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide--

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost-effective approach; and
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

Applicant did not address this priority.

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi - CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

Applicant provides a detailed and coherent plan for how it will validate and enable the broad adoption of its effective practices, including through a library of nationally juried Common Core State Standards assignments and instructional mini-tasks; training and coaching processes and tools for teacher learning, collaboration, reflection, and improvement of literacy practices; a national multi-tiered jurying system for teachers; nationally tested student work rubrics and scoring processes; and third party evaluation. (pages e18-22) The discussion thoroughly addresses each sub-element (a) through (d).

Weaknesses:

The application provides limited insight into the adaptability of critical components to diverse learners. The project's is much more tightly focused on impacting the teaching environment.

Reader's Score: 2

IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning - IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning

1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that improve the coordination and alignment between early learning and development systems and elementary education systems in order to improve transitions for children from birth through third grade.

General:

Applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/08/2014 04:45 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2014 02:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel	25	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
Priority Questions		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. Cost-Effectiveness/Produc	1	0
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
1. Enable Broad Ad of Eff Pr	2	0
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
1. Early Learning	0	0
Total	103	29

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2014 Validation Grant Review - 3: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Questions

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 national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.
- (2) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.
- (3) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address the unmet needs within the context of the absolute priority. Additionally, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the proposed project will address unmet demands and enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale. Applicants are also encouraged to explain how the applicant will ensure future scaling should the proposed project have positive results.

Strengths:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

- (1) The 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.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to develop a clear set of goals as well as the applicant's plan for achieving those goals. In designing this plan, applicants should consider the risks that could prevent success and what strategies they will implement to counteract those risks to ensure the proposed project is implemented successfully and will achieve its goals. Further, applicants are encouraged to identify barriers to scaling the proposed project and address how they will overcome the identified barriers.

Strengths:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

(2) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

(3) The extent to which the project director has experience managing large, complex projects.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate both the successes and challenges of the project and use the lessons from their ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project to improve the project. Applicants also are encouraged to explain the organization's plan to operate the project at a national level or regional level during and after the life of the grant. Applicants are also encouraged to think about how the project director's past experience demonstrates an ability to manage large, complex projects, such as an i3 Validation grant.

Strengths:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

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 methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

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

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

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The applicant should address whether the methods for evaluation would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards and how the evaluation design will ensure the project will be evaluated at the proposed level of scale. The response to this criterion should include a description of the proposed sample size and the estimated project impacts as well as the key components of the proposed project for implementation. 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 project proposes a mixed methods evaluation design with a quasi-experimental quantitative component (p. 45). Propensity score matching will be utilized to construct a comparison group of students (p. 45, 49). This design can provide evidence of effectiveness that will meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations. The third-party evaluator has evaluated previous implementations of the proposed project and is well qualified to implement this evaluation design.

The proposal provides three evaluation questions (pp. 47-48) that can guide the conduct of the project evaluation. These questions address both implementation and impact. A "Proposed Evaluation Timeline" (p. 55) provides a year-by-year schedule of proposed evaluation activities.

The proposed evaluation will examine differential impacts by student subgroup (p. 48). The proposed evaluation study will also examine the relationships between implementation and impact of teacher and student learning (p. 51). These analyses will deepen the understanding of the project's impact.

The proposed evaluator will examine the reliability, dimensionality, and validity of various implementation measures (p. 54). Such examination is important to insuring the quality of the data upon which the evaluation will be based.

The proposed evaluator will prepare descriptive analyses that will examine the distribution of schools, teachers, and student characteristics in the intervention and comparison sites (p. 53). These descriptive analyses will assist external readers in understanding the context in which the project operated and in which the impact occurred

The proposed evaluator will test the intervention and comparison groups for initial equivalence (p. 54). If non-equivalence is found, then analyses of post-program outcomes will be adjusted to reduce the influence of those existing initial differences.

Approximately 11% of the total project budget has been reserved for the cost of the evaluation. This appears to be sufficient to fund the conduct of an evaluation of the scope and quality desired.

