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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)
Reader #1:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	15
Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources/Management Plan	20	16
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	66
Total	100	66

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)

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:**

    (1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

    (2) 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.

   Strengths:

   The applicant provides for the potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge of educational issues. Their project will develop, implement, and evaluate scalable practices for an evidence based, elementary school intervention: Class-Wide Function-related Intervention Teams (CW-FIT). CWFIT uses a positively focused group contingency to increase academic engagement and academic competencies for high needs students. This evidence-based interventions CS-FIT is novel because it is the only one that addresses engagements as a dependent variable and has a Tier 2 level of supports for non-responsive students. It targets changes in teachers' skill sets as they learn to establish a more positive classroom climate and improve their classroom management skills. The applicant's project represents a way to improve engagement in elementary school classrooms in class and school settings that are becoming more and more challenging to classroom teachers in high need low performing school districts. E27

   The applicant demonstrates aspects of an unmet demand for their practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application. Citations are provided that support engaging students in instruction as they may often lack adequate behavior and classroom management skills. They cite studies that indicate that urban teachers report being unprepared to address challenging behavior and student social-behavioral needs and too often abandon teaching because of their classroom frustrations. This program is geared to improve elementary student engagement as schools with high percentages of high need students look for solutions to improve student achievement. E28

   Weaknesses:

   2. The applicant did not provide sufficient studies or citations to show there is an unmet demand for their project. The applicant did not illustrate what makes CW-FIT the answer to engaging high need elementary students and improving classroom management compared to other classroom management techniques/strategies that have been utilized and proven overtime to work by experienced teachers who have mastered the art of teaching. The applicant cites the strong demand for their product, but does not provide sufficient details to how they will reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application. E28

This criterion was thoroughly discussed, and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Reader's Score: 10

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:**

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

   (2) 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 provides clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. The project has two major goals: Increase the scalability and sustainability of CW-FIT by creating a District Coaching Model and developing Implementation Supports and Contribute to the CW-FIT evidence base for improving student academic engagement and achievement for high students in elementary schools and improving teachers' classroom management in these schools. Their Table 2-Project Goals, Objectives, Outcomes and Measures are comprehensive and detailed with specific measurable outcomes for each strategy. For example the strategy that deals with Conduct Initial Training of District Coaches is measured by: All district coaches attend training and each coach demonstrates 90% or greater on Coaching Mastery Assessment. District Coaches submit training evaluations with 90% satisfaction and no major issues/procedures in need of revision are identified. The applicant has high expectations for performance and rigor set for their project outcomes. E30

The applicant provides a conceptual framework underlying the proposed demonstration activities with a framework that is well detailed and comprehensive. Their Logic Model provides sufficient inputs and outputs for program key components as well as intermediate and long-term outcomes in support of their conceptual framework. The project is based on District Coaching Model and Implementation Supports to integrate CW-FIT into the schools and sustain that program over time. Their Figure 2-CW-FIT Logic Model contains the variables to initiate CW-FIT with fidelity. The Logic Model contains key program components with inputs and outputs coupled with Outcomes that are intermediate and Long-Term. For example under intermediate outcomes a heading lists Improved Training Capacity, Improved Teacher Outcomes and Improved Student Outcomes which are supported by appropriate bullets under each category. The project is a pragmatic one that utilizes school-based personnel and schools to improve outcomes for both teacher and student. E33

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

(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.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project will increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results and increase productivity.

Strengths:

The applicant provides barriers that prevent the applicant from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application. The most significant barrier described by the applicant is the need to develop a system to train District Coaches who are not external to the school and what happens is schools that previously adopted the project do not have the capacity to train and support teachers. The remedy as indicated by the lead agency is to build a district coaching model where school districts will build capacity and grow the use of CW-FIT. Table 3-District Coaching Model provides the components of the plan. E35

The applicant provides that the proposed project will increase efficiency in the use of time, staff and cost to improve results and increase productivity. Time will be enhanced by using district coaches and the TORSH system (secure online platform) to provide coaching and feedback based on uploaded teacher videos. This saving of time reduces time spend on discipline issues and freeing more time for instruction. In addition, the district makes a valid point in that training district coaches builds district capacity and is more cost effective as well as having online access to training materials and a Coaching Manual and access to resources for teacher implementation. E37

Weaknesses:

 1 The applicant provides only one barrier (District Coaching Model) to project implementation. Based on the rigors associated with high needs elementary school classrooms, other barriers exist that may include, teacher turnover, lack of effective teachers, school leadership, desire or lack of, to be a part of a professional teacher training that involves videotaping, and others germane to the participating school environment most likely exist to be considered. E35

