

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2021 01:15 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (S411B210013)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	20
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	
<b>Sub Total</b>	65	40
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>Computer Science</b>		
1. Computer Science	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>Total</b>	105	75

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (S411B210013)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. (1) The national significance of the proposed project.

#### Strengths:

The national significance of the proposed project is demonstrated through its systems approach to implementing and measuring the success of strategies in classrooms, which addresses a continuing problem of practice (pp. e16-e17). The applicant supported its claim based on the 2019 National Assessment of Educational Progress which demonstrated that reading and math scores for both 4th and 8th graders decreased since 2017 with an overall proficiency rate of 34% (p. e17). In addition, the 2018 Program for International Student Assessment scores showed United States have been consistently stagnant for the past 50 years (p. e17).

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score:

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

#### Strengths:

The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems is effectively demonstrated through the applicant's intent to provide critical educational research in several key areas. For instance, the applicant plans to provide research on the alignment of the Instructional Core; effective professional development; the effect on integrating content and literacy development on the depth and range of student learning; the power of formative assessment and data use; and the role of leadership and teacher engagement in change (pp. e18-e19).

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score:

## Strategy to Scale - 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:

Reader's Score: 20

### Sub

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant comprehensively identifies several strategies that address particular barriers that have previously undercut their scale efforts (p. e21). For instance, one of the barriers identified is the human (teachers and students) barrier due to the resistance of remote learning (p. e21). The applicant plans to address this barrier by providing teachers with training (improved online navigation and improved application programming interface (API) integration with Google Classroom) to increase their comfort level in teaching students remotely (p. e22).

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score:

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant plans to participate in conferences and publish findings in academic media to broadly disseminate information on its project to support further development (p. e26). In addition, the applicant plans to disseminate its findings through email, social media, and e-blasts (p. e26). The applicant regularly communicates with over 100,000 registered teachers through email blasts and platform messaging, which additionally demonstrates broad dissemination of information to support further development or replication (p. e28).

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score:

## Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a thorough conceptual framework (p. e29) that underlies the proposed research. For instance, it contains inputs (i.e., technology tools embedded), objectives (i.e., teachers would be engaged in year-long job-embedded professional development to implement rigorous standards-based instruction with formative assessment), outcomes (i.e., teacher knowledge and skill to plan and deliver rigorous aligned instruction, and goal (i.e., student success on state ELA and science assessment) (p. e29).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses in this section.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The measurable goals, measurable objectives, and measurable outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly outlined in a table (pp. e29-e30). For example, it contains clear goals (i.e., increase in student learning), objectives (i.e., instruction of validated performance writing task anchors), and outcomes (i.e., student formative assessment data on standards-validated performance writing tasks) (p. e29).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses in this section.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The fitting design of the proposed project to implement effective strategies to improve students deeper learning is grounded in current research (i.e., Elmore, Darling-Hammond, and Hattie) will likely address the needs of the target population (p. e30). The comprehensive project design plans to incorporate effective standards instruction through the integration of curriculum, assessment, and professional development to provide students with deeper learning opportunities (p. e30).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses in this section.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

- 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:**

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant's participating organizations demonstrate that it has the capacity to bring the proposed project to scale on a national level. For instance, The Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) is an international research organization that has engaged in similar research projects of this magnitude (p. e36). In addition, Stanford Center for Assessment Learning and Equity (SCALE) is credited for developing edTPA, a portfolio assessment used nationally for teacher licensure and program accreditation assessing 150,000 teacher candidates (since 2013) in many states (p. e38). This indicates that similar contributions will be made by the partnering organizations support the applicant's capacity for the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score:

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant's thorough management plan is likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The management plans contains clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (pp. e39-e41). For example, the Literacy Design Collaborative plans to implement SCALE student rubric scoring calibration training in year 2 (August 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) (p. e40).

