

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 08:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DUVAL COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (S411C200018)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	40	36
Sub Total	40	36
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources and Management	35	33
Sub Total	35	33
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	24
Sub Total	25	24
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Computer Science	5	3
Sub Total	5	3
Total	105	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 EIR Early Phase- AP2 STEM - 1: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: DUVAL COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (S411C200018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 36

Sub

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

Strengths:

The projects goals, objectives, and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable. The project utilizes a balance of qualitative and quantitative measures, utilizes current measures for teacher's observation rubric levels with established baselines, and lays out a cost-effective plan for replication. Pg e24-26; Abstract

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The project addresses the needs of Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and non- Exceptional Student Education students, as well as a diverse population of students attending the Duval elementary schools. The project will reach a diverse population of 4,760 students and 280 teachers over the courses of the grant. Pg e26; Abstract

Weaknesses:

The project did not provide statistics on the economically disadvantaged population of the students to be served throughout the project. By not naming at least some of the schools to be served within the project leaves the reader wondering how many of the schools represented within the project will actually include high-need populations. Pg 26; Abstract

Reader's Score: 8

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

Sub

Strengths:

The project utilizes up-to-date research on professional development, social and emotional learning, and on ESE students. Additionally, the focus of the Florida State Sunshine Standards provides a strong foundation for the research study. Pg e27-28

Weaknesses:

Although the project's foundation discusses research and data around ESE students and that subgroup appears to be a large focus of the grant, only 10% of the population to be served in grant will be an ESE student population – that is a small percentage if the grant research proposed will produce measures around that subgroup in contract to 90% Non-ESE student population. Pg e27-28

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

The project will produce increased knowledge in areas where there is limited research at the current time. Additionally, the project will produce knowledge around how ESE students react to computer coding and gamification strategies. Lastly, the project will contribute to additional professional development and coaching and mentoring strategies, especially in the areas of technology. Pg e30-31

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 10

Resources and Quality of Management Plan - Resources and Quality of Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 33

Sub

1. (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.

Strengths:

The project has provided a yearly management plan that provides extensive alignment to all goals and objectives. The project uses a 12 month cycle and allows for recruitment and retainment of teachers throughout the project. Each defined role lays out clear expectations and responsibilities across all partners. It is evident that collaboration will be seamless within the management of the grant, with Duval County Public Schools taking responsibility for overseeing all goals, objectives, and tasks. Pg e32-33; evaluation plan appendix Pg e107

Sub

Weaknesses:

It is unclear why the outside evaluators are not included in the management plan, planning year 1, or timelines for year 1. It would benefit the project to have the evaluators at start-up meetings during the implementation year, especially as teachers and schools were being selected and training options being discussed. Pg e32-33; evaluation plan

Reader's Score: 9

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

Strengths:

The costs are reasonable for the proposed project. An investment of \$736 per student is minimal with the sustainability of the project able to last many years beyond the 5 year proposed project. Additionally, purchasing technology for each classroom adds an additional layer of success for the project as students will not need to wait to computer lab access, they can work within the area of their own classrooms and have access at any time during the project. Pg e33-34; budget narrative

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

All proposed leads within the project have extensive knowledge in technology, the areas of science, and leading large federal grants and research projects. Having two university professors who have had extensive experience in publishing and research enhances the success of the project. Pg e36-37; resumes

Weaknesses:

The project director/co-project director Pauls is only allocated .1 FTE yearly. With a project of this magnitude, especially in the planning year, this seems like a limited time allocation. With an increased role, especially in year 1 and maybe year 2 may increase the success of the project's start-up time and success in kicking off the project. Pg e36-37; resumes; budget narrative

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The project has multiple processes in place for feedback and continuous improvement. The extensive expertise indicated by the members of the Advisory committee will allow for key stakeholders to provide feedback and suggestions; the inclusion of the outside evaluator will ensure changes be made throughout the project, not at the end of the project. Making changes after each cohort will lend to the success of project, especially after the baseline of cohort 1 is analyzed. Pg e36-37; evaluation plan appendix Pg e107

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 10

5. (5) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The project not only will disseminate information and strategies locally; it is also partnering with multiple technology and STEM large corporations who will assist in the project and disseminating findings nationally. Additionally, providing training on results to regional educators will help propel the project forward and allow other schools to replicate the project. Lastly, training parents will ensure that if students are required to move to remote learning, families will understand how the technology works and can better support students at home. Pg e18-19

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 24

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

Strengths:

The evaluation components would meet the What Works Clearing House standards without reservations. The project has accounted for attrition, creating baseline data in cohort 1, and focusing the evaluation data on additional cohorts. Additionally, the project is focused on two overarching research questions with exploratory research questions to produce additional data around ESE student achievement. Pg e39-40; Evaluation Plan Appendix Pg e107

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 15

2. (2) 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.