The applicant does not identify as a potential barrier what they discuss in their narrative, which is the lack of school behavior support team personnel being available to classroom teachers in participating high needs schools serving elementary students due to budget or other commitments they may have. They may not be there to help classroom teachers implement the Tier 2 component. (Being able to redirect students who are non-responsive). E27

2. The applicant, the lead agency proposing the project, shares that they lack within their own existing organization sufficient training, infrastructure, and a support framework (resources) to provide school districts with requests for training and ongoing maintenance. The applicant's response demonstrates that they are not able to currently fulfill requests for services due to the fact that they do not have the resources (time, staff, money, etc.) to improve results and increase productivity. E29

This criterion was thoroughly discussed, and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

 1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the**

management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) 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.

(2) 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.

(3) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

(4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

1. The applicant has provided details that their management plan is adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time, within budget including clearly defined responsibilities, and timelines for accomplishing project tasks. Table 5-Objectives, strategies and project personnel lays out the goals, strategies, the timeline and personnel assigned to meet project outcomes. Clearly stated is that the KC Site Team will be responsible for implementation tracking and SRI will be responsible for conducting the evaluation. This division of primary responsibilities as laid out by the applicant will assist project task completion. Meetings are planned to coordinate, review feedback and records and timelines. Coaching logs are placed into the TORSH system and will be reviewed by the KC CW-FIT staff. Included in their plan is the establishment of an advisory board well suited to inform the development of Implementation Supports and the District Coach Model.   E38

2. The applicant illustrates their capacity in terms of qualified personnel and management capacity to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level working through partners during the grant period. The applicant has successful management experience; including large efficacy trials and multi-site training and evaluation efforts. The applicant has repeated funding form agencies that include IES, NIH and OSEP illustrating accountability with funded work. The evaluator SRI has successfully evaluated projects from multiple agencies and departments with the names and roles for that component. Implementation personnel are listed in Table 6-Project Personnel with clearly defined roles delineated including the designated person who will oversee fiscal and budgetary management. Complete resumes with education and experience are provided for the project. School based team roles are detailed as well including the team structure and District Coaches. Figure 3- Management/Organizational Structure and Communications Strategies shows the direct relationships between and among key staff and partners. E39

3. The applicant illustrates some supports for the project after federal funding ends; including the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support. The applicant indicates the possibility of continued implementation if the project is proven effective. The concept of the district coaching model and implementation supports based locally will go a long way in maintaining the impetus for the project. If proven effective, internal district professional development funds may be utilized to continue and expand the project. There is an extensive communication strategy exemplified on Table 7 to enhance those working at all levels in terms of meeting frequency and project outcomes. Other districts will have the opportunity of directly viewing exemplar classrooms before adopting the project. Links to social media will help ensure broad dissemination and the active translation of research to practitioners.   E44

4. The applicant provides some information that the costs are reasonable in Relation to the Objectives, Design and Project Significance. This includes that this funding will increase the value of the prior USDOE funding of CW-FIT by building on those initial investments. The TORSH Talent component is budgeted at $150 per teacher and coach and districts should be able to sustain that cost to be as low at $50 per teacher depending on the outcome of the project.

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant has not specifically identified/listed and/or included the category of milestones which is part of this sub criteria for this project. The applicant's absent of specific milestones inhibits being able to monitor and measure project component implementation. The applicant's omission of milestones also hampers the project's progress to meet outcomes. E38

 3.There is no obligation on school districts or other partners to continue the project even with proven outcomes, based on the content found in letters of support provided by the applicant for this funding. These letters do not include carryover of project activities after funding ends. This includes the letters submitted on behalf of school districts and institutions of higher education provided by the applicant in the Exhibit Section.
 I.e. "It is understood our district will not incur costs associated with participation and will not be invoiced for expenses such as training .E91 In addition, an IHE scope of work only details involvement within the grant award period. E87

 4. The applicant does not provide sufficient narrative that explains that the costs are reasonable in relations to the objectives, design and potential significance of the proposed costs. The applicant's scope of the positions and the rationale for the low FTE are not detailed. For example, project implementation components include to be announced/hired graduate assistants, who will be responsible for project implementation in selected schools. Their FTE components are listed at 30% and 50%. This is also true for the Implementation Support Coordinator at a 35% effort. E108

Reader's Score: 16

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:**

   (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 this notice).