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score:

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant has requested \$8 million in federal grant funding (p. e5) for the proposed project that intends to serve 302,200 students in grades sixth through eighth (p. e14). Based on the number of students who will receive services, the cost is reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses in this section.

Sub

Reader's Score:

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

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

Reader's Score:

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

**Priority Questions**

## CPP1 - Computer Science

1. 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:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/06/2021 01:15 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2021 01:20 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (S411B210013)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	15	15
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	20
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	20
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	20
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	65	40
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>Computer Science</b>		
1. Computer Science	5	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	0
<b>Total</b>	105	75

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (S411B210013)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. (1) The national significance of the proposed project.

#### Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates how the proposed project will have the potential to provide for national significance. The project is based on its previous work with an EIR supported program, Investing in Innovation Validation, which will be scaled up and replicated through the use of measurable and effective instruction by effective English Language Arts and science and social studies teachers. This expansion will provide for a tech-enabled approach and online architecture for building both the capacity of teachers and administrator-supported school instructional systems to move all students towards mastery. The applicant has built this proposed project on data that indicates significant needs which contributes to the national significance of the proposed project. For example, in 2019 NAEP scores decreased for both fourth and eighth grade students will an overall proficiency rate of 34%. The applicant effectively demonstrates that the problems are especially acute in science where a national panel urged intensive professional development and materials development prior to holding schools responsible for Next Generation Science Standards, National Research Council, 2014. (Page e16-18)

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

#### Reader's Score:

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

#### Strengths:

The proposed project will provide specific contributions that will have the potential to increase knowledge of education problems through effective teaching and learning strategies. These efforts will include application of research-based strategies that provide effective development on the depth and range of student learning which will contribute to increased knowledge and understanding of educational issues. For example, the use of specifically selected grade level assignments for students will address the rigor that is frequently lacking as student assignments are not at grade level (Atkins and Akerson, 2002). The project will also address the role of leadership and teacher engagement in change. The strength of teacher skill development and the implementation of student-

**Sub**

centered engagement will provide for effective strategies that will increase knowledge. The project will use effective, formative assessment to fittingly inform teaching and learning . (Pages e18-20)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:**

**Strategy to Scale - 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:**

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly describes the barriers that prevented the proposed project from reaching the level of scale in the past. These barriers are identified in three areas including human , technology, and content. Each barrier will be addressed with specific strategies. For example, within the human barrier category, school culture that is resistant to remote learning will be addressed by providing training, improved online navigation and improved Application Programming Interface (API) integration with Google Classrooms. Technology barriers include the difficulty of online automating of manual Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT) capacity building learning processes. The proposed project will include the use of more than one year of training of teachers through Professional Learning Communities with the support of direct supports from Literacy Design Collaborative (LDC). This improved intervention is based on best practices and previous experiences , which will aid the applicant in reaching the proposed level of scale. A third barrier identified was student work scoring and the need to add authentic disciplinary student product progression online course content. To address this barrier, the LDC will improve and expand CoreTools to capture Stanford Center for Assessment Learning and Equity (SCALE) student rubric standards scores which will in turn inform improved real time teacher instructional choices. Those efforts will improve student assessment and curriculum review. (Pages e21-26)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project includes comprehensive mechanisms for the dissemination of information. The applicant appropriately proposes to continue to use its previous and current partner connections to both disseminate the project successes as well as provide resources for replication. In addition to the typical dissemination of information on the project through the partners working with the project and publishing the findings in academic media, the applicant will serve as a hub for information regarding the proposed project and thus support development and replication efforts. For example, the LDC CoreTools online platform currently has over 100,000 registered teachers which is a strong indicator that the applicant already has mechanisms in place that encourages further development and replication. In addition, e-mail blasts and platform messaging are utilized to effectively and broadly disseminate project information. (Page e26-28)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates a comprehensive conceptual framework underlying the research-based activities that are planned as part of the project design. The framework and the logic model are cyclical in nature and clearly support the quality of the framework. The inputs of the logic model include ongoing virtual professional development for the Instruction Leadership Team to support, monitor, and sustain the teacher professional learning communities. Proposed interventions will ensure that students are provided standards-based learning. Specifically, the applicant appropriately proposes to make adjustments to teaching by aligning the curriculum based on student assessment and formative evaluations. The conceptual framework will produce student academic success. (Pages e28-29)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates several goals, objectives and outcomes that are specific and measurable. For example, the goal to increase student learning will be effectively measured by increases in state assessment scores. The Instruction Leadership Team (ILT) will be trained to monitor the professional learning centers, and the support for responsive teaching will be measured by the course completion and attendance data from bi-monthly coaching sessions. The outcome, student classroom performance, will be measured by SCALE Rubrics. (Pages e29-30 and Page e150-153)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates the key components of the LDC model will ensure that the target population's needs are successfully addressed. The applicant clearly demonstrates the needs of the target population including all teachers as well as all new and low skilled individuals, will be able to provide effective learning experiences for all students including those with high academic needs. To address these identified needs successfully, the applicant will use ILT Coaching of teacher PLCs to adjust teacher instruction to move all students to mastery, professional learning focused on what standards mean and what mastery looks like, externally validated online performance tasks to measure student growth toward mastery, and professional development that will reach all teachers including those with limited experiences. (Page e30-36)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

