

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 01:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	18
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	0
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	103	18

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - i3 Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(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.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) 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 level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

Strengths:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) 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.

(2) 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.

(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 measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Strengths:

The application provides substantial information about the research design and questions, along with sufficient explanation about analytical strategies and methods. The research questions are logical and directly relate to the overall project goals and clearly presented logic model (p 14). The narrative includes an appropriate and strong set of project activities and accompanying data collection and analyses, aligned with each other. Thus, if implemented with fidelity, the study should produce strong, clear results that meet What Works Clearinghouse standards.

The evaluation questions are clear, direct, and appropriate for the project purpose and design, and the evaluation plan includes a sufficient variety of data collection activities and types to adequately address the research questions (i.e., observations, assessments, surveys (p 28). The project uses previously validated instruments for surveys and observations (p 29), which provides a critical element of quality to the resulting analyses.

The narrative notes that schools will be randomly assigned to treatment or control groups, with the overall design a multisite, cluster-randomized experiment. This makes the study more replicable and the resulting overall effectiveness would meet What Works standards.

The narrative's evaluation plan includes detailed and specific metrics for analyses, with a clearly specified sample size and minimum detectable effect sizes provided (p 27), along with an acceptable measurable threshold for implementation (p 28). All of these give credibility for the design of the project.

The evaluation contractor (AIR) is an experienced project and program evaluation company. The budget for evaluation is about 18% of the overall project funding, which should be sufficient to carry out an effective evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The application is not clear on the number of AIR staff involved in the evaluation. Similarly, the narrative does not provide the time allocation for evaluation staff on the project. Thus, it is not possible to determine if the resources allocated are sufficient to carry out an effective evaluation.

The interrater reliability for the teacher portfolio scores (p 33) is relatively low (i.e., .51-.79). However, the application does not state how project staff will ensure reliability of scoring is sufficiently high to produce strong and verifiable data for analyses.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity****1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)**

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:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

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:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 01:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/30/2015 10:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	18
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	0
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	103	18

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - i3 Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(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.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) 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 level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

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 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.

(2) 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.

(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 measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Strengths:

- The design is a multi-site, cluster-randomized experiment which will make it possible to draw strong inferences about the effectiveness of the eMINTS PD program and fully meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations. (p 25-26)
- Nine important and clearly worded evaluation questions are listed on pages 25 and 26 of the application. Questions are appropriate and aligned with the intended outcomes of evaluation.
- The cost effectiveness competitive preference priority was addressed with research question 6 and is detailed on p 34.
- The methods proposed for addressing the evaluation questions are appropriate.
- The proposed sample is large and diverse including 56 high-needs schools (40% or more students in poverty) in 56 districts reaching about 448 teachers and 25,500 students over 5 years in Alabama, Arkansas and Utah. Project.
- The proposed data analysis does address the potential for differential effectiveness on at least some variables including district and school.
- The minimal detectable effect size for the design and sample was calculated to be 0.20 for primary achievement measures (p 28) and .25 for survey measures (p28) which are reasonable.
- The data analysis will use in HLM model with students nested within schools and schools nested within districts and will be supplemented with a sensitivity analysis. These analytic techniques are appropriate for the design.
- The sampling plan thoughtfully anticipates sample attrition for study estimating it at five percent which should not be a problem.
- The evaluation plan clearly articulates all the key components of the project as reflected in the program logic model on page 14.
- The measurable threshold for fidelity of implementation was reported to be 80% on page 32 of the application. The application noted that the researchers will revisit and refine that criterion during the study which is appropriate.
- The application identifies AIR as the agency that will implement the program evaluation and provided a vita for the AIR evaluator assigned to the project (Appendix F). Both the evaluator and the agency are well-qualified to implement the study.
- Page 19 of the budget narrative details the evaluation budget and some components by year with a total of \$2,159,955 for a five year evaluation.
- The budgetary and human resources allocated for this project should be adequate to effectively conduct the evaluation
- Overall the evaluation plan is very thoughtful, rigorous, and appropriate for addressing the evaluation questions and is rated in the "well developed" range with a score of 18.

