

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2014 12:33 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| 1. Summary Statement                     | 0               |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Significance</b>                      |                 |               |
| 1. Significance                          | 35              | 35            |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>         |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                        | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan/Personnel             | 20              | 18            |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 15              | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 100             | 83            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 12: 84.411C

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

Applicant: New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

## 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:

The application highlights the approach piloted in 5 cities by the applicant called Teach to One (TTO) that provides individualized instruction for each student, with a customized daily schedule. TTO is a reimagined classroom approach where students learn what and how they need to in diverse subjects in an open classroom model. The TTO uses an algorithm that converts student data into an individualized schedule, integrates 5 learning modalities in the open classroom, establishes and digital and live lesson bank that is prioritize based on effectiveness, and via a web-based portal. (p 1-4)

The applicant's proposed TTO project states that it provides a complete classroom solution that is fully-integrated digital, collaborative, and live teacher-led instruction that can be implemented with fidelity across diverse public district and charter schools. The approach uses the students learning data to guide the individual schedule and direct to the material and live learning that meets the students learning needs.(p 5-6)

The proposed project identifies contributions to field of study by establishing causality through intentional validation of data that approach supports accelerated student academic growth. Outside research from the Teachers College at Columbia University will review approach to validate gains in math. A quasi-experimental design study will be conducted in the 5 existing schools to also determine causality. The proposed project has capacity for scalability as it is operating in

larger and disparate districts. (p 6-10)

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses identified.

**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 proposed project's 3 goals are clearly stated with descriptive information on the desired impact of each goal. (p 10-11) The applicant provides a logic model in Appendix D that includes information that substantiates the proposed approach capacity to achieve outcomes.

A phased approach will be used that includes milestones, activities, and stakeholders that will be involved in each phase. (p 11-14) Each phase includes sub-phases, timing, and description of efforts. The applicant identifies several risks and strategies to mitigate to the proposed project's implementation that includes technology, space, staff, student, and other risks. (p 14-15)

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**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 is leveraging an existing relationship with EPS to expand the pilot TTO and their letter of support is included. (Appendix G) The applicant proposes several feedback opportunities for stakeholders during the implementation of the project. The feedback loops are based on the stakeholder group and are timed to effectively support the stakeholder groups' role in implementation. Qualitative and quantitative measures will be used to provide feedback as well to inform implementation and support the proposed project's success. (p 17-18)

The application includes job descriptions of the implementation team and describes key project staff roles and responsibilities. The project director, a former teacher is the CEO of the applicant and the former CEO of the School of One located in New York City that emphasizes personalized learning. (p 18-19, Appendix F)

**Weaknesses:**

Additional information is needed in the application on the capacity of the project director in managing similar projects and the time allocated to effectively support implementation of the program. The role of project director is critical to the project's success and the availability of the project director can have a significant impact.

**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 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: This criterion was evaluated by another reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A: This criterion was evaluated by another reviewer.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/23/2014 12:33 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2014 01:59 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| 1. Summary Statement                     | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Significance</b>                      |                 |               |
| 1. Significance                          | 35              | 35            |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>         |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                        | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan/Personnel             | 20              | 20            |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 15              | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 100             | 85            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 12: 84.411C

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

Applicant: New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

##### General:

This application represents a full developed proposal in every way.

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 proposal does "provide access to learning experiences that are personalized, adaptive, and self-improving in order to optimize the delivery of instruction to learners with a variety of learning needs through the use of an algorithm, multiple modalities, an extensive lesson bank, and a web-based portal (p2-4)

The novelty of this project is noted through the use of the algorithm to generate actionable plans based off of data (p2) Novelty is also noted in the stage of implementation, as this is a project determining to bring a successful pilot to scale while determining causality (p6-7)

In addition, New Classrooms is uniquely positioned to share (partnerships with bellwether education partners, CPRE) the outcomes of their findings and potential success with the nation. (p8-9)

##### Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses were found.

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:

Three goals mentioned are clear and coherent as noted in the developed logic model in attachment 8.

The plan to select, prepare and support 5 schools is logical and well thought out.

The data measurements for student growth in Math are also well thought out (p10, section D)

Goal 3 actions are aligned to the expected outcome through the use of communication and sharing success of the initiative. (p11)

Risks and mitigations seem logical and an appropriate action plan provided (p14-15)

#### Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 30

### 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 management plan articulates key responsibilities and defined objectives with key milestones and due dates as noted on pages 15-17.