Weaknesses:

The proposal indicates that state assessments in mathematics and reading will be used as the outcome measures (p. 48). Project participants will be enrolled in schools in at two different states which may be utilizing two different state assessments. The proposal did not discuss how the results of different state assessments will be combined to produce an overall measure of impact.

Reader's Score: 29

Priority Questions

CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity - CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

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

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

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide--

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost-effective approach; and
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi - CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi

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

- (a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption,

including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

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

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

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

Strengths:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning - IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning

1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that improve the coordination and alignment between early learning and development systems and elementary education systems in order to improve transitions for children from birth through third grade.

General:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2014 02:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2014 02:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management/Personnel	25	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
Priority Questions		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. Cost-Effectiveness/Produc	1	0
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi		
1. Enable Broad Ad of Eff Pr	2	0
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning		
1. Early Learning	0	0
Total	103	30

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 2014 Validation Grant Review - 3: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (U411B140029)

Questions

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 national need and priorities the applicant is seeking to meet.
- (2) The likelihood that the project will have the estimated impact, including the extent to which the applicant demonstrates that unmet demand for the proposed project or the proposed services will enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale.
- (3) The feasibility of national expansion if favorable outcomes are achieved.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address the unmet needs within the context of the absolute priority. Additionally, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the proposed project will address unmet demands and enable the applicant to reach the proposed level of scale. Applicants are also encouraged to explain how the applicant will ensure future scaling should the proposed project have positive results.

Strengths:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

- (1) The 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.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to develop a clear set of goals as well as the applicant's plan for achieving those goals. In designing this plan, applicants should consider the risks that could prevent success and what strategies they will implement to counteract those risks to ensure the proposed project is implemented successfully and will achieve its goals. Further, applicants are encouraged to identify barriers to scaling the proposed project and address how they will overcome the identified barriers.

Strengths:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

(2) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional (as defined in the Validation Notice Inviting Applications) during the project period.

(3) The extent to which the project director has experience managing large, complex projects.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate both the successes and challenges of the project and use the lessons from their ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the project to improve the project. Applicants also are encouraged to explain the organization's plan to operate the project at a national level or regional level during and after the life of the grant. Applicants are also encouraged to think about how the project director's past experience demonstrates an ability to manage large, complex projects, such as an i3 Validation grant.

Strengths:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

N/A 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 methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

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

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

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

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The applicant should address whether the methods for evaluation would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards and how the evaluation design will ensure the project will be evaluated at the proposed level of scale. The response to this criterion should include a description of the proposed sample size and the estimated project impacts as well as the key components of the proposed project for implementation. 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 investigators propose an evaluation plan that addresses most of the evaluation requirements of the i3 funds. Investigators present relevant and key research questions that will be addressed by the methods and research design. Their study proposes using either a cluster Randomized Controlled Trial (RTC) or an experimental design with matching groups. Their logic for not necessarily using a RCT is understandable, however investigators should make great efforts for using an RTC model if they want to meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

The investigators propose an evaluation plan that will collect information to assist with the identification of the project's specific features, documenting treatment fidelity and its impact on teachers and students.

Investigators will contract with UCLA's Center for Research and Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing, an evaluation group that will conduct all evaluation activities. SRI International is an independent, nonprofit research institute with more than 50 years of experience conducting research. Evaluation experts appear to have extensive experience with design and analysis. This group will bring a lot of strengths to the project.

Investigators also presented plans to study differentiated outcomes for diverse student populations and diverse settings. Budgeted resources for this purpose are sufficient for carrying out the proposed evaluation plan.

Weaknesses:

No major weaknesses have been identified in this project.

Reader's Score: 30

Priority Questions

CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity - CPP 1: Improv Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

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

(a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.

- (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.
- (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide--

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost-effective approach; and
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi - CPP 2: Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practi

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

Strengths:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning - IP: Supporting High-Quality Early Learning

- 1. The Secretary encourages applicants to propose projects that improve the coordination and alignment between early learning and development systems and elementary education systems in order to improve transitions for children from birth through third grade.**

General:

N/A Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2014 02:17 PM