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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Uncommon Schools, Inc. (S411C210094)
Reader #1:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	16
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	27
Sub Total	50	43
Resources & Management Plan		
Resources & Management Plan		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	21
Sub Total	25	21
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	25	0
Priority Questions		
CPP1		
CPP1		
1. CPP1	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
CPP2		
CPP2		
1. CPP2	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
CPP3		
CPP3		
1. CPP3	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	77

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Uncommon Schools, Inc. (S411C210094)

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: 16

> **Sub**

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

> **Strengths:**

> The project provides support for over 8,500 high need Black and Latinx students in grades 9 and 10 by inserting computational thinking curriculum into five courses across the general education scope of required coursework in high school. This is a noted strength because the innovation suggests an integrated approach to developing computational skills in a unique way that is seamless within a standard discipline. Another strength is the additional innovative design elements including centering on student identity, empowering students, and designing for sustainability. (p. e18) Also, the design for CURE CompSci program which allows students to build a foundation for computational thinking prior to engaging in computer science (CS) coursework demonstrates a logical progression for student learning. (p. e21) In addition, the program design is focused explicitly on a culturally responsive computing framework, which is a strength and improves the likelihood that the project will reach this target population. (p. e21)

> **Weaknesses:**

> The culturally-responsive part of this program is underdeveloped as it is not clear if all underrepresented students, including Black, low income and Latinx, will respond in the same way to the curriculum. There is research that shows very different senses of identity development and community among different subpopulations. Specifically, such a particular approach, even embedded within a culturally responsive framework, might not reach certain all students in the same way, depending on how it was defined or interpreted. The proposal lacks detail on how the culturally-responsive program elements will be adapted to meet the diverse needs of the target population. (p. e21)

> **Reader's Score:** 11

> 2. **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:**

> Products from the research will be shared through Uncommon's open-access High School Curriculum Hub, which is a noted strength because free access to the results of this project can inform others doing similar work through an easy-to-access portal. (p. e18) Uncommon Schools, Inc. (USI) has a demonstrated history of generating popular and widely used professional development materials, including Practice Perfect, Teach Like a Champion and Driven

by Data. (p. e25) USI will also present findings at local, regional and national conferences including the Computer Science Teachers Association (CSTA) and the Special Interest Group Computer Science Education (SIGCSE) and will share results with the Charter School Growth Fund working group. The project demonstrates a robust dissemination plan to increase the likelihood for future replication beyond the award period.

Weaknesses:

No noted weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 27

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

Strengths:

One of the strong conceptual foundations for this initiative is the research on attitudinal changes and supporting literature which shows the benefits of increasing self-efficacy and combating stereotypes and biases as well as the internalization of these negative perceptions about belonging in the field of computer science (CS). (p. e23) The proposal provides relevant research which shows how to infuse a more relevant and engaging curriculum for Black and Latinx students. This is another conceptual strength and demonstrates the utility of embedding CS curriculum in core courses. (p. e27) Another strength of the program is the use of the "Teach Like a Champion" framework because it provides replicable structures and coaching practices to sustain the curriculum. (p. e25)

Weaknesses:

A weakness is that the program is building computer science knowledge into five separate courses. This may lead to a watering down effect or a sequence where different course requirements may not exactly align. It is not clear how the project plans to ensure that all students participate in all five courses in the intended learning progression. (p. e23-e27)

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

The project lists four goals including embedding, centering on identity, equipping teachers to empower students and designing for sustainability. The proposal lists example activities for each goal, which is a noted strength because there is a clear connection between stated goals and the project activities that will be developed. The specific discussion of embedding is further broken down by course so it is easy to see how the course components will add and build on the curriculum in a useful way that is guided by student interest and engagement in project-based delivery (p. e27-e31). Another noted strength is the list of metrics, which are listed by objective. This shows an attention to the details of the project as well as to a realistic approach to project outcomes. (p. e32)

