

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2024 09:31 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	40
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	75
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	2
<b>Total</b>	106	80

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The proposed project will explore adaptations to the existing Class-Wide-FIT (CW-FIT) classroom engagement program in order to address the high needs of Native-serving and rural schools, needs that are exacerbated by the constraints of resources available to Native and rural students (page e15). The applicant proposes two promising practices: one is to improve student academic engagement to regain lost learning time through incorporating culturally relevant practice into the CW-FIT model, and the other is to support teachers in implementing the CW-FIT strategies (page e16). The lead team at the University of Kansas will partner with a variety of organizations including Northern Arizona University (NAU), a minority serving university, and six state affiliates of the National Rural Education Association, ensuring representation for the project target schools (page e12) The existing strategy of the CW-FIT classroom engagement program will be adapted for cultural relevance of Native American students and will implement a new promising strategy using artificial intelligence (AI) coaching supports for teachers.

#### Weaknesses:

None identified.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 40

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from

Sub

**reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant identifies two barriers to that have previously prevented the scaling of the CW-Fit program to Native-American and rural schools (page e13). Those barriers are addressed in the project with specific scaling strategies including adapting the CW-Fit program for cultural relevance through collaboration with NAU and the University of Kansas's Tribal Relations Leaders (page e20). Focus groups with Native American educators will provide feedback on the cultural relevance of program components. Examples of adaptations that may stem from the information collected include training materials, posters, resources, and procedures (page e20). The applicant presents compelling support in acknowledging that CW-Fit lacks cultural relevance for Native-serving schools. On page e19, the applicant highlights the fact that Native students, schools, and communities have not been included in most WWC reviewed studies, resulting in ongoing disparities for Native students. The details of the strategy to adapt CW-Fit for cultural relevance are displayed in Table 2 on page e21.

Another scaling strategy, the implementation of AI coaching supports, will be available to teachers through online platforms. In addition, the project will include three micro-credentials to support non-native teachers of Native American students in better understanding unique customs and cultures of local tribes, increasing the value of the adaptations in creating relevance for Native students (page e20). Details of the AI coaching supports to be provided are presented by the applicant in Table 3 on page e22.

**Weaknesses:**

None identified.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 2. (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.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides extensive evidence of a management plan composed of experienced and relevant key personnel, as well as clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for completing project tasks. The organizational structure on page e27 displays key personnel and partners who will collaborate to bring the project to scale. The structure is uniquely non-hierarchical, supporting the concept of collaboration between and among the partners. Project goals, objectives, and related strategies, along with project timelines, milestones, and responsible personnel, are clearly shown in Table 4 on page e30. For example, Strategy 1.1 Focus Groups will be conducted in the first five quarters of the project by the Implementation Team and Indigenous Advisors as part of Goal 1 to expand the project model CW-FIT. Table 5 on page e32 effectively demonstrates the project goals and objectives in concert with anticipated project outcomes and measures of progress.

**Weaknesses:**

None identified.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents convincing evidence of the capacity to bring the proposed project to scale. The evidence includes descriptions of key personnel on pages e24-e26 who bring years of relevant expertise to their roles relative to project implementation. One example is the Project Director who is a senior scientist and professor at the University of Kansas and is also the developer of the CW-Fit program (page e24). Another example is the Implementation Director who has 15 years' experience working with rural school systems to implement evidence-based interventions (page e25). It is especially significant for the intended outcomes of the project that a Co-Director for Project and Tribal Relations who is an associate professor at KU will facilitate collaboration between the grant entities, the Tribal Nations, and Native-serving schools, and the Co-Director for Tribal Relations who is a professor at NAU will assist with hiring and overseeing focus groups with teachers from Native-serving Schools (pages e25-e26).

The capacity to bring the project to scale is further enhanced by partnerships with organizations bringing skills and resources to support full-scale AI development support, professional development resources including micro-credentialing, and an online professional development platform with HIPPA-level security protections critical for connecting training efforts across project schools (page e28).

**Weaknesses:**

None identified.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a reasonable plan for disseminating project information in support of further development or replication of the project. A particular strength of this component of the project is that planning for dissemination starts in the first quarter of the project (page e28). The involvement of the Indigenous partners and oversight from Northern Arizona University will be especially pertinent to dissemination with and about Native-serving schools and Native Americans (page e28). Project funds have been budgeted for dissemination resources that will be distributed at conferences and presentations, national journals, and local and state school district leaders. Social media platforms will be used to further broadly distribute project progress and outcomes (page e29).