Weaknesses:

- The applicant says districts have shown interest in participating in the eMINTS PD (p 12) but did not say how many or provide documentation other than a support letter from the Granite School District. (Appendix B) Overall there is a lack of documentation showing commitment of districts, teachers, and schools to participate in this project which raises questions about whether we'll ever be implemented at the proposed level of scale.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity****1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)**

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

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

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**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/30/2015 10:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2015 09:52 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	14
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	30
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	34
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	78
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	1
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - i3 Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes research-based interactive PD that includes with in-class coaching guiding teachers through Common Core State Standards transforming classrooms into highly engaging, student-centered learning communities through achievement data and formative assessments to inform instructional decisions and integrate technology.

The applicant proposed replicability of eMINTS comprehensive school-base expansion project to variety of settings due to strategies of affiliate train-the-trainer model, contextualize PD, address local needs provide for diverse learners, pace technology expansion, and improve sustainability.

The applicant proposes eMINTS as a solution for changing to an organization of student-centered classrooms and teacher-facilitated teaching and learning practices that increases student achievement in high poverty schools showing the lowest achievement rates.

Weaknesses:

The application would be strengthened with specific description of evaluation standardization with implementation of teachers and administrators as it relates to effective capacity with proposed project in variety of settings.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(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.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates understanding and implementation of unmet need by partnering with school districts for sharing of resources, curricula and quality PD on CCSS implementation activities of teachers design engaging student-centered lessons that use assessment data to drive instruction and integrate technology.

The applicant addresses grant funds to codify and formalize out-of-state implementation of the eMINTS program and expand existing materials--creating flexible options for affiliate trainers while maintaining program fidelity (pg. 11-e28).

The applicant provides evidence of existing dissemination efforts through citations and professional journals as venues of continued efforts. The applicant will also disseminate on eMINTS website, ISTE, AERA, and iNACOL as appropriate to unmet need.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) 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 level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive logic model of project design with teacher professional development schedule on pg. 14 and Appendix J) along with detailed explanation of measurable goals and objectives with supporting measures of success and key stakeholders participation (administrators, teachers, trainers, grant personnel).

The applicant provided management plan (e.g., Five-Year Project Timeline) with key responsibilities and milestones for accomplishing project tasks with time and budget (pgs. 15-24,40).

The applicant provides clarity and coherence of model to operate in three states.

The applicant provides procedures for feedback and continuous improvement with a formal system for internal review of program process and PD materials (pg. 24).

Weaknesses:

The application would be strengthened with specific description of adaptive contingency plan to support proposed project at a national or regional level.

Reader's Score: 34

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 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.

(2) 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.

(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 measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Strengths:

Another reviewer is scoring this section.

Weaknesses:

Another reviewer is scoring this section.

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)

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 address all criteria areas.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

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:

The applicant addresses all areas of criteria as demonstrated in project design and management plan.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2015 09:52 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 05:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	14
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	29
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	34
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	77
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	1
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - i3 Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

The approach offered in this application of using a multi-tiered professional development cycle to improve both the focus and quality of instruction is well thought out. The depth provided in this project of following up PD with classroom visits, videos of lessons for self-reflection and peer interaction, and networking with colleagues near and far is strong. Two previous projects utilizing similar techniques have proven very effective according to the evidence cited in the application.

The use of "virtual" meetings and mentor districts will allow for a much broader application of this approach across several states.

The efficacy of PD across the country has recently been challenged as ineffective and this non-traditional approach offers a plausible alternative that will impact both teachers and students.

Weaknesses:

This proposal does not describe the extent of PD that will be carried out in the 'control' schools. Will the teachers there have the same number of hours of development and will it be focused on the same topics? Also a brief description of what the applicant considers 'traditional' PD to be would have helped to put their strategy into better context.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(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.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to

support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The use of trainers and site visits as well as video records will provide a way to ensure fidelity of the approach across districts and states. The problem of making sure all participants are indeed working on the 'same page' has made many PD attempts across the nation remain local and insular. This multi-tiered strategy promises to find a solution to that.

The applicant's use of the grant money will enable the establishment of mentor schools and virtual networking amongst peers across great distances.

The video library being built will offer a robust resource that will continually grow and deepen throughout the length of the project, and survive beyond the 5 year program.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the administrators, i.e. the principals, will use the individual classroom observations of eMINTS strategies in use as part of the teacher's evaluation as stated in the application. It would have been helpful to explain how such evaluations would be standardized from district to district and state to state? Also an explanation of how this element would be matched in the 'control' schools would be helpful to better understand impact.