Sub

> **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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 strength of this project is that it will reach a wide number of students, including over 9,500 low-income Black and Latinx students in nine schools across five regions in three states including New York City, Rochester, NY, Newark and Camden, NJ, and Boston, MA. The intention of the project to provide computer science learning for such a large number of students is a noted strength because it supports improving student outcomes at a larger scale as well as an opportunity to research effectiveness across different regions. (p. e21)

   Weaknesses:

   This target population is all in the northeast, but schools in these regions may have very different needs depending on the targeted school and the background of students. This is a weakness, because it is not clear that the project has a plan to address these diverse needs across different sites like Boston, MA and New York City, NY. (p. e21)

   Reader's Score: 9

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & 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:**

Reader's Score: 21

> **Sub**

> 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:**

>   Uncommon Schools, Inc. (USI) is well-positioned to implement this grant. The organization has already implemented a Department of Education Investing in Innovation Grant (i3). Additionally, the project has an evaluation partner, Mathematica, who has a well-known track record for strong evaluations and is a national leader in social policy research. (p. e21) The project is broken out by phases, with the first six months for developing units, years 1 and 2 for formative assessment, and a second treatment cohort in 2023-24, which appears to be a logical progression to achieve the project goals with time built in for assessment activities. (p. e34)

>   **Weaknesses:**

>   The staffing component is vague with USI staff being tapped for many positions, and others to be hired. It was not clear who at USI was specifically on the project team. Additionally, the project lacks clear mechanisms that allow for different components of the grant in different states to communicate with each other or collaborate toward formative assessment. (p. e35, Table 2) It is not clear how much time will be needed in each class to implement the computer science curriculum or how much each teacher will have to be trained to implement the new curriculum, or how

teachers would be supported in adjusting their ongoing curriculum plans to allow for this new embedded curriculum. These weaknesses make it unclear if the project has the necessary plan in place to achieve the outcomes of the proposal within time and on budget.

Reader's Score: 7

2. **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

The qualifications of Uncommon Schools, Inc. staff appear appropriate for the program. The proposal describes personnel to oversee the development of curricula, in computer science (CS) and other personnel to oversee the creation and refinement of math courses. (p. e37) This demonstrates an alignment between expertise and project activities.

Weaknesses:

Aside from the organizational leadership, details on other project personnel were lacking. It is noted that a project of this scale will require many subgroups and working committees with additional expertise to inform and execute implementation of the project across the diversity of program sites. (p. e37)

Reader's Score: 4

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

Strengths:

The cost per student of the program has been calculated to be $469, which is very low for this type of project and the intended outcomes to bring computer science to such as large number of students. (p. e38) The budget narrative is well developed and provides an excellent level of detail that aligns with the proposed project activities (p. e194).

Weaknesses:

No noted weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The project has a dedicated plan for feedback and continuous improvement and as outlined in section D.1. which provides a list of research questions that will guide the evaluator's feedback for iterative improvements. (p. e39) Additionally, Mathematica will collect and analyze student enrollment and performance data annually to inform progress toward the intended goals and allow for iteration in implementation.

Weaknesses:

No noted weaknesses.

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. 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 with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
   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 threads computational thinking and computer science (CS) curriculum throughout core courses. This is a strength, as this blending of curriculum shows the direct connections between CS and other disciplinary courses. Additionally, the approach allows for increased exposure for all students. The details of the curriculum were explained effectively in section starting on p. e28.

Weaknesses:

A weakness of the embedded approach is that the project may be working with teachers that will not be trained adequately or have the motivation to aggressively utilize the approach to use CS concepts in addition to their core content. Additionally, there is danger of the CS curriculum being diluted as a side element in the curriculum, lessening the effectiveness. (p. e28)

Reader's Score: 4

CPP2 - CPP2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through…[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

Strengths:

The tri-state region where this project will take place has been assessed for impact due to COVID-19. This project responds to this assessment noting that low-income students of color were disproportionately affected by disruptions caused by COVID-19. (p. e22). Additionally, a strength of this initiative is this regional assessment as well as the culturally responsive computer science curriculum embedded within the general curriculum. Finally, the project explicitly calls out the intent to "building back better" and not just simply reverting to pre-pandemic status quo. (p. e22)