**Weaknesses:**

None identified.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**5. (5) 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 presents adequate evidence of project products that have the potential to be used in a variety of settings. First, the project will provide evidence-based interventions for students in rural and Native-serving schools (page e29). As described on page e29, the CW-Fit program and relevant products and resources developed through the project will be available for free. The utility of the CW-FIT AI Coaching supports is that they reduce costs to those implementing the program at a later time because of the reduced coaching time required for implementation. The supports and resources will be of high quality for dissemination because they will be reviewed and measured through the five years of the project (page e29).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

None identified.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

The Logic Model for the proposed project is shown on page e119 and provides a visual representation of key components, core activities, mediators, and short- and long-term outcomes for the project. Relationships between the mediators and the outcomes are shown. For example, when the “teacher exhibits more culturally responsive classroom practices, an anticipated short-term outcome is that students exhibit “less antisocial behavior in class” (page e30). The applicant posits on page e31 that teachers will implement the model with fidelity, allowing them to anticipate that the outcomes of the previous study will be reflected in the long-term outcomes of improve student achievement and better teacher instruction practices.

**Weaknesses:**

None identified.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides sufficient evidence of project goals, objectives, and outcomes that are specific and measurable. Table 5 on page e32 clearly presents project goals and objectives with corresponding strategies to be implemented in the project. In addition, the table includes outcomes and measures of progress. For example, for Strategy 1.3 to train 6 pilot school coaches and intervention coaches, the outcome will be that coaches complete micro-credential training, and supplemental training in CW-FIT in order to monitor fidelity and provide feedback. The percent of coaches completing training and demonstrating coaching mastery will be measured (page e32). As described on page e39, all project student and teacher outcomes are projected to meet WWC standards. Given that intention, the applicant describes that the study will collect baseline measures. Table 8 on pages e41-42 demonstrates the plans for student data for student baseline and observation data.

**Weaknesses:**

None identified.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides project goals and objectives in Table 5 that are specific to addressing the needs of the target populations (page e33). The applicant then presents a strong argument for the extent to which the project design will successfully address the needs of the target populations of Native-serving schools and rural schools. On pages e33-e34, the applicant describes how the collaboration with Native American and indigenous partners as well as the institutional supports provided for the project will ensure the project will serve the needs of Native-serving and rural schools (page e34). The applicant displays confidence that the strong foundation of the CW-Fit program adapted to address the needs of Native and rural students and to support the teachers in those schools achieve the anticipated outcomes of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

None identified.

Reader's Score: 10

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**Strengths:**

Not applicable.

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

**Strengths:**

Not applicable.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable.

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

Not applicable.

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

The proposed project will be implemented in partnership with (d) Northern Arizona University (NAU) a minority-serving institution (page e14). This partnership is especially significant as the university has a proven commitment to indigenous education as identified by the applicant and as described in the MOU on pages e85-e86.

**Weaknesses:**

None identified.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports**

(up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

(a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

The applicant addresses part (b) of this Competitive Priority through a project designed to account for the educational impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, especially for those students in Native-serving and rural schools (page e14). The existing CW-FIT project already uses evidence-based approaches that will be enhanced in the current project to include cultural relevance for indigenous students and artificial intelligence coaching supports for teachers in rural and underserved communities.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant provides no evidence of addressing part (a) of this criterion.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/01/2024 09:31 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/31/2024 12:49 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	0
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	19
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	19
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Total</b>	106	19

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

2. (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.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

5. (5) 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:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

#### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

**Reader's Score: 19**

**Sub**

1. (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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**Strengths:**

Per pages e34/e35, the study is designed to meet WWC standards without reservations.

Per page e35, the plan for the control sites to receive delayed treatment is strong in that it will minimize attrition.

The power analysis on page e38 demonstrates that the study is well-powered to detect effects.

Clear plans are outlined on page e39 that document how the study will address issues of attrition.

Per page e40, controlling for baseline measures will ensure variation in the outcome but is uncorrelated with the treatment, leading to an increase in precision.

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear how, if the control group receives the intervention in the spring semester, they then would not be 'contaminated' in the second year/second cohort.

Page e41 indicates an outcome of core subject grades as a measure of academic performance (RQ1), yet these are not reliable measures. Further, grades will only be collected for students in grades 6-8, and thus unknown is how academic achievement in lower grades will be measured.

The measures of child behavior, while validated, may be biased in teachers awareness of being in the treatment vs control group.

**Reader's Score: 11**

2. (2) **The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

**Strengths:**

Per pages e43/44, the inclusion of focus groups will allow for an in-depth assessment of the teacher experience to inform adaptation needs and implementation barriers.