   (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 project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

   Strengths:
   -

   Weaknesses:
   -

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/28/2019 05:23 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)

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

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	20
Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources/Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	80
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)

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:**

    (1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

    (2) 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.

    Strengths:

    (1) The applicant well describes how the Class-Wide Function related Intervention Teams (CW-FIT) program will contribute to increasing the knowledge base for how effective evidence- based strategies can be taken to scale and be sustained. The applicant proposes to enhance district capacity to implement and develop supports for classroom management using an online platform to support coaching and fidelity (the TORSH Talent System in Strategy to Scale Section). The Class-Wide Function related Intervention Teams (CW-FIT) program will help the applicant to make a potential contribution to increased knowledge and understanding of a classroom intervention program that engages students at risk of school failure and improves teachers' ability to teach more (p.e26). CW-FIT is a unique approach to dealing with the classroom management issues which targets changes in teachers' skill sets as they learn to establish a more positive classroom climates and improve their classroom management skills.

    (2) The applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for classroom management practices that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application. The applicant cites relevant research documenting the need for evidence-based interventions addressing classroom management or classroom behavior (pp. e26-29). Researchers agree that there is a strong demand for evidence-based, scalable, cost-efficient interventions that can improve elementary student engagement as schools with high percentages of high-needs students look for solutions to improve student achievement. Although schools and school districts around the country have shown significant interest in CW-FIT, there is an unmet demand for CW-FIT as schools with high-needs students look for evidence-based strategies to help address disengaged students, poorly managed classrooms and low student achievement. For example, the applicant reports that a significant number of Website visits (12,551) and website visits and requests (1,350) for CW-FIT information (p. e29). Unfortunately, the lack of a sufficient training infrastructure and support framework to fulfill these requests for training is significant.

    Weaknesses:

    (1) None noted
    (2) None noted

Reader's Score: 15

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:**

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

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

   Strengths:

   (1) The applicant presents specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project. Project objectives and outcomes are clearly linked to goals. The applicant provides performance measures with quantitative indicators used to gauge project performance (p. e 30- 32).

   (2) The applicant provides a comprehensive logic model (p.e38) for the CW-FIT project to which there is a solid conceptual framework. The logic model includes key components, including inputs (teaching skills); outputs (# of teachers trained); intermediate outcomes (improved classroom management); long-term outcomes (improved student achievement). The conceptual framework for the proposed project is based on developing, implementing, and evaluating scalable practices for an evidence-based, elementary school intervention. Class-Wide Function-related Intervention Teams (CWFIT) will use a focused group format to increase academic engagement and academic competencies for high-needs students. Data collected from implementing partners will assist in identifying school-level assets and barriers to inform future expansion.

   Weaknesses:

   (1) None noted
   (2) None noted

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

   (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.

   (2) The extent to which the proposed project will increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results and increase productivity.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant clearly describes how the lack of sustainable supports for training and implementation fidelity is a barrier to reaching the level of scale that can be achieved. This barrier exists because a system to train District Coaches with district capacity to train has not been developed, which means that school districts have relied on external coaching from CW-FIT trainers, and we are limited outside of targeted regions due to factors such as cost and time. To address this barrier, the applicant proposes to develop the District Coaching Model, (a train the trainer approach) training District Coaches (who will then train teachers) and building district capacity to sustain the intervention. The second barrier includes the limited availability of on-site coaching and in classroom support to teachers due to cost and time effective methods to support teachers. To address this barrier, the applicant will develop Implementation Supports using the TORSH Talent system and the CW-FIT website supports (pp. e34 -36). The strategies to address these barriers will support the applicant in reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The applicant describes how the proposed project will increase efficiency in the use of time, costs, and resources in order to improve results and increase productivity. Increasing time efficiency will be achieved by implementing CW-FIT to reduce time spent in student discipline, freeing up even more time for instruction. For example, District Coaches will be able to provide coaching and feedback based on uploaded teacher videos, which will save time driving to individual schools and scheduling observations (p. e36). Efficiencies in cost will be achieved by training District Coaches who will be able to train, coach and monitor the fidelity of teacher implementation builds district capacity and is expected to be more cost effective than hiring external coaches. Efficiencies in resources will be achieved by District Coaches having online access to all training materials and a Coaching Manual (p.e37). These strategies in the use of time, costs, and resources will help the applicant improve results and increase project efficiency.

Weaknesses:

(1) None noted
(2) None noted

Reader's Score: **20**

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) 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.