Reader's Score: 29

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) 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 level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

Strengths:

This proposal has clearly identified all of the goals, objectives, and outcomes, as well as procedures for attaining them. (Page 14) The extensive planning is clear in the coherent structure of the plan and in the assignment of roles and responsibilities.

The costing out projections are clear and concise and seem to account for all contingencies that a multi-year project might face.

Weaknesses:

The plan states that seventh grade students who have had instruction from eMINTS teachers will show improved scores on the state assessments in Math and English Language Arts when compared to students from the 'control' schools. However, no projection was offered of the margin of separation that would prove success for the new strategy.

Reader's Score: 34

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 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.

(2) 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.

(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 measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Strengths:

NA, A different reviewer scores this section.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)

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 budget provided shows a savings per student through the ramping up to larger numbers.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

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:

As stated in the proposal the use of mentor schools and virtual technology will enable systematic review and improvement to the tools and strategies while ensuring fidelity across state lines.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 05:48 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 11:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	13
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	30
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	33
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	76
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	1
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	79

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - i3 Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: The Curators of the University of Missouri (U411B150005)

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

One of the strengths of the eMints program is the statistical evidence (p. 4& 5) to support the validity of the program gathered from randomized control trial which impacted teacher's instruction. In addition, the strategies (project-based instruction, collaborative learning and technology integration) provided with this program along with a variety of tools and skills should improve the teacher instruction.

The applications makes the strong connections between national needs of students and the role of eMints in closing the achievement gap through teacher –facilitated learning PD and its use of technology p. 8 & 9.

The applicant address how program would be implemented in cross sections of 28 urban, suburban and rural high poverty district in 3 states supported by evidence p. 2 in the Absolute and Competitive priorities.

Weaknesses:

While the application does address how the program can be scaled nationwide and replicable, it is unclear how the program would be implemented or adapted even though that applicant provide adequate evidence that this program increase student achievement in different subpopulations of student (Appendix C).

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(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.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The applicant establishes unmet need and addresses how eMint will fill this need by providing high quality PD that will lead to teachers implementing CCSS p. 10.

The applicant addresses using a train- the –trainer model to account for cost, travel and distance as a barrier and decrease overall cost of the program. As well, the applicant has strong partnership with businesses to support matching funds to sustain the program after I3 grant.

The applicant uses Wide variety of communication (journals, books, meetings, conference and social media) to promote information about program.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(3) 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 level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides and explains three measurable goals including budget, timelines and milestones that provide in appendix J.

The applicant also provides a detailed management plan that addresses 5 key objectives in appendix J that include roles and responsibilities.

The applicant establishes comprehensive a multi-year financial and operating model in the budget narrative that uses funds that is aligned meet the goals of the program

Weaknesses:

In the application, there is a no plan to receive feedback from all stakeholders until year 3 of the program to make adjustments p.24. The applicant also did not provide an explanation as follow up beyond year to collect data.

It is unclear who the makeup of the focus group and what kind of data that will be obtained from this group.

Reader's Score: 33

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 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.

(2) 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.

(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 measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Strengths:

See evaluators comments

Weaknesses:

See evaluators comments

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity**

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)

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 addresses competitive preference priority 1 by providing evidence through previous research to support ways to reduce cost of its program while still showing academic gains in its student population. Applicant will use technology, video systems online platform accompanied with blended learning to support its trainers and administrative staff. Applicant provides detail example on p. 11 in narrative how it will reduce effectiveness of program. In addition, provides implementation plans with sound data collection and measures from 28 districts as well as provide data collection from variety of sources including PD, teacher attendance, teacher survey, etc. (32-33)

Applicants cites research model RCM and AIR to calculate as tool evaluate cost effectiveness

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides limited explanation of how it will sustain program after grant expiration

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

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 address preference priority 2 by adoption of effective practices of using the context of train the trainer model that supports developing professional development to meet college and career-ready curriculum as well as use of technology to support the program.

The eMints program has a 15 year history with a track record of increase student achievement in a diverse setting of 56 middle school in urban, suburban and rural high poverty districts including 448 students and over 24, 000 in 5 years period.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/01/2015 11:15 PM