

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/04/2017 10:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Sub Total	15	0
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
Sub Total	30	0
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	14
Sub Total	55	14
Total	100	14

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 4: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant 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.
- (3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

This project meets the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without Reservations. For example:

1. Both evaluation plans include plans to include the positive impact of the program (e42).
2. The RCT is appropriately sized at more than 350 students and 50 schools (e15) at multiple sites.

The grant narrative does address some issues needed for replication. Pages e29 and e30 of the narrative reflect on the populations that might be served by the proposed program. Also, there is a short explanation of a plan to have the "Friday Institute" to build a coaching program that can be scaled to partner locations in the country included.

Information on data to be collected and of the data tools developed in the program is in the narrative. The evaluation plan does provide the Effect sizes from a previous study of this project (e45).

Weaknesses:

The narrative on evaluation methods would be improved by adding details and clarifying steps on the projects. For example:

1. The timeline for project activities references development of assessments (e39). Pages e42 and e43 refer to specific measures that are in place. Some clarification of this is needed.
2. Page e45 states that the evaluation will use valid and reliable achievement measures. However, no detail is provided including which measures are referred to and support for these statements.

3. No explanation is provided for the percentages used to identify full, partial, and low implementation of strategies (e46) and, in fact, the outcome of one objective listed on e32 is that 85 percent of teachers will use strategies. This falls in the “partial implementation” group, not the full implementation group defined on e46. Clarification is needed.

4. No specifics are provided on the types of analyses that will be conducted to determine the outcomes of this project. This makes it difficult for groups wishing to replicate the project to ensure they are evaluating their project in the same way

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/04/2017 10:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 07:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Sub Total	15	0
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
Sub Total	30	0
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	14
Sub Total	55	14
Total	100	14

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 4: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant 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.
- (3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

The project proposes a randomized control design using at least 65 schools in the sample (p. 25). The proposal also notes that schools will be randomly assigned to treatment and control groups (p. 25) and the evaluator will track attrition and address any baseline equivalency issues with statistical methods (p. 28). These steps will meet the requirements of the What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards without reservations. The proposal includes measures that will provide data on the elements of the program that are associated with successful implementation and could provide some data for use with replication (p. 26). The data collected to measure the identified objectives are based on state level student data and teacher level value added measures (p. 14 & 25) which will produce reliable and valid outcome measure to track program performance. The project includes a discussion of specific outcomes for the project (p. 14) and thresholds for implementation on some of the components (p. 29).

Weaknesses:

The proposal notes that the project will need to recruit at least 65 of 73 schools in the state (p. 25) which is a very large percentage of schools, but there is no discussion of what the project would do if they did not obtain the participation of the schools. While the proposal includes data collection tools that will address specific components of the planned program there is limited information on frequency, viability or reliability of the data (p. 26). While the project includes thresholds of implementation for some components (e.g., teachers using personalized learning models) it does not address components discussed in the project design (e.g., technology integration) (p. 29). The limited focus of the evaluation will not provide all of the necessary information for effective replication.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/02/2017 07:32 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/05/2017 12:49 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	14
Sub Total	15	14
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	25
Sub Total	30	25
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	33
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	55	33
Total	100	72

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 4: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

(2) The national significance of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant provides clear evidence that the students in the target area rural schools score below the state average in reading and have reading achievement gaps for students with disabilities and English Language Learners (ELLs) that exceed state average. Some reading gaps reach as high as 60 percentage points.

(2) The applicant states that this project will use personalized learning to have a positive impact on student achievement (p. 5).

(3) The applicant thoroughly addresses priorities one and five (p. 3). The applicant proposes to use a personalized learning approach that targets an area where the poverty level of students is 61 percent. The approach is exceptional in that it has dual emphasis on adolescent literacy and personalized learning rather than on technology (p. 6).

Weaknesses:

(2) It is not clear how the applicant's approach has national significance. More detail is needed to make that distinction on how this approach is important nationally.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

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

(2) The extent to which the applicant 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.

(3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety

Strengths:

(1) The applicant states that personalized learning has limited implementation in rural middle schools (p. 5). A shared service network will be used to support implementation to scale among a region of rural schools.