   (2) 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.

   (3) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

   (4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant provides a solid management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The management plan with goals, objectives, measures, activities, timelines and responsible personnel is provided below (p.e38), as well as measures for objectives (pp. e 30-32). The applicant provides a description of key project personnel, clearly defined responsibilities (pp. e 38- e 42), and resumes which fur describe their qualifications and experiences (Appendix B). In addition, the applicant provides an organizational flow chart which shows the reporting structure communication strategies (p. e 43). The applicant provides a realistic year to year timeline, as well as milestones for accomplishing project tasks (p. e 38). This management plan will provide a clear blueprint for the successful implementation of the project goals.

(2) The applicant well describes their capacity through qualified personnel and other resources to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)). The personnel are highly qualified to bring the project to scale. For example, the project director has over a decade of experience with CW-FIT, having conducted training for schools across the country; as led numerous federal education projects including two efficacy trials of CW-FIT; and has extensive administrative experience and an MBA with a management emphasis (p. e 44). The resources are sufficient to bring the project to scale. For example, The TORSH Talent System, a key resource for this project, is an online professional development platform that allow District Coaches to Observe (teachers), Measure (the fidelity and implementation of CW-FIT), Coach (teachers at scale), and Coordinate all teachers training events, coaching and feedback (p. e 49).

(3) The applicant describes the potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support. CW-FIT is highly likely to continue in the partnering districts following project funding if proven effective. The District Coaching Model and Implementation Supports will develop district capacity to continue and to disseminate to additional schools throughout their districts. Several factors contribute to the likelihood of CW-FIT being sustained and successfully disseminated following the project. First, sustainability planning will integrate CW-FIT into partnering districts' planning budgets including TORSH and District Coaching, yearly professional development and systems for support. Second, District Coaches and leaders will help with the multi-strategy dissemination plan including partnering organizations; sharing results and the intervention within their school district and state; and providing exemplar classrooms that other districts may consult with prior to adopting CW-FIT. Third, supporting broader dissemination, will include news releases to education and news services; maintaining a website, video resources and testimonials; and links to social (pp. e 43-45). Utilizing these strategies will help to bring the project to scale and will help ensure broad dissemination and the active translation of research to practitioners.

(4) The applicant's proposed budget of $7,992,701.25 is reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project. The cost of TORSH Talent is budgeted at $150 per teacher and coach and Districts look to sustain the costs that could be as low as $50 per teacher based on the final District Coaching Model (p. e 45). The potential impact of the project includes 9,900 students to be served (p. e 21).

Weaknesses:

(1) None noted
(2) None noted
(3) None noted
(4) None noted

Reader's Score: **20**

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:

   (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 this notice).

   (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 project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/28/2019 02:39 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/29/2019 03:52 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)
Reader #3: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	15
Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources/Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	68
Total	100	68

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)

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:**

   (1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

   (2) 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.

   Strengths:

   • The applicant identifies the tiered components of the intervention that involves teachers teaching lessons addressing common problem behaviors, students earning points for their teams, and self-management (e26-e27).

   Weaknesses:

   • The applicant does not clearly illustrate that there is an unmet demand for this process. Purely identifying the number of website visits and requests does not fully demonstrate an unmet demand (e28-e29). There is a need for concrete citations and research data to indicate the demand for this process.
   • The applicant does not clearly articulate details about the educational problem for which this project will increase knowledge or understanding (e25-e26).

Reader's Score: 8

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:**

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

   (2) 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 includes a timeline that explicitly identifies the project's goals, outcomes, measures, and milestones (e30-e32). The content within Table 2 illustrates that the applicant has thoroughly chartered the work that would be done within the project and the measures that would be put in place to measure the success of the five-year project.
   • The logic model clearly establishes the conceptual framework that (e33) will drive the project design and project

evaluation. The project objectives, project design, and evaluation plan demonstrate that the desired outcomes of increased student academic engagement and achievement and improved classroom management.

Weaknesses:

• None noted

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

   (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.

   (2) The extent to which the proposed project will increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results and increase productivity.

   Strengths:

   • The District Coaching Model, or train-the-trainer approach, will combat barriers associated with lack of district capacity to train, cost and time (e34). District Coaches will be able to provide face-to-face technical assistance and support that is cost prohibitive for districts to sustain with external coaching. The success of the model will be supported with a nomination process for identifying the coach, initial training of the coach, and consultation with national trainers.