Weaknesses:

The details of activities related to addressing COVID-19 compensation are lacking. It is not clear how the teacher time will be supported for some of the needs that arise due to COVID-19. (p. e22)

Reader's Score: 4

CPP3 - CPP3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following…[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

Strengths:

The focus on equity is permeated throughout all CURE CompSci core elements. In particular, the design to work from the lived experiences of underserved students to decrease the distance between their world and the world of STEM-CS is a strength of the overall project approach to improve equity in access. (p. e22)

Weaknesses:

No noted weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/05/2021 01:26 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/05/2021 01:33 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Uncommon Schools, Inc. (S411C210094)
Reader #2:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Sub Total	50	48
Resources & Management Plan		
Resources & Management Plan		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	24
Sub Total	25	24
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	25	0
Priority Questions		
CPP1		
CPP1		
1. CPP1	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
CPP2		
CPP2		
1. CPP2	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
CPP3		
CPP3		
1. CPP3	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - EIR Early Phase - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Uncommon Schools, Inc. (S411C210094)

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: 20

Sub

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

   Strengths:

   The problem and proposed rationale on pages e23-e25 describe a clear research-based approach for improving Black and Latinx students experiences in computer science and computational thinking. The approach of combining curricular, attitudinal, and environmental interventions within a Culturally Responsive Computing (CRC) framework is a multipronged approach that is likely to improve student outcomes and has a strong potential to create an additional strategy for the field. The proposal includes a range of citations to support the statements about the problem and the proposed solution.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 15

2. **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 proposal includes a range of dissemination options for both practitioners and scholars in the field (p. e25-e26). Including the resources within a free curriculum hub will also make the materials more readily available for those who are interested in this approach and increase the likelihood of future replication.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the

quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 28

Sub

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 framework discussed on pages e26-e31 includes short, medium, and long-term outcomes that encourage a wide range of engagement, both within and outside of AP computer science courses. This approach will likely encourage more students to participate in computer science electives, and ultimately within the field, including those who might be hesitant to take an AP class. Overall, the approach outlined within this narrative is likely to develop sustainability and impact more than just the students and teachers participating in the proposed project.

   Weaknesses:

   There is no single definition for computational thinking (CT) that is defined in the proposal or universally understood within the field. It would help to clarify what the authors of this proposal consider to be CT as a central concept for the project and demonstrate alignment with the conceptual framework to support the project activities as described. (p. e26-e31)

   Reader's Score: 14

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

   Strengths:

   The goals, objectives, and outcomes outlined on pages e32-e33 are very specific and measurable. For example, the proposal outlines objective 1 to increase access to, participation in, and success in computer science (CS) opportunities for underserved students and calls out the intent to measure computing self-efficacy through survey data with an intended outcome of seeing 10% higher affirmative responses in the treatment schools as compared the control schools. This level of detail is maintained throughout the projects goals and objectives, demonstrating a clear coherence between the project activities and the achievement of the intended goals.

   Weaknesses:

   It is unclear when some of the intended outcomes will be achieved. For example, Object 1.6 indicates that some of the outcomes will be achieved in years 3-5, but other outcomes do not clarify whether the outcomes are intended for the conclusion of the proposed project or during key milestones throughout the project. The lack of detail related to the timing of the outcomes is a weakness because it is not clear if the outcomes are appropriate for the intended time frame.

   Reader's Score: 4

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:

   Pages e33-e34 provide a clear explanation of inequalities that impact the target population of this study. The conceptual framework (p. e26-e31) and goals (p. e32-e33) are clearly designed to address the inequalities outlined. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the needs of the target population were used to inform the design of the

project, and therefore increase the likelihood that the project will improve student outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & 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:**

Reader's Score: 24

Sub

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 outlined on pages e35-e36 appears well thought out and aligns with the objectives proposed for the project. Assessments and refinements based on those assessments are embedded throughout the program, which will likely result in a higher quality project that is more likely to achieve the intended outcomes.