(2) Barriers that are cited to implementing personalized learning are absence of technology infrastructure, comprehensive data systems, and a lack of continuous professional development for teachers (p. 10).

(3) The applicant states that personalized learning is replicable and cites studies where personalized learning is being used in school districts (p. 13).

Weaknesses:

(3) While the applicant states that personalized learning is replicable, it is not clear how this approach will be replicated. The applicant describes strategies related to scaling personalized learning, but not specific methods on how this project or approach can be replicated.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant states goals that are aligned to the project's objectives and outcomes (pp. 14-15).

(2) The management plan is clear and demonstrates how the applicant will complete the project on time and on budget. A description of key staff is provided with experience implementing projects of this size. The organizational structure for the project is provided (p. 17). A timeline is also provided with the activities and key milestones indicated.

(3) Feedback will be gathered from students, parents/guardians, teachers, principals, and superintendents (p. 23). Surveys, reports, and site visits will be used to provide a summary of suggestions for improvement.

(4) The applicant states that sustaining the project will be less expensive as the upfront costs are much greater (p. 24). As more teachers are trained and personalized learning strategies are implemented, it is suggested that a 'new normal' is established.

Weaknesses:

(1) While the applicant states objectives for the project, as they are written they are not measurable or time-bound.

(4) The applicant does not provided sufficient detail or strategies as to how the project activities will be incorporated into the schools served.

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/05/2017 12:49 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/05/2017 06:53 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	14
Sub Total	15	14
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	27
Sub Total	30	27
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	33
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	55	33
Total	100	74

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 4: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

(2) The national significance of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Strengths:

The applicant uses data to provide evidence of need for reading improvement in Tennessee's rural districts (p. 9) specifying that Tennessee's rural students are outperformed on reading assessments by rural students both nationwide and by students statewide (Johnson). Research cited also strongly supports the need for development of critical thinking skills for high-school graduates and the impact of academic achievement of students prior to 8th grade on their readiness for college and careers (ACT), (p. 10).

Data supporting national significance suggests students attending rural schools begin school with more challenges (Grace, p. 4), and that 20.4 percent of public school students in 2014 were enrolled in schools in rural areas (Johnston, p. 4). The applicant strongly supports evidence of national need through data (U.S. Census Bureau, p. 4) that indicates the demographics in rural school populations are shifting, while the schools continue to face challenges of performance gaps, high dropout rates, and low college completion rates (p. 4). The applicant also supports the need for reading instruction in the middle grades (Biancarosa, p. 5), and use of a research-based personalized learning model to improve achievement levels (Clayton Christensen Institute, p. 5).

The applicant incorporates sound data regarding the effectiveness of personalized learning strategies for students from high-need populations (absolute priority one) (Getting Smarter, [p. 3], and the need for highly skilled teachers to offer the strategy in schools (Council of Chief State School Officers, p. 3). Data supports number of students impacted, with 73 schools in 11 counties, and approximately 19,700 students (grades 6-8) with 61 percent economically disadvantaged, p. 3).

The applicant also provides compelling evidence on the use of evidence-driven practices (absolute priority five) with details to support the use of shared services network to help scale reforms in rural settings in an efficient manner (Nelson, p. 5), and provides data showing that use of technologies help to implement, scale, and improve outcomes of the personalized learning model (Tennessee SCORE, U.S. Dept. of Education, Kennedy, p. 6). Applicant demonstrates the exceptional approach of combining a personalized learning model to adolescent literacy instruction (p. 6), and specifies that schools will choose the personalized learning strategies that will work for that school as long as it's based in the four research-based criteria of personalized learning p. 7).

Weaknesses:

Application lacks specific details regarding a defined personalized learning model (p. 6).

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

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

(2) The extent to which the applicant 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.