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:**

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub**

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates clearly that the proposed project provides appropriate management support to ensure the applicant's capacity to bring the proposed project to scale on a regional and national level. The proposed project includes well-defined partnerships that have successfully managed large, complex research projects for decades. The identified partners' experiences will increase the applicant's capacity to bring the proposed project to scale. For example, LDC has worked with CRESST (UCLA) an international research organization and SCALE for several years on complex projects similar to the proposed project. These partners will continue to work together to address the goals of this project. CRESST will provide school performance data and SCALE will provide support for validated performance tasks for embedding in science, social studies, and English Language Arts middle school curricula. (Page e36 and Page e40)

The proposed project includes qualified personnel. The leaders of the key partners include individuals with extensive leadership experience, demonstrated understanding of literacy components, demonstrated understanding and implementation of educational technology and evaluation. This expertise will be valuable to attainment of the goals of the project. (Pages e36-37 and Career Vitea)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The project management plan includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks and providing support for completing the project on time and within budget. The management plan includes specific milestones for each key element of the project. These milestones are linked to the timeline and the responsible organization which supports the tasks being completed on time and within budget. For example, during year two of the project, CRESST-UCLA will provide baseline student, teacher, and school performance data. (Page e39-41) which are adequate to achieve the objectives on time and within budget.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The proposed project costs are reasonable in relationship to the objectives, design and potential significance of the proposed project. The applicant estimates that during year two and three, 1,890 teachers and 113,400 students will be served. This would be approximately \$26.00 per student. That is a reasonable amount for the scope of the interventions planned. The costs for personnel are reasonable as the total of all of the key leader positions during year one is only \$659,280.00. This proposed cost includes three full time positions and several part time positions. The budget for evaluation contracted services for the five-year grant period is reasonable as it is budgeted at \$227,959. (Page e42-43 and Budget narrative)

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:**

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

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**

**Priority Questions**

**CPP1 - Computer Science**

1. **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 applicant did not apply for this priority.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not apply for this priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/06/2021 01:20 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2021 09:17 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (S411B210013)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	
<b>Sub Total</b>	15	
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	
<b>Sub Total</b>	20	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Quality of the Management	20	
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	23
<b>Sub Total</b>	65	23
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>Computer Science</b>		
1. Computer Science	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>Total</b>	105	23

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (S411B210013)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

### Reader's Score:

#### Sub

1. (1) The national significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

### Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

### Reader's Score:

### Strategy to Scale - 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:

**Reader's Score:**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score:**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

- 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:**

**Reader's Score:**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

3. (3) 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:**

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

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

**Reader's Score:** 23

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**Strengths:**

The blocked (school-level) cluster randomized control trial (RCT) proposed by the applicant has the potential to yield evidence that meets What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations. The applicant accounts for potential risks of attrition, as experienced in previous studies this one intends to replicate, by over-recruiting, which is an acceptable practice.