Weaknesses:

Although table 3 on pages e37-e38 discuss responsibilities of key personnel, it is unclear who is responsible for each of the tasks in table 2 (p. e37-e38). The two tables do not clearly align, which is a noted weakness because it is not clear that all activities have a clear responsible party to guarantee the likelihood they are achieved.

Reader's Score: 9

2. **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

The key project personnel appear to have the requisite training and experience for this project (p. e37-e38). For example, the Chief Executive Officer demonstrates experience in opening and managing 25 new schools and overseeing evaluations. The team experience as practitioners and in research is a noted strength and demonstrates the expertise to achieve the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Sub

Strengths:

A per-student cost of $469 (p. e38) is very reasonable, given the scope of the project and the dissemination efforts that will enable other teachers and students to use the resources created through this project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

Strengths:

The proposal includes a variety of measures for obtaining feedback and continuous improvement embedded throughout the proposed project (p. e39). For example, the project will examine student enrollment and performance data and present the findings at a monthly project team meeting to inform the continuous improvement process. The inclusion of specific data sets and timing for the continuous improvement is a strength and demonstrates a clear plan for implementation.

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. 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 with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

2. **(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Sub

>**Strengths:**

>**Weaknesses:**

>**Reader's Score:**

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

>**Strengths:**

>**Weaknesses:**

>**Reader's Score:**

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
    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 framework outlined on pages e26-e31 are likely to address the problems outlined on pages e33-e34 and needs of the target population. Overall, the approach is grounded in peer-reviewed research and practices that will likely achieve the goals for improving student outcomes.

    Weaknesses:

    No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

CPP2 - CPP2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**
    Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through…[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

Strengths:

The proposal provides a clear discussion on page e22 about how COVID-19 has impacted the communities this project will serve. The increased instructional time and support for teachers and students will likely assist with addressing some of the negative impacts of COVID-19, such as disruption in learning, that was experienced by these communities during the pandemic.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

CPP3 - CPP3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following…[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

   Strengths:

   Page e22 provides a clear link between promoting and proving equity and the approaches and strategies outlined throughout the proposal. This approach will likely have a positive impact on Black and Latinx communities that are the target population for this project.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/05/2021 01:33 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/05/2021 12:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Uncommon Schools, Inc. (S411C210094)
Reader #3:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		20	0
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		30	0
	Sub Total	50	0
Resources & Management Plan			
Resources & Management Plan			
1. Resources & Manag. Plan		25	0
	Sub Total	25	0
Selection Criteria			
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	23
	Sub Total	25	23
Priority Questions			
CPP1			
CPP1			
1. CPP1		5	
	Sub Total	5	
CPP2			
CPP2			
1. CPP2		5	
	Sub Total	5	
CPP3			
CPP3			
1. CPP3		5	
	Sub Total	5	
	Total	115	23

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - EIR Early Phase - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Uncommon Schools, Inc. (S411C210094)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: **0**

   Sub

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

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

  2. **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:

   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: 0

> **Sub**

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

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

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:

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & 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:

Reader's Score: 0

> **Sub**

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.

Sub

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

2. **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

4. **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation 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

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 applicant provides an evaluation plan that is well developed and organized and will enable the evaluation to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations (page e39). The applicant identified its independent head external evaluator who has extensive experience in evaluating similar projects. The plan includes a series of evaluation questions that will assist the team in conducting a random controlled trial assessment that will focus on interventions being conducted by the applicant (page e42). The random control process will limit attrition and will guarantee that all nine schools remain in the sample. The plan further ensures that the treatment and control groups are similar in composition and will result in baseline equivalents. The evaluator will also provide annual impact estimates using the random control trial design which separates the implementation and cultural responsiveness measures in the project (page e44).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses are found.