Sub

Strengths:

The project includes both summative and formative data points. The project also includes both stakeholder feedback and proposes a systematic process for implementation as key components to ensuring the evaluation is implemented with fidelity. Each component is aligned to the project's logic model and is measuring both teacher and student outcomes. Lastly, the evaluation includes timelines of when baseline targets will be refined to ensure fidelity to data collection and rating criteria. Pg e42-43; Evaluation Plan Appendix Pg e107

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The methods utilized within the cluster RCT evaluation plan will ensure valid and reliable outcomes of the project; the project sampling will take place over 4 cohorts, including the pilot cohort of year two with comparison groups being selected from teachers who volunteer to participate – participants will be randomly assigned to treatment and non-treatment groups. The extensive feedback methods provided in the plan ensure multiple points of setting baseline data and making needed changes throughout the project. The surveys proposed have already been tested and are part of the What Works Clearing House standards currently and have been tested and proven valid and reliable. Pg e43-45

Weaknesses:

Although the evaluation plan is extensive, it is questionable how reliable data collection around the ESE subgroup population can fully contribute to the evaluation report. With only 10% of students participating in the research study being proposed as ESE, and allowing for attrition of students, it could impact the full validity of the ESE data collection and reporting. Abstract and Project Need

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Strengths:

The project addresses expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science courses for a small population of students with disabilities, traditionally underrepresented students, and females.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the project will, through the selection process, ensure access to high-need schools or even high diversity schools. The schools will be selected based on teachers wanting to participate; the proposal does not show that the teachers in the selected schools are willing or able to participate in additional professional development offerings.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/28/2020 08:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/30/2020 10:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DUVAL COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (S411C200018)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	40	40
Sub Total	40	40
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources and Management	35	32
Sub Total	35	32
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	25
Sub Total	25	25
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 EIR Early Phase- AP2 STEM - 1: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: DUVAL COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (S411C200018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 40

Sub

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

Strengths:

The project goals and objectives, as described on page e24, align strongly with project design and needs of target population. The particular focus on exceptional student education (ESE) in the project design is reflected in the project outcomes as they are separately measured for all students and ESE students. A mix of qualitative and quantitative objective measures is included such as teacher and student self-efficacy, student motivation, student achievement, and teacher observation ratings (p. e24).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The evidence and rationale provided support the needs of the target population to a great extent. The primary target population is ESE students, which makes up a significant part of the student body across the district (p. e25). Data on graduation rates and science achievement of ESE students compared to non-ESE demonstrate persistent achievement gaps and establish a strong rationale for the proposed project design (p. e26). Given the challenges of working with ESE students, the project design has an added focus on social-emotional outcomes.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

Sub

Strengths:

A theory of change backed by research is provided. The proposed project (ULTRA:ME) is built on the Social Learning Theory (SLT) framework (p. e27) and components of Minecraft lessons are mapped to the SLT elements (p. e28). Evidence of effective practices for each component of the proposed project (gamification, augmented reality, teacher professional development) is linked to best practices in STEM teaching and learning and social emotional learning (p. e28-29).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

List of potential contributions provided in every point of entry of the proposed project (gamification in teaching and learning, ESE students in STEM, etc.). Previous research on Minecraft is limited to its implementation on computer science, but this study will measure the impacts of this gaming system on regular science instruction and teacher professional learning (p. e30). In addition, the distinct focus on ESE students also positions this study as a strong potential contributor to the field.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Resources and Quality of Management Plan - Resources and Quality of Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 32

Sub

1. (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.

Strengths:

The project management plan includes well established timelines and milestones, as well as delineates responsibilities of all parties involved in project management (p. e33-34). Project partners are described in the management plan in terms of their involvement and scope of responsibilities (p. e33). A separate evaluation management plan in Appendix I adds greater detail and evidence to the overall strength of the project management plan (p. e107-111).

Sub

Weaknesses:

All milestones and key activities are related to logistical/operational aspects of launching the program (p. e33-34). None are listed regarding student outcomes. Project Director is in-kind with only 10% FTE dedicated to the project (p. e126).

