

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2010 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.295A **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Applicant Name Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- , **PR/Award No** U295A100016
Reviewer Name R1

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	15
Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design	25	25
Project Personnel	10	10
Management Plan	20	13
Project Evaluation	20	20
TOTAL	100	93

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- , **PR/Award No** U295A100016
Reviewer Name R1

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1.

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

- a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.
- b) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

Strengths

The applicant addressed the population of students at risk - English Language Learners - and how this project will provide them a service they otherwise would not have.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses identified.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

2.

The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:

- a) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths

The applicant identified populations - students, teachers and parents - who are in need of access to these types of products and how they anticipate their product being used in various settings.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses identified.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

3.

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

- a) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices.
- b) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- c) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths

The proposed design includes current research and best practices. This project is part of a larger, more comprehensive effort to improve student achievement for children whose first language is not English. On page 25 the applicant identifies efforts to secure sustainability for the project beyond the grant period.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses identified.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

4.

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project.

- a) In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.
- b) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths

The applicant has identified qualified personnel to manage this project. The applicant has adequately identified underrepresented persons and will continue to recruit this population as positions become available.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses identified.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

5.

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

- a) 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.**
- b) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**
- c) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths

Time commitments from director and principals were adequate and appropriate. The systems to be established would allow for feedback and continuous quality improvement.

Weaknesses

Other than the three tables on pgs. 32 and 33, the reviewer could not identify well defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones within the management plan.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

6.

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths

The evaluation plan includes methods which are related to intended outcomes and will produce both quantitative and qualitative data. The evaluation will allow for feedback and opportunities to address progress.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses identified.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2010 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.295A **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Applicant Name Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- , **PR/Award No** U295A100016
Reviewer Name R2

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	15
Significance	10	8
Quality of Project Design	25	25
Project Personnel	10	10
Management Plan	20	20
Project Evaluation	20	15
TOTAL	100	93

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- , **PR/Award No** U295A100016
Reviewer Name R2

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1.

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of

students at risk of educational failure.

b) **The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.**

Strengths

A. The project identifies the lowest achieving schools as partners in this effort. The goal is to close the achievement gap on math achievement for lower socioeconomic students.

B. Language, learning literacy and reading as well as a basic knowledge of numbers are identifies weaknesses. Unequal access to technology is also a contributing factor. LAMP, in alignments with common core state standards will provide books and multiple platforms. These platforms will assist in the training of parent, teacher and caregivers.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were identified in this section.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

2.

The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:

a) **The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

Strengths

The plan identifies home and school as the setting in which the product will be utilized. Social networks as an alternate setting will assist in disseminating information.

Weaknesses

Two properties are in place. The plan indicated that the Latino property will not be made available until

year five.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

3.

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

- a) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices.**
- b) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**
- c) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**

Strengths

- A. The project's foundation is search based and is aligned with common core state standards. Content area domains will be explored.**
- B. The project is a part of the effort to improve teaching and learning. Working with students in low performing school, the plan will develop applications that will address literacy, math and technology.**
- C. Maintaining the project after the five year period will be done from the already established products. Royalties from the Miss Spider and NOVA projects will help cushion additional costs.**

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were identified in this section.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

4.

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project.

a) In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

b) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths

A.) The project proposes to encourage the employment of underrepresented groups by advertising in partner networks. They will seek individuals with experience with or work directly with the targeted population.

B.) Qualifications on pages 27-31 indicate relevant training and experience of key personnel.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were identified in this section.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

5.

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

a) 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.

b) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

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

Strengths

A. Three plans are presented indicating the roles and responsibilities of each key member of the team.

B. Roles and responsibilities of key personnel are indentified with time commitments. The percentage of time seems appropriate to achieve the objectives.

C. The project management team will develop an initial plan with specific milestones for the first 12 to 24 months. This team will further ensure ongoing qualitative feedback from other project teams.

Weaknesses

A. No weaknesses were identified in this section.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

6.

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths

A.) An independent evaluator and collaborative partners will identify performance measures for evaluation. Formative and summative research will be used. A summative study will be conducted on the use of the three properties.

B.) The evaluation of the project will provide ongoing feedback to teachers. Learners and developers. Findings will be reported monthly and will aid in the development of a final report.

Weaknesses

B.) The evaluation seems challenging and lofty. I was unclear as to how they would adequately assess the project.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2010 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.295A **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1

Applicant Name Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- , **PR/Award No** U295A100016
Reviewer Name R3

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	15
Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design	25	18
Project Personnel	10	10
Management Plan	20	18
Project Evaluation	20	20
TOTAL	100	91

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- , **PR/Award No** U295A100016
Reviewer Name R3

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1.