(3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety

Strengths:

The applicant provides sufficient evidence for unmet demand in the grant delivery area (p. 9). Through use of personalized learning strategies, the applicant proposes to help improve achievement of rural 6-8 grade students in Tennessee (18 school districts) with 85 percent average Title 1, serving about 19,700 students (abstract). Need is supported by data (Tennessee SCORE) that indicates rural students in Tennessee's rural schools face significant barriers to attainment, including geographic isolation, and human and capital resources, making them at greater risk of not succeeding (p. 2). Research-based and previously successful strategies include personalized learning strategies, teacher support (reading), shared service network, assessment tools for teachers (abstract). Application provides evidence that barriers to delivery of personalized learning include technology infrastructure, data systems, professional development, and access to quality teachers (p. 10). By citing previously successful programs nationwide, applicant provides evidence of feasibility of successful replication in a variety of settings and populations (12).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant addresses barriers to implementing the model specific to the area of delivery, and strategies to overcome the barriers, the applicant does not provide evidence of barriers identified that prevented the applicant from reaching scale previously (p. 11). While applicant provides ample evidence on feasibility of replication, the application provides very general information on the how of replication and scaling (p. 13).

Reader's Score: 27

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

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

(4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

Strengths:

The main goals of increasing proficiency, teacher effectiveness in model delivery are aligned to the objectives and projected outcomes. Objectives are measurable and attainable for goals one and two (p. 15). The management plan is specific, feasible, and within reasonable expectations of expected delivery. The plan includes specific timeline of activities

and aligns to the proposed budget. The applicant adequately provides opportunity for feedback and continuous improvement (pp. 15-16, Table 3, p. 23). In addition, the plan includes well-thought-out activities toward sustainability through capacity and infrastructure development (p. 24).

Weaknesses:

The third goal, replication, is vague and may be difficult to measure (p. 15). Measurable outcomes for goal three are not clearly stated (p. 15).

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/05/2017 06:53 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/03/2017 08:10 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	12
Sub Total	15	12
Selection Criteria		
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	22
Sub Total	30	22
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	55	30
Total	100	64

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - EIR - Mid Phase Grants - 4: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Niswonger Foundation (U411B170038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The national significance of the proposed project.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

Strengths:

The applicant's focus on adolescent literacy and personalized learning is an underdeveloped area in the field and would, if implemented successfully, have national significance; they demonstrate the population is also underserved. The program design is differentiated, offering choice based on school needs and priorities while being aligned to general set of foundational practices—this, in part, is an exceptional approach to addressing the needs of persistently low performing schools.

Weaknesses:

Because the applicant does not articulate its theory or practice model for literacy, it's difficult to ascertain how and why their planned approach would be exceptional. Indeed, as it does not offer a specific and/or novel approach to personalized learning that expands understanding and implementation of it, it is not clear how the results will be significant to the development of effective personalized learning practices.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

- (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.
- (2) The extent to which the applicant 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.
- (3) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates significant achievement gaps among population it intends to serve and common barriers that impede access. Its focus on personalization would allow other settings to adapt program components more readily, thereby encouraging greater replication; the fact that many of the resources are available online and on-demand would likely increase replication attempts. The applicant's plans to implement programming at control schools at a faster rate than treatment may provide insight into how to scale the work past the grant period.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not articulate a specific strategy for attending to the general barriers identified; it remains unclear how it specifically intends to address likely challenges to its program model. Furthermore, because there is not a specific improvement strategy articulated, it's not clear what the value-add would be for those not participating in the grant program. Scaling may be difficult in those communities without experience with PL or strong regional LEA support.

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
- (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

Strengths:

Goals are measurable and address both student and teacher achievement; detailed project plan aligns milestones with roles and timelines. Multiple advisory/oversight groups, organized by stakeholder type, will likely provide meaningful feedback on implementation; applicant plans on collecting a variety of data from multiple stakeholders. Planning support during initial stages are likely to encourage practices beyond grant period.

Weaknesses:

Though receiving some interim feedback from stakeholders, it is not frequent enough to likely impact program model; the frequency and intensity of analysis and reporting, too, does not appear likely to affect program outcomes. The applicant will need to hire a considerable most of its project team, raising questions about its ability to implement its plan according to the timeline and at the level necessary to achieve its goals.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components, mediators, and outcomes of the grant-supported intervention, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/03/2017 08:10 AM