   Weaknesses:

   • Beyond the impact of the District Coaches, the applicant does not adequately detail the extent to which the proposed project will increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results and increase productivity (e37). The applicant could enhance this section by including details that would provide an analysis of costs, time, staff, and money.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) 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.

   (2) 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.

   (3) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

(4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

•   The management plan thoroughly describes the goals, objectives, measures, activities, timelines, and personnel responsible (e37-e38).

•   The applicant has proven project management success with large efficacy trials and multi-site training and evaluation efforts. Repeated funding shows the integrity and accountability the applicant has demonstrated when carrying out funded work (e37).

•   The project personnel's roles and responsibilities are detailed and will increase the likelihood that ongoing feedback, continuous improvement, strong communication, and external evaluation will occur (e38-e39). The past experiences of the personnel demonstrate that they are highly qualified to bring the project scale (e41-e42).

•   To contribute to the success of the project, district and school-based staff will continue monthly meetings to monitor program data. Furthermore, the advisory board will have quarterly video conference calls and yearly in-person meetings to provide ongoing review and feedback (e40-e41).

•   Project teams have demonstrated resources necessary to bring the project to scale including Juniper Gardens Children's Project, the TORSH Talent System, and the TIDR Lab (e42).

•   Continued support of the project after funding ends will be supported in various ways. This includes the District Coaching Model and Implementation Supports developing district capacity to continue and to disseminate information to additional schools. The applicant commits to sustainability planning from day one of the project. Professional development, monthly consultation calls, multi-strategy dissemination planning within the district and state, broader dissemination via news services, research briefs, and social media (e44-e45).

•   The applicant's budget narrative (e107-e116) reasonably details the various costs associated with this project. Expenses are categorized by personnel, fringe benefits, travel, supplies, contractual, other costs, direct costs, indirect costs, and matching funds.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

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:**

    (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 this notice).

    (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 project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/29/2019 03:52 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/30/2019 10:58 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)
Reader #4:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		15	0
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	0
Strategy to Scale			
1. Strategy to Scale		20	0
Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan			
1. Resources/Management Plan		20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	14
	Sub Total	100	14
	Total	100	14

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - EIR Mid Phase - 2: 84.411B

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)

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:

   (1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

   (2) 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.

   Strengths:

   na

   Weaknesses:

   na

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:

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

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

   Strengths:

   na

   Weaknesses:

   na

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

   (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.

   (2) The extent to which the proposed project will increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results and increase productivity.

   Strengths:

   na

   Weaknesses:

   na

Reader's Score:　　0

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) 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.

   (2) 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.

   (3) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

   (4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

   Strengths:

   na

   Weaknesses:

   na

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:**

    (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 this notice).

    (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 project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

    Strengths:

    The applicant presented a comprehensive evaluation design for the proposed elementary school intervention. If well implemented, the evaluation method is likely to produce evidence that meets the What Works Clearinghouse standards for the following reasons:
    1.   The evaluation follows a teacher-level randomized control trial (RCT) design to compare program outcomes between participants in the treatment and the control condition.
    2.   The applicant articulated how the evaluation will inform the replication of the program (p.24-27).
    3.   The applicant will use data from multiple sources to measure implementation fidelity and program outcomes, including primary data collected from survey and observations, and secondary data from the program and schools. The applicant articulated the relevance of these data to the program outcomes and cited reliability indices from previous studies. Table 10 on page 28 effectively presents the outcomes, measures and the timing of data collection.
    4.   The power calculation suggests the sample has a good chance of detecting the target size of effect.
    5.   The modeling of data is appropriate given the nested structure of students and schools.

    Weaknesses:

    The evaluation plan can be strengthened in the following ways:
    1.   The description of staggered schedule for the program implementation needs to be substantiated. It would be helpful if the applicant can explain how the treatment sample changes each semester in year 3 and 4, and how dosage of treatment affects the estimation of the program effects. These are important analytical considerations for the proposed design.
    2.   The applicant needs to develop a stronger argument for assuming low attrition or handling attrition as it may well affect how the evaluation meet WWC standards.
    3.   The data sources for covariates need to be explained as some of the measures do not appear to be easy to capture, for example, the school context as stated on page 25.

    Reader's Score: **14**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/30/2019 10:58 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)
Reader #5:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	0
Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources/Management Plan	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Sub Total	100	16
Total	100	16

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - EIR Mid Phase - 2: 84.411B

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

Applicant: University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. (U411B190025)

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:**

   (1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

   (2) 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.