   Reader's Score: 15

2. **(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant indicates that the evaluator will provide annual feedback on a variety of performance outcomes (page e44). The focus of this feedback will be on such areas as student participation and achievement as well as the quality, relevance, and inclusiveness of the project. The annual feedback has the potential to improve the overall implementation of the project and increase the likelihood of achieving the stated goals.

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant does not intend to collect feedback and share data on a monthly, quarterly or other short term basis. This is a noted weakness because the dependence on an annual feedback process limits the ability of the project staff to consider and make changes or alterations to the interventions being offered by the project if they do not meet expectations with a frequency that would allow for improvements for project participants (page e44).

   Reader's Score: 3

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant indicates the proposed activities and services will systematically address structural barriers that prevent or delay students from entering the computer science field (page e45). The applicant further explains that the project will contribute to the broader field of educational policy by developing a rigorous set of data and information that will help other school districts to implement inclusive and equitable computer science programs.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses are found.

Sub

    Reader's Score: **5**

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
   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:

CPP2 - CPP2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through…[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP3 - CPP3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following…[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

   Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/05/2021 12:24 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/05/2021 06:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Uncommon Schools, Inc. (S411C210094)
Reader #4:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		20	0
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		30	0
	Sub Total	50	0
Resources & Management Plan			
Resources & Management Plan			
1. Resources & Manag. Plan		25	0
	Sub Total	25	0
Selection Criteria			
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	23
	Sub Total	25	23
Priority Questions			
CPP1			
CPP1			
1. CPP1		5	
	Sub Total	5	
CPP2			
CPP2			
1. CPP2		5	
	Sub Total	5	
CPP3			
CPP3			
1. CPP3		5	
	Sub Total	5	
	Total	115	23

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - EIR Early Phase - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Uncommon Schools, Inc. (S411C210094)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

Reader's Score: **0**

    Sub

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

      Strengths:

      Weaknesses:

      Reader's Score:

    2. **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:

      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: 0

> **Sub**

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

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

   Reader's Score:

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:

Resources & Management Plan - Resources & 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:**

Reader's Score: 0

> **Sub**

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.**

Sub

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

2. **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

    Reader's Score:

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:

4. **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation 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

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 proposal will evaluate multiple outcomes that are directly related to the proposed logic model and are intended targets of change from the program. A strength of the proposed evaluation plan is that it will be conducting a randomized control trial over several school sites and with a sample size of over 350 students (pg. e41). The proposal did a good job of explaining how confounding variables would be controlled through the design and methodology of the proposed evaluation. Attrition and baseline equivalence was adequately addressed. The methodology and plan demonstrates a high potential of being able to achieve the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservation.

   Weaknesses:

   An analytic plan for addressing missing data was not provided (pg. e42). This is a weakness, because the approach to missing data is a key factor to the project being able to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservation.

   Reader's Score: 14

2. **(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

   Strengths:

   The proposed variety of data collected to answer various research questions will aid in improving the overall program design. In deciding how to improve programming it is important to obtain data from multiple stakeholders and the proposal plans to do this by obtaining information from both teachers and students (pg. e44-e45). The proposal also intends to collect data related to implementation barriers which will aid in improving the program and increase the likelihood of achieving the intended outcomes.

   Weaknesses:

   There was lack of clarity on how the data would be used to determine program progress or how the feedback would be incorporated to improve the program (pg. e44-e45). The lack of details about process is a weakness because it is not clear if the team has the appropriate resources and methods in place to implement a successful continuous improvement model.

   Reader's Score: 4

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

   Strengths:

   The proposed evaluation plan may yield findings that would help improve understanding on what is needed to implement inclusive and equitable computer science programs (pg. e45). If found to be effective, the findings will contribute to understanding what is needed to address racial disparities in computer science. Lastly, the data collected during the development cycles will greatly inform improvement of the program, which in turn should lead to better outcomes.

Sub

    Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

    Reader's Score: **5**

Priority Questions

CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**
   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:

CPP2 - CPP2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through…[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

    Strengths:

    Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

CPP3 - CPP3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**
   Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following…[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/05/2021 06:48 PM