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant provides a detailed description of how attrition will be accounted for, they assume attrition may reach 25% or more. That rate of attrition may impact the ability of evaluation to provide evidence that would meet WWC standards without reservations unless baseline equivalence is ensured. Although the applicant will control for student level characteristics in the analysis stage, their methods for ensuring baseline equivalence across schools could be articulated with greater clarity to strengthen their evaluation design.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant is proposing an examination of intervention fidelity as well as the relative relationship between fidelity measures and overall programmatic impact (p. e46). The applicant includes fidelity thresholds.

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a theory of change model (p. e137) that broadly describes the intended intervention outcomes, which are more clearly defined in the narrative on the conceptual framework found on pages e28-29. Goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes of a summative evaluation are clearly defined pp. e29-30). The study also examines student-level moderators (p. e46).

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score:**

**Priority Questions**

**CPP1 - Computer Science**

1. 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:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/06/2021 09:17 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2021 05:19 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (S411B210013)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
<b>Strategy to Scale</b>		
1. Strategy to Scale	20	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	20	
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Quality of the Management	20	
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	25
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>Computer Science</b>		
1. Computer Science	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>25</b>



# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Literacy Design Collaborative (S411B210013)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

### Reader's Score:

#### Sub

1. (1) The national significance of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

### Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

### Reader's Score:

### Strategy to Scale - 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:

**Reader's Score:**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score:**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources**

- 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:**

**Reader's Score:**

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

3. (3) 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:**

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

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

**Reader's Score:** 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 without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

**Strengths:**

The applicant has arranged for an independent evaluation of program activities and outcomes with UCLA via the CRESST Center (p. e39). Dr. Jia Wang, an experienced evaluator, will lead the evaluation. The use of an external evaluator is a strength because it will help minimize bias in the data collection, analyses, and reporting of evaluation findings. The evaluation plan calls for a mixed-methods approach (p. e43, p. e45) and includes parallel randomized control trials (RCTs) in two geographic areas (rural Kentucky and California). On pages e44-e45 the applicant outlines the plan for conducting the RCTs that involves random assignment of schools to condition. The applicant specifies that steps will be taken to protect against contamination and preserve the design's ability to provide evidence for the intervention's impact on individual students. In addition, the applicant outlines steps to manage attrition (p. e45) including a plan to over-recruit based on prior experience with similar projects.

According to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Standards Handbook, p. 20, in order to be eligible for the WWC's highest rating, a cluster RCT must limit potential bias from changes in the composition of clusters and individuals within clusters after random assignment. The plan outlined by the applicant would allow for RCTs that meet these WWC criteria.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified for component 1.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan includes components that would allow the applicant to report on effective strategies and replication in other settings. Specifically, the applicant will evaluate a range of settings (e.g., urban and rural schools and districts) and investigate program effectiveness for different audiences. Multiple data sources are planned for each group of participants (e.g., student, teacher). On page e47-e48 the application details specific steps to inform guidance for replication, including exploration of dosage and the relation to outcome(s) observed, investigation of moderation/sub-group analysis, effects of mediators (e.g., teacher commitment and skill), as well as data collection to understand fidelity of implementation.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified for component 2.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan is clear, and each facet of the program is included in the planned evaluation activities. The evaluation team has outlined a comprehensive set of evaluation questions (p. e43) and potential moderators (p. e43, e47) as well as implementation thresholds (p. e48-e49). The mixed-methods evaluation plan will allow for detailed exploration of each component in the program's logic model (p. e28 – 29).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified for component 3.

**Reader's Score:**

**Priority Questions**

**CPP1 - Computer Science**

- 1. 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:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/06/2021 05:19 PM