The study is designed in a way that will help disentangle the conditions under which the program is successful, thus aiding in determining how new sites would fare implementing the program.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal would have benefited from the inclusion of more groups with which to explore impact beyond rural and Native students as a method of scaling up the project to reach more groups of students, such as students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds and/or students of other racial/ethnic backgrounds.

**Reader's Score: 4**

Sub

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

**Strengths:**

The logic model on page e31 lays out project mediators, which are focused on teacher practice.

Page e42 states that each measure specifies a sample level threshold for what constitutes adequate implementation while page e46 outlines such thresholds, which will be critical for incorporating into the analytic model of impact.

Per page e44, a plan is in place to incorporate school-, classroom-/teacher-, and student-level moderators into the impact models via interactions of the moderator variables with the treatment indicator. The variables are well-delineated.

**Weaknesses:**

Per the logic model on page e31, the mediators would be strengthened by being focused on a level (i.e., degree of culturally responsive classroom practices) as opposed to a change in level (i.e., teacher exhibits more culturally responsive classroom practices) as the latter will have variation in overall degree (i.e., one teacher could show substantial growth in culturally responsive classroom practices and wind up with the same level of culturally responsive classroom practices as another teacher who did not show any growth but already had strong culturally responsive classroom practices).

**Reader's Score:** 4

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:**

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

(a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/31/2024 12:49 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2024 01:20 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	0
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	20
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	0
<b>Total</b>	106	20



# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

2. (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.

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

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

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

5. (5) 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:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

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

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

#### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

- 1. (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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**Strengths:**

The project's evaluation plan to engage in a multi-state, multi-site cluster randomized controlled trial (RCT) will meet WWC version 5.0 Group Design Standards without reservations (e35). The applicant's use of an experienced independent consultant to conduct the evaluation has a strong likelihood to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness (e35). The applicant's randomized study design to engage K-8 students in 120 rural schools across six states and prioritize rural Native-serving schools, is more than likely to meet What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations (e35).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide details as to how they plan to actively recruit and/or engage interested core teachers to participate in the study, or whether their participation will be encouraged or completely on their own accord (e36).

**Reader's Score: 12**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant research design has the potential to be replicated on a national scale, as they provide a five step design process for other agencies to follow in order to replicate in other settings (e43-44).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's plan to conduct focus groups is not sufficiently detailed, with regards to location, frequency or the recruitment process of participants, to establish its potential for testing in other settings (e44). The applicant does not further elaborate on how the evaluation can be replicated with diverse student groups, beyond Native and rural students (e44).

**Reader's Score: 3**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant's evaluation plan clearly articulates key project components, including a proposed five-step collection process of implementation data by the evaluation team (e46). The data the applicant seeks to collect will set thresholds for acceptable implementation, as well as provide insight into the key project components and outcomes such as impacts on teachers' self-efficacy and classroom engagement practices (e46).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

**Reader's Score: 0**

### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   08/01/2024 01:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2024 03:56 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	40
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	75
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	2
<b>Total</b>	106	80

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The proposed project involves the effective development and demonstration of a promising new strategy that builds on an existing strategy. It builds on the CW-FIT evidence-base and expands its reach with adaptations for scaling. It supports the Promising New Strategies that will include: 1) Adapt CW-FIT for cultural relevance, 2) Implement CW-FIT Artificial Intelligence (AI) analyses (e16). The applicant proposes the project serve economically disadvantaged students in grades K-8 in Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico, and Nebraska (e6; e16-e18). The project aims to improve academic engagement and achievement for students and improve teacher's engagement practices. It plans to expand CW-FIT by providing culturally relevant adaptations to the CW-FIT program and adapting the CW-FIT for flexibility in coaching, training, and implementation using the CW-FIT mobile application and CW-FIT AI Coach (e16-e18).

The proposed project supports the need for this project based on data on Native students being two to three grades in reading and math, having dropout rates 237% higher, and are 207% more likely to face expulsion, disciplinary action, special education designation, and chronic absenteeism compared to White students (e15).

#### Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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



**Reader's Score: 40**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly identifies barriers to scale, as well as their strategies to address them. The two barriers are 1) CW-FIT is lacking cultural relevance for Native-serving schools; 2) CW-FIT is limited by the school or district coaches' capacity (e19). To address the barriers, the project will implement two scaling strategies: 1) Adapt CW-FIT for cultural relevance to Native-serving schools by a) collaboration with Northern Arizona University and University of Kansas's Tribal Relations leaders along with Native serving schools grades K-8; and b) adapt any training materials, posters, resources, and procedures; and (2) Implement the new CW-FIT AI Coaching Supports including a) CWFIT Mobile App and b) CW-FIT AI Coach to provide individual supports on-demand as needed.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 2. (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.**

**Strengths:**

An adequate management plan is provided (e22-e28). The management plan aligns the project tasks, the personnel responsible, and the milestones (outcomes). The timeline covers the five year grant period and provides overarching details in addition to describing the activities. One highlight that supports the alignment of the objective to accomplished project tasks is that the District and School-based Staff will be supported by Regional Directors to create their own road map - a customized plan of how they choose to adapt CW-FIT for cultural relevance and how they plan on adapting coaching, training, and implementation of CW-FIT (e23).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has demonstrated its capacity to scale the project nationally throughout the application. For instance, the team members identified to work with the project are highly qualified to meet the project's requirements and offer essential support for its successful implementation, as detailed in the grant application (e24-e28).

**Sub**

Overall, the applicant has proven that its team members are exceptionally qualified to meet the project's requirements and deliver the necessary support to ensure the project's successful implementation at the intended scale, as described in the grant application.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant outlines a plan for disseminating information about the Project findings (e26). A key strength of the dissemination plan is that it will occur in three distinct avenues: 1) Dissemination planning begins in the first quarter and involves Project leaders and indigenous partners; 2) Teachers and school leaders will have the opportunity to disseminate project findings at national conferences and publications; 3) KU Communications Department will provide news releases and support for the website (e28-e29).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

5. **(5) 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:**

It is highly likely the utility of the products produced from the proposed project will result in their usage nationally and in other settings. The applicant will assess and document the effectiveness of the resources developed during the project. The availability of AI coaching for small rural districts has the potential of significantly increasing student achievement (e28).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

**Sub**

**1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

The conceptual framework is appropriate and is based on CW-Fit Program Model, Mediators, and Outcomes (e28). A logic model is provided that aligns the project key components, core activities, mediators, short-term, medium term, and long-term outcomes, and inputs to the teaching outcomes, student outcomes, and process outcomes (e119). Student outcomes are increased student engagement, increased school attendance, and increased student academic performance. The project provides coach and teacher training along with on-demand AI coaching (e149).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided a table that aligns the project goals to the objectives, and anticipated outcomes (e31-e33). Goals include 1) Expand CW-FIT to Native-serving and rural schools across the country and 2) Contribute to the CW-FIT evidence-base in Native-serving and rural schools for (a) improving academic engagement and achievement for high-needs students in Native-serving and rural elementary schools, and (b) improving teachers' classroom engagement practices in these Native-serving and rural schools. Examples of objectives include Implement Strategy to Scale: Adapt CW-FIT for Cultural Relevance, Implement Strategy to Scale CW-FIT AI Coaching Supports, and Conduct an Independent Implementation Evaluation (e30-e31).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project design will effectively meet the needs of the target population, which is K-8 grade economically disadvantaged students attending native and rural schools. (e33-e34). Key strengths that support the success of the project are: 1) The strength of the partner organizations and support for the project. Partners include Northern Arizona University, NREA, and State affiliate Executive Directors; 2) Adapting CW-FIT with flexibility for scale in response to the needs of the partnering schools, leaders, and teachers; and 3) The Design builds on the CW-FIT foundation of development and 16 years of evidence (e33-e34).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Reader's Score: 0

### Sub

1. (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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**Strengths:**

Not Applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.

**Strengths:**

Not Applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0

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

**Strengths:**

Not Applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

The applicant has fully demonstrated how the project will be implemented in partnership with Northern Arizona University (NAU) a minority-serving institution. NAU is a partner throughout all project years and research areas including playing a key role in guiding adaptations to improve the cultural relevance of CW-FIT for Native-serving schools. This partnership with NAU, along with the commitment of Native serving schools as implementers, will strengthen the project (e14).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

- (a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided compelling evidence in the use of evidence-based instructional approaches and supports to accelerate learning for high-need students. Evidence-based supports including professional development, coaching, and ongoing support for educators (with district/school coaches and adapting options with this project) and addressing inequities and challenges such as lost learning time and absenteeism. With this project, new innovations utilizing Artificial Intelligence (AI) will be added to coaching options through the new CW-FIT Mobile Application (providing automated and instant feedback on teacher performance) and the CW-FIT AI Coach (providing in-the-moment support to teachers (e14).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide evidence on any community asset-mapping or needs assessments that were conducted.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/01/2024 03:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2024 10:57 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	40
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	75
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. Impact of COVID-19	3	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	3	2
<b>Total</b>	106	80