Reader's Score: 8

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

Strengths:

Costs identified for the proposed project are very appropriate and reasonable. The project's overall cost per student is \$736 (p. e35) which is less than \$150 per student per year. All budgeted items are essential expenses to support the proposed project and are adequate to accomplish the intended goals and outcomes.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (3) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

Proposed project team has extensive qualifications in education and human development as demonstrated by their resumes (p. e50-81). Job descriptions of vacant project management positions are provided (p. e69). Key project personnel have particular expertise in Minecraft tool and instructional technologies in general (p. e36).

Weaknesses:

None of the key personnel have a background in STEM.

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The district will convene a regional advisory committee consisting of internal and external stakeholders as well as representatives from project partners. The committee will have a vested interest on project activities and deliverables and will provide feedback and input to support the project (p. e37). Phased expansion and quarterly program reports will ensure feedback and continuous improvement among other procedures outlined on pages e37-38.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. (5) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Sub

Strengths:

A detailed plan is included to disseminate findings at local and national levels as described on page e38. Findings will be presented to parents, educators, and the broader community in training events and summits. In addition, the findings will be presented in academic conferences and papers will be submitted to peer-reviewed journals (p. e39).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project based on the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 25

Sub

- 1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

Strengths:

The proposed evaluation design is a cluster Randomized Control Trial, which will meet What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations if implemented as described. Samples are large enough (p. e40) to ensure statistical strength. Treatment and control groups are formed by randomly assigning volunteer teachers. Volunteer participation will help with attrition issues (p. e39-40). Research questions are directly aligned to project goals, objectives, and intended outcomes (p. e41).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

- 2. (2) 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 evaluation plan includes mediation, moderation, and fidelity analyses to ensure a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation against key components and outcomes. Mediators are identified in the logic model (p. e106) and initial targets for implementation variables and fidelity measures are included in Appendix I (p. e114). Fidelity scores are used as moderators to deal with varying levels of implementation (p. e43).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

Instruments to collect data and evaluate the program as well as methods are valid and reliable as described on pages e43-44. Student achievement and teacher observation data are collected from state assessments and Danielson Rubric. Student and teacher surveys for efficacy and motivation are already developed (p. e44). Appendix I includes very detailed qualitative and quantitative data collection notes on instruments, reliability, and scale properties (p. e115-118).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Strengths:

Not applicable. Competitive Preference Priority is not selected by the applicant.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable. Competitive Preference Priority is not selected by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/30/2020 10:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 02:21 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DUVAL COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (S411C200018)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	40	40
Sub Total	40	40
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
Resources and Quality of Management Plan		
1. Resources and Management	35	35
Sub Total	35	35
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	24
Sub Total	25	24
Priority Questions		
CPP		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Computer Science	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 EIR Early Phase- AP2 STEM - 1: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: DUVAL COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (S411C200018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 40

Sub

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

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates three clear and specific goals that will be the focus of this project. Those elements include increased social-emotional and academic outcomes of students with and without disabilities, an increase in teacher knowledge, efficacy, and practice, and refining an innovative, replicable and cost-effective model for professional development in Minecraft: Education Edition. These goals are measurable. The applicant provides several objectives that are specifically aligned to each goal. For example, "Objective 1.1 Use Minecraft to improve student self-efficacy for STEM and motivation/engagement in STEM." This objective as well as others are measurable. The applicant clearly aligns the outcomes and measures for the project to the objectives and goals. (Pages e23-e24)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The proposed project, "Using and Leveraging Technology to Reinvent Accessibility: Minecraft Mentor Edition" (ULTRA-ME), is effectively designed to address the needs of the target population. This project will address the academic performance and the graduation rate gaps that are present between Exceptional Student Education (ESE) students and non-ESE students. These gaps are significant. For example, the 5th grade science proficiency rates are 54.1% for non-ESE and 25.9% for ESE students in 2018-2019. (Pages e25-e26)

Sub

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

Strengths:

The applicant provides extensive up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice that aligns with the goals, objectives and outcomes of the project. For example, the research by O'Sullivan in 2017 supports the potential benefits of gamification educational tools for students with various disabilities. The project is built on the theoretical framework of the Social Learning Theory. These best practices use elements that will improve ESE students access to the learning process. The professional development components of the proposed project are based on effective practices in both professional development and STEM instruction. For example, the use of Professional Learning Communities enhanced with coaching and modeling will support effective implementation. (Pages e27-e29)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The potential contributions for this project include an increased knowledge and understanding of the impact of Minecraft in learning. This project will specifically address the ESE students with specific disabilities including neurodiverse issues such as ADHD and autism. The expectation is that the project will contribute to an improved use of science instruction using accessible gaming systems that will extend beyond the area and region. (Page e31)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Resources and Quality of Management Plan - Resources and Quality of Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 35