   Strengths:

   NA

   Weaknesses:

   NA

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:**

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

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

   Strengths:

   NA

   Weaknesses:

   NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

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

   (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.

   (2) The extent to which the proposed project will increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results and increase productivity.

   Strengths:

   NA

   Weaknesses:

   NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) 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.

   (2) 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.

   (3) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

   (4) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

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:**

   (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 this notice).

   (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 project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

   Strengths:

   The evidence of effectiveness produced by this evaluation is likely to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. The design is a cluster randomized controlled trial or RCT (see page e47). Random assignment occurs at the teacher level. The sample size (28 schools, 144 classes, and 3,600 students) are adequate and statistical power is estimated to identify significant differences (page e52). Key moderators being gathered for both the treatment and control groups, such as prior academic performance, gender, race/ethnicity, and social-economic status; are listed in this application (page e48). The risk of non-response from individuals is minimized due to a study design that gathers assessments/measurements from administrative units of the participating LEAs.

   The evaluation plan outlines a comprehensive 4-component strategy for generating and sharing key information regarding implementation and useful in supporting replication efforts. Using key moderators at the school level, teacher level, and the student level (race/ethnicity, eligibility for free/reduced lunch, special education status, and prior achievement), the evaluation plan will provide useful information on how program efforts impact subgroups differentially (see page e48). Note the mention of demographic composition (e.g., percentage of students eligible for free/reduced lunch); indicating "contextual effects" will/can be tested in the statistical models being utilized. Contextual effects are important moderators and/or mediators in most studies involving school settings. Other key components of the evaluation plan provide detailed information on barriers to implementation (fidelity) on page e48 and a cost analysis to establish the cost-effectiveness of this endeavor (pages e49 and e50).

   All outcome data elements are succinctly, but completely described on pages e51 in Table 10 Data Collection Components and Timing. All measures are appropriate for their purpose. The core outcome data are state assessment scores, and rating scales of student engagement and classroom management. Implementation measures are simple counts and percentages on observer tools, all of which are likely to be gathered with low measurement error. Reliability estimates from prior studies are available and support the use of these assessments for their purpose.
   The measures used in this evaluation design (pages e51) are appropriate for their purpose, likely measured with very little error, and are unlikely to be diminished by non-response, missing data, or attrition. The measures are embedded in a well thought out evaluation design.

   The three-level HLM being used in this study (see page e53) will yield results that support valid inferences regarding program impact. The use of an RCT with random assignment at the cluster/group-level to generate evaluation data where DVs and IVs are reliable and valid for their purposes, sets the stage for a successful analysis of outcome data. The HLM is the most appropriate statistical model to use in this scenario due to the explicit modeling of the nested data structures inherent in this setting and its ability to separate error sources across the different levels of the hierarchy; thereby improving the accuracy of standard error estimates used to tests hypotheses regarding the student, school, and programmatic impacts/outcomes.

   Authors do not succinctly describe key project components within the evaluation plan but do refer in general to the logic model (page e33). On page e53 of the application, authors clearly describe the relationship between program actions as

mediators of short-term and mid-term outcomes which then in turn mediate the long-term outcomes. Structural equation modeling will be used to test mediation effects (page e53). This is an excellent approach to testing these relationships. On page e51 of the application, authors provide a comprehensive listing of outcomes as well as how outcomes will be measured. Program strategies are logically linked to anticipated outcomes and proposed measures are appropriate for their purpose. On page e53 of the application, authors clearly describe the measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation. Key components with threshold statements are included and appropriately set. All thresholds set are rigorous but attainable.

Weaknesses:

It is challenging to estimate likely cluster-level attrition (assumed to be low in application), and there is no mention of actively managing attrition in this application. The application makes no mention of whether individuals that join a cluster after random assignment of the cluster will be included in the analytic sample.

This evaluation plan does not have a well-developed implementation classification rubric that yields a fidelity score such as low, moderate, or high fidelity. This type of information would assist others in gauging the extent to which a program is implemented with fidelity and guide replication efforts.

The research questions (see page e46) are not adequately operationalized within the application. There are very limited descriptions of decision criteria (regarding program "success") provided that refer to operationalized understandings of the outcomes. Effect size criteria are not evident. The mention of Minimum Detectable Effect Size (MDES) as part of the Power calculation, does not provide readers with specific success criteria related to each research question. No reference to specific statistical tests were noted. The reader is left to wonder how decisions regarding research questions are going to be made and hence how replication efforts can validate findings.

Reader's Score: 16

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/22/2019 12:14 PM