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of

students at risk of educational failure.

b) **The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.**

Strengths

The applicant has well established a need for this project by citing research that supports the large gap and disparity between at-risk students and their peers. The applicant addresses the magnitude of the need by including the failure rate among students from low income families. Also, the applicant offers supportive information regarding the critical need for the area of reading (students who struggle in reading tend to struggle in all academic subjects. The applicant, also, states that a correlation exists between a student's socioeconomic status and math achievement.

The applicant points out that many households may have inexpensive, dial-up Internet services (if they have a telephone), and the dial-up service may be slow and severely limit the student's or user's capacity to utilize Internet to its fullest (i.e., explore, retrieve, download, and store information).

There is a recognition, as the applicant has written, that many teachers have not been trained in the most recent computer-based applications.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were identified.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

2.

The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:

a) **The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

Strengths

The applicant states that over 50 percent of homes have some type of media services (Internet, a computer, cell phone, DVD player, video game, etc.). One study cited by the applicant shows that lower-economic status children spend more time watching tv and playing video games than do their counterparts (p. 9).

According to the applicant, homes and schools can use Project LAMP's educational learning applications.

Weaknesses

There were no weaknesses identified.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

3.

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

- a) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices.**
- b) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**
- c) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**

Strengths

Project LAMP identifies the HITN, Calloway, and Michael Cohen Group as providers of formative and summative evaluation of the design.

The applicant references the current state content standards for mathematics and listed some of them (P.12).

The applicant expresses an intent to work with multiple partners in low performing schools and higher education programs.

The applicant has given consideration to introducing transmedial content via parent workshops, child reading and math activities, family nights, and childcare centers (p.21 table).

The applicant speaks to the areas of distribution and sustainability by utilizing a partnership with Clearwire Communications who will help provide free Internet Access to low-income Hispanic families; the applicant also will partner with Apple to create and sell interactive multimedia eBook apps.

The applicant appears to already have existing properties: Miss Spider and Nova Robot. According to the applicant, more than 5 millions Ms. Spider books have been sold since 1994, and Nova the Robot was launched in 1999. The applicant has a plan of sustainability that will extend beyond the Federal financial

assistance period. The applicant is partnering with Callaway Digital Publishing to raise additional funding from private equity sources (P.25)

Weaknesses

Even though the applicant has existing properties and is partnering with a publishing company to raise additional funding from private equity sources, there is not a given that this collaboration will yield funding considering the present state of the economy.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

4.

The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project.

a) In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

b) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths

The applicant identifies and addresses the underrepresented and plans to reach out to this group by advertising positions through business partners who have experience or work directly with the target population.

Weaknesses

There were no weaknesses identified.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

5.

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

- a) 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.
- b) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.
- c) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths

The applicant effectively uses tables and charts on pp. 32-33 to discuss delivery of properties. The tables also reflect the various team players, timelines, milestones, and responsibilities.

Weaknesses

The table was helpful, but a more explanation would have been helpful. For example, what kind of website is referenced in the table, and what is the purpose?

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

6.

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

- a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
- b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths

Numerous evaluative methods and safeguards are in place to measure the intended outcomes. The services of experts in the field of research, evaluation, and analyses will be used. A project Management Team will track implementation of the Operating Plan along with the Operating Plan expense budgets; this will be done semi-annually. Other Committees will be in place to monitor impact of LAMP materials on target audience.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were identified.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2010 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.295A **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 2

Applicant Name	Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- ,	PR/Award No	U295A100016
Reviewer Name	R1		

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Priorities		
Competitive Preference	20	15
TOTAL	20	15

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name	Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- ,	PR/Award No	U295A100016
Reviewer Name	R1		

Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority

1.

Up to twenty additional points will be awarded depending on how well the application meets this priority.

Points awarded under this priority will be determined by the quality of the proposed evaluation method. In determining the quality of the evaluation method, we will consider the extent to which the applicant presents a feasible, credible plan that includes the following:

- (1) The type of design to be used (that is, random assignment or matched comparison). If matched comparison, include in the plan a discussion of why random assignment is not feasible.
- (2) Outcomes to be measured.
- (3) A discussion of how the applicant plans to assign students, teachers, classrooms, or schools to

the project and control group or match them for comparison with other students, teachers, classrooms, or schools.

(4) A proposed evaluator, preferably independent, with the necessary background and technical expertise to carry out the proposed evaluation. An independent evaluator does not have any authority over the project and is not involved in its implementation.

In general, depending on the implemented program or project, under a competitive preference priority, random assignment evaluation methods will receive more points than matched comparison evaluation methods.