Sub

Sub

1. **(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.**

Strengths:

The management plan includes a clearly defined implementation schedule that includes milestone activities and tasks, the persons responsible for each major task and the month or season as well as yearly timeline. The specifically outlined processes will ensure that the work is completed on time and within budget. For example, classroom implementation directed by the Lead Coach and the Coaches will begin in January of year two of the grant period. This management plan outlines an ambitious and attainable process during the five years of the project. (Pages e33-e34) The applicant has effectively incorporated partnerships into the management plan. Those partners include the Microsoft Training Partner and the school district. (Page e33)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Strengths:

The costs for the project as outlined in the narrative and the budget narrative are reasonable and relate directly to the objectives, the project design and the potential significance of the project. For example, appropriate expenditures are allotted for the research team for the purpose of oversight and evaluation. The budget also includes three full-time trainers. (Pages e34-35) The contractual services are clearly defined and appropriate for the project. For example, the annual contract with a third party evaluator will include ten to twenty hours weekly. The supplies and equipment including the laptops for student and teachers are aligned to the uses as defined in the project design. (Budget Narrative pages e126-e131)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. **(3) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

The applicant clearly identifies the appropriate, relevant training and experiences of the key project personnel. The key personnel include the project director and co-investigators who have extensive training and experience in leadership roles as well as instructional technology, STEM education, and ESE education. The applicant includes a job description for the lead training coach, that includes expectations of relevant education and training. Those individuals will need a Bachelor's degree and three to five years of experience providing professional development for teachers. (Page e36 and Resumes pages e49-e81)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Sub

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The applicant defines comprehensive procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement. This will occur at several levels and include both formative and summative activities. For example, at the local level a regional advisory committee will convene and meet twice annually to review the status and provide feedback. The project director will work with the evaluation team to examine program processes. This will occur prior to expanding to include additional cohorts. Team meetings with the project director, co-investigators, evaluation team and project team members will meet regularly including virtual check-in sessions as well as quarterly, semi-annual summaries and annual reporting out to the Department of Education.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. (5) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The dissemination plan for the proposed project includes local level training events for regional educators as well as parent training sessions. The advisory group will provide a channel for dissemination of progress on the project goals. A summit with Northeast Florida Education Consortium will also be a venue for sharing best practices gleaned from the efforts of the proposal. These efforts are adequate methods of sharing the results that will enable others to use the strategies and information. (Page e38)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project based on the following factors:

Reader's Score: 24

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

Sub

Strengths:

The evaluation plan includes a randomized controlled trial (RCT) meeting the What Works Clearinghouse Standards without Reservations. The model will use four cohorts including a pilot cohort in year two of the project. Teachers will be recruited from across the district's 104 elementary schools. The study timeline will span one school year per cohort. Annual studies will be made providing formative evidence of effectiveness. A full-scale impact study will be conducted based on the combined sample from cohorts one through four. The comprehensive evaluation plan includes appropriate tools and timelines that will ensure that progress is assessed, analyzed and applied to any necessary updates. (Pages e40-41 and Pages e106-e118)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

- 2. (2) 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 project evaluation includes extensive, clear and concise descriptions of the components, mediators and outcomes for the proposed project. The logic model (Page e108) clearly articulates the resources and inputs, the key components and activities, the outputs, the mediators and outcomes. The applicant applies several research questions that provide for a thorough review of the outcomes of the project. For example, "Does the intervention have differentially positive effects on the outcomes for ESE students?"

Mediation analysis will be used to determine the proportion of variance in student achievement accounted for by the teacher's knowledge, strategy, use and efficacy. The evaluation plan includes research question (RQ6) that will address the extent to which key components are implemented with fidelity. This part of the process will ensure the appropriate thresholds for acceptable implementation. (Page e42) For example, to address goal 3, objective 3.1, "100% of participants' Minecraft instructional plans scoring at level three or above on four level rubrics."

Weaknesses:

Several references are made to "rubrics". Without specific samples of the criteria for those rubrics, it is not clear what the levels of performance are. (Page e45)

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The applicant includes extensive methods of evaluation that will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. For example, the grade level-specific, standards-based end-of-course exam will be used to measure students' science achievement. Student self-efficacy and motivation/engagement will be measured using the Student Motivational Climate Assessment. Teacher practice knowledge and use of strategies will be measured using the district's Collaborative Assessment System for Teachers which is built on Danielson's Framework for Teaching. (Pages e42-e45)

Sub

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

CPP - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

Strengths:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address competitive preference priority one.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/28/2020 02:21 PM