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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of New Hampshire (S411C210138)
Reader #1:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		20	20
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		30	27
	Sub Total	50	47
Resources & Management Plan			
Resources & Management Plan			
1. Resources & Manag. Plan		25	20
	Sub Total	25	20
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	3
	Sub Total	5	3
CPP3			
CPP3			
1. CPP3		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
	Total	115	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - EIR Early Phase - 6: 84.411C

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

Applicant: University of New Hampshire (S411C210138)

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 grant proposal provides a multi-prong approach to addressing computer science with ELs, which will further the knowledge of how to approach CS with EL populations. The inclusion of peer tutoring provides an innovative approach to previously studied interventions (e21-e25).

   Weaknesses:

   NA

   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 grant proposal provides a focused approach to disseminating findings to both the scientific and education communities through a mix of both traditional and innovative models, which will ensure that both researchers and practitioners benefit from the outcomes of the grant (e16).

   Weaknesses:

   NA

   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

    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:

   Overall, the grant proposal provides two separate frameworks that provide an evidence-based approach that supports grant activities, which ensures that they have an impact on student outcomes (e23-e25).

   Weaknesses:

   The grant proposal lacks specific details on the research base that undersets the "Teacher Teams and the SLATE Institute" grant