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Expansion - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (S411A240010)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development and demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The applicant clearly details the significance of the proposed project by citing on (page e12) the project's primary focus will to evaluate and scale implementation of CW-FIT to the highest needs Native and rural students in grades K-8 in the nation. The project proposes to expand CW-FIT by providing culturally relevant adaptations to native and rural schools for cultural relevance and utilizing the innovative CW-FIT AI coaching supports for teachers as cited on (page e9

#### Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

Reader's Score: 40

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

#### Strengths:

The applicant clearly outlines two (2) major barriers preventing the applicant from reaching the level of scale in the past. These barriers are detailed by the applicant and include: CW-FIT lacking cultural relevance for Native-serving



**Sub**

schools due to lack of partnership with Native-serving education leaders resulting in CW-FIT not being implemented in Native-serving schools. The second barrier included CW-FIT being limited by the school or district coaches' capacity as cited on (page e19). The applicant proposes to address these barriers by: adapting CW-FIT for cultural relevance to the target population by collaborating with their partners and adapting trainings and resources as needed; and implement the new CW-FIT AI Coaching Support for teachers to receive rapid feedback with regard to profession development as noted on (page e20).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 2. (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.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's team roles and responsibilities are clearly articulated on (pages e27 and e35) in logic model and chart form. The project's goals are listed. For example Goal 1 states – Expand CW-FIT to Native-serving and rural schools across the country and Goal 2 states – Contribute to the CW-FIT evidence base in Native-serving and rural schools as cited on (pages e32 and e33). Within this chart, the applicant provides project milestones, objectives, outcomes and measure of progress.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly outlines the partners as part of the logic model on (page e 27) along with the roles and responsibilities of the partners identified on (pages e23-26). Resumes of key personnel can be located in Appendix B on (page e54). The applicant clearly delineates that the financial resources of all participating organizations are stable and supportive of the project to provide matching funds and resources as cited on (page e22).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly articulates how the project will disseminate information and is outlined on (pages e28-29). For example dissemination efforts will be guided by NAU, the CW-FIT team and State Executive Directors. For example, dissemination will begin in the first quarter and will include efforts such as presentations at teacher education conferences, national and state conferences, journal publications, social media posts, to name a few as

**Sub**

cited on (page e29).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 5. (5) 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 on (page e29) outlines the potential for project products to be used in a variety of settings. For example, the applicant indicates that there is a strong need for evidence-based interventions in Native-serving and rural schools, the CW-FIT program and all available resources and products that result from the project will be available for free, and the CW-FIT AI Coaching supports will provide teacher with efficient feedback resulting in lower professional development costs.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's logic model clearly delineates the project's conceptual framework underlying the proposed research as cited on (page e31). The applicant on (page e119) Appendix G, also provides a comprehensive logic model depicting the process for which the project will aim to increase student academic engagement and achievement along with improved teacher classroom engagement practices for the target populations.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The project's goals are listed. For example Goal 1 states – Expand CW-FIT to Native-serving and rural schools across the country and Goal 2 states – Contribute to the CW-FIT evidence base in Native-serving and rural schools as cited on (pages e32 and e33). Within this chart, the applicant provides project functional milestones, objectives, outcomes and measures of progress.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly delineates how the project addresses the needs of the target population by providing strength of the partner supports to include, but not limited to: adapted CW-FIT with flexibility for scale to ensure the partnering schools, leaders and teachers preserve the core of the program; and the project design builds on a strong CW-FIT foundation of over 16 years as cited on (page e34).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

- 1. (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 standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

**Reader's Score: 0**

- 2. (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

**Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

- (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
- (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
- (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

**Strengths:**

Strengths: The applicant has demonstrated they have partnered with a minority serving institutions such as Northern Arizona University. Members of this entity will work collaboratively to investigate adaptations to CW-FIT to make it more scalable, implemented efficiently and effectively with the target populations as cited on (page e12).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

## Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

**Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty: Community Asset-Mapping and Needs Assessment and Evidence-Based Instructional Approaches and Supports (up to 3 points).**

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through the following priority areas:

(a) Conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) Using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high-quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K-12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant addresses the impact of Covid-19 learning losses and the strategies implemented to mitigate said losses in distressed communities as cited on (page e14). The applicant further outlines evidence-based supports that will be implemented such professional development, coaching, and ongoing support for educators.

#### **Weaknesses:**

There were no needs assessments clearly delineated as part of this application.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/03/2024 10:57 PM