The plan is to assess student mathematic achievement at three points during the grant cycle. (p17)

There is evidence of commitment from the key partners in the grant such as EPS and CPRE as noted in Appendix G.

The proposal clearly lays out steps and objectives to provide continuous feedback through the cycle and provides an outline of the timing for the feedback cycle (p17-18)

The project director, has extensive experience in management positions as well as overseeing large federal grants. His team is also very experienced (p18-19)

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses.

**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

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/23/2014 01:59 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2014 01:54 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| 1. Summary Statement                     | 0               |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Significance</b>                      |                 |               |
| 1. Significance                          | 35              | 35            |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>         |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                        | 30              | 30            |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan/Personnel             | 20              | 18            |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 15              | 0             |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 100             | 83            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 12: 84.411C

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

Applicant: New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

## 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:

Absolute Priority is addressed via the technology-driven and delivered program that focuses on personalized learning that includes a variety of lesson modalities as well as using an algorithm to guide students to appropriate lessons for self-improvement (p 2-3). The applicant makes solid arguments for novel approach in regards to "complete" classroom solution that integrates the tool versus having it function as an add-on, as well as offering it for elementary and middle school students (p 5). Contribution to theory and knowledge has already begun via early implementation that showed success (p 6, e129); applicant would contribute further via validation of early results through broader deployment. If successful, plans to serve as an exemplar are in place via publication of a guidebook (p 8) as well as current channels of professional outreach (p 9).

#### Weaknesses:

None found.

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:

Three main project goals related to the program and intended outcomes are clearly and completely outlined in detail (p 10-11). Activities related to supporting the goals are broken down by clearly planned and thought-out phases and milestones (p 11-12). Applicant has taken into consideration all aspects of implementation, including preplanning for physical space layout, technology infrastructure, teacher and site support, assessment, and sharing of finding (p 12-14). The logic model (p e64) is clearly and coherently laid out. Appropriate risks to all stages of implementation – such as participating school withdrawal, teacher turnover, machine and furniture upgrades, and difficulty with participant buy-in/implementation – are identified and contingency plans are in place to mitigate them (p 14-15).

#### Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 30

### 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:**

Project Director is well-qualified to oversee implementation as he has done so successfully in the past (p 18). Key partners will demonstrate commitment via selection process (p 11-12) and stakeholders are committed to continuing the success of the past, smaller implementation. Key responsibilities, timelines, and milestones are clearly laid out for each phase of implementation and are appropriate to accomplishing applicant's stated goals and outcomes (p 12-13, 15-17). Feedback for continuous improvement will be collected from appropriate parties – teachers, and school and district leaders – at rigorous intervals ranging from daily to annually (p 18).

**Weaknesses:**

Schools must apply to participate in project and meet certain criteria to be considered (p 11-12) – what if there are not enough schools that are interested, or not enough schools that meet the application requirements?

**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 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

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/22/2014 01:54 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2014 10:14 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| 1. Summary Statement                     | 0               |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Significance</b>                      |                 |               |
| 1. Significance                          | 35              | 0             |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>         |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                        | 30              | 0             |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan/Personnel             | 20              | 0             |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 15              | 13            |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 100             | 13            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 12: 84.411C

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

Applicant: New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

## 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**

**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:**

- Key questions are included for implementation and impact evaluations. The key questions are aligned with the goals.
- The methodology and data collection plan for the implementation evaluation is sufficient. There is a clear analysis plan for qualitative data. Moreover, the data analysis program is specifically designed for sophisticated qualitative data analysis (pgs. 24-25).
- The methodology is clearly explained along with a rationale for why a comparative interrupted time series design was chosen (Appendix J.f). The selection criteria and process for schools are clearly explained (pg. 11-12)
- Although not included in the evaluation section (section D), the intervention and data source for the impact evaluation is included in the proposal (pgs. 6, 10). There is some discussion on the control and matched variables (pg. 23)
- Key components, such as outcomes, sample size, threshold, and minimum detectable effect size are included (Appendix J.f). The applicant also clearly explains and justifies the appropriateness of the threshold and MDES for the proposed sample size.