Strengths

The Evaluation Team is an independent group that has a designated PI with technical expertise and necessary background for conducting the proposed evaluation. There is evidence that the data collected will result in usable reports to determine continued implementation of success. Assessments are age appropriate and clearly connected to the goals of the proposal.

Weaknesses

A rationale for each of the co-variants discussed, need to be described thoroughly. A timeline with details for evaluating each year of implementation would be helpful for following the multiple years of the study. No plan for attrition is included for parents, teachers or students. A power analysis is included, but the numbers of participants and the effect size seem to not clearly correspond.

Question Status:Not Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2010 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.295A **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 2

Applicant Name	Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- ,	PR/Award No	U295A100016
Reviewer Name	R2		

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Priorities		
Competitive Preference	20	15
TOTAL	20	15

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name	Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- ,	PR/Award No	U295A100016
Reviewer Name	R2		

Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority

1.

Up to twenty additional points will be awarded depending on how well the application meets this priority.

Points awarded under this priority will be determined by the quality of the proposed evaluation method. In determining the quality of the evaluation method, we will consider the extent to which the applicant presents a feasible, credible plan that includes the following:

- (1) The type of design to be used (that is, random assignment or matched comparison). If matched comparison, include in the plan a discussion of why random assignment is not feasible.
- (2) Outcomes to be measured.
- (3) A discussion of how the applicant plans to assign students, teachers, classrooms, or schools to

the project and control group or match them for comparison with other students, teachers, classrooms, or schools.

(4) A proposed evaluator, preferably independent, with the necessary background and technical expertise to carry out the proposed evaluation. An independent evaluator does not have any authority over the project and is not involved in its implementation.

In general, depending on the implemented program or project, under a competitive preference priority, random assignment evaluation methods will receive more points than matched comparison evaluation methods.

Strengths

Michael Cohen Group LLC is well qualified organizationally to conduct the work.
Good detail provided about the nature and use of covariates in the RCT model.
The wide range of collaborative partners should help strengthen the project.
The inclusion of both summative and formative evaluation components, including a Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) - is commendable.
Use of pretesting to control for initial group differences is commendable.
The inclusion of attrition-related analyses is commendable and important.

Weaknesses

It appears that some of the assessments will be developed specifically for the study, rather than using existing validated measures. While this may allow for theoretically better alignment to the skills targeted by the program, it also introduces questions about reliability and validity of the outcome data that may compromise the interpretation of the RCT results.
There is no mention of how the sample might be affected if new students enter the Nova the Robot school environment during the course of the intervention (whether those students would be allowed to participate, etc. etc.).
Home computer ownership and internet access are prerequisites for participating in the Miss Spider study. This could systematically exclude some populations of interest such as low income, etc. Some discussion of this and why it would (or would not) be problematic would have been better.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2010 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.295A **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 2

Applicant Name Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- , **PR/Award No** U295A100016
Reviewer Name R3

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Priorities		
Competitive Preference	20	18
TOTAL	20	18

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Hispanic Information & Telecommunications Network -- , **PR/Award No** U295A100016
Reviewer Name R3

Priorities - Competitive Preference Priority

- 1.**
- Up to twenty additional points will be awarded depending on how well the application meets this priority.
- Points awarded under this priority will be determined by the quality of the proposed evaluation method. In determining the quality of the evaluation method, we will consider the extent to which the applicant presents a feasible, credible plan that includes the following:
- (1) The type of design to be used (that is, random assignment or matched comparison). If matched comparison, include in the plan a discussion of why random assignment is not feasible.
 - (2) Outcomes to be measured.
 - (3) A discussion of how the applicant plans to assign students, teachers, classrooms, or schools to

the project and control group or match them for comparison with other students, teachers, classrooms, or schools.

(4) A proposed evaluator, preferably independent, with the necessary background and technical expertise to carry out the proposed evaluation. An independent evaluator does not have any authority over the project and is not involved in its implementation.

In general, depending on the implemented program or project, under a competitive preference priority, random assignment evaluation methods will receive more points than matched comparison evaluation methods.

Strengths

A good description of the outside evaluation firm is provided, along with a thorough documentation of collaborating partners in the evaluation. A randomized control design will be used for the summative evaluation, and a thorough description of the sampling for treatment and control groups is provided. Three treatment groups are analyzed - Nova the Robot, alternate media, or no additional treatment. There is a clear sequence of treatments presented from pre test to post test for each treatment group. Sample size estimates and expected effect sizes are well documented and explained. Covariates are indicated and rationale for their use is explained. Control and experimental conditions are well described.

Weaknesses

Project outcomes and how they are to be measured by the randomized control design and subsequent analysis is not clear. The methods for randomizing students into treatment and control groups are not well described. It is not mentioned if pre test data is to be included as a covariate to better insure pre test equality.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 18