**Weaknesses:**

The logic model on page e64 includes two outcomes for student achievement: one for improved state exam scores and one for improvement compared to a control group. The applicant clearly explains the significance level for the control group comparison, but doesn't provide a baseline or the degree to which the treatment students are expected to improve. Some minor weaknesses include:

- o Two sets of evaluation questions are provided on page 21. Although both are labeled impact questions, the second set seems to be implementation questions. Therefore, this may be a typo or mislabeling error. Another potential mislabeling is the alignment of goals with the research questions (pg. 21). For example, question one for the impact evaluation is indicated to align with Goal 1, which is stated on page 10; however, it seems to be more aligned with Goal 2. The applicant clearly shows alignment between key questions and goals 1 and 2, but it is unclear which question(s) align with goal 3. The last question is appropriately aligned to Goal 3, but the applicant doesn't indicate this.
- o While there is a solid rationale for the matching process for the comparison group, the variables could be more specific. The applicant states that academic and socio-economic characteristics will be used, but no examples or specific variables are provided.

**Reader's Score:** 13

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/22/2014 10:14 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2014 09:51 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| <b>Summary Statement</b>                 |                 |               |
| 1. Summary Statement                     | 0               |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Significance</b>                      |                 |               |
| 1. Significance                          | 35              | 0             |
| <b>Quality of Project Design</b>         |                 |               |
| 1. Project Design                        | 30              | 0             |
| <b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>    |                 |               |
| 1. Management Plan/Personnel             | 20              | 0             |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 15              | 13            |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 100             | 13            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 12: 84.411C

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

Applicant: New Classrooms Innovation Partners, Inc. (U411C140023)

## 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 selection criterion was scored by another peer reviewer.

#### Weaknesses:

This selection criterion was scored by another peer 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 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:**

This selection criterion was scored by another peer reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

This selection criterion was scored by another peer reviewer.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

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

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

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

(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:**

This selection criterion was scored by another peer reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

This selection criterion was scored by another peer reviewer.

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

(2) The extent to which the 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:

#### Design

The evaluation is divided into two segments as indicated on page e36. One segment is focused on the impact of the program. The other segment will focus on program implementation. Together, these evaluation segments can help program staff identify what parts of the program are working and what changes should be made. This informs stakeholders' programmatic decision-making.

The impact evaluation is mixed-mode, including both quantitative and qualitative research questions and data as indicated on page e36. These types of data can be merged together to examine overlap intersections in order to confirm and justify findings.

The applicant proposes to conduct a quasi-experimental design that is commonly used in other similar research and evaluation. This design is a "comparative interrupted time series design [...] also known as the difference-in-difference approach" (e37). The design is a strong pre-test/post-test approach, which is validated (and recommended) in the field, which will result in rigorous determination of program impact.

The applicant proposes to do a qualitative evaluation of program implementation as indicated on page e39, which will include observations, as well as semi-structured teacher interviews (p e40). The process evaluation focuses on the "classroom environment, lesson structure, lesson implementation, and lesson content" (p. e39). This examination is comprehensive and addresses the research questions indicated in the evaluation plan on page e36. The analysis tools and approach are described on page e40.

#### Sampling and Recruitment

The evaluation plan describes the strategy that will be employed in order to identify and match the control sample. On page e38, it states, "we will employ propensity score matching techniques." This information is important in the evaluation plan and this strategy is strong because it takes several characteristics into account in order to determine which

prospective samples are most similar to the treatment group.

The evaluation plan appendix states that approximately 4,500 students will be recruited to participate in the evaluation (p. e58). The sample size is appropriate for the scope of the evaluation. The power analysis has been conducted and reported with minimum detectable effect sizes.

#### Resources

The organization responsible for the evaluation is clearly identified at the beginning of the evaluation plan on page e36. This organization consists of experienced program evaluators.

#### **Weaknesses:**

##### Sampling and Recruitment

The impact evaluation will consist of a sample of 5 treatment schools and 5 control schools. The evaluation plan states, "New Classrooms will identify five schools [...] that are also willing to participate. The sample for the impact evaluation will include these five treatment schools, as well as five matched comparison schools" (p. e36). The evaluation plan would be stronger if in addition to this statement, it also indicated how recruitment will occur.

##### Process evaluation

The applicant proposes to do a qualitative evaluation of program implementation as indicated on page e39. The applicant proposes to use the UTOP classroom observation protocol, but has not indicated who developed this tool or if it has been standardized on similar research and evaluation projects.

##### Other

There were some typos such as page e36 where the table repeats "quantitative impact evaluation." One should say, "qualitative process evaluation." Also, on page e39, the last paragraph has "(CITE)" in parentheses.

**Reader's Score:** 13

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/22/2014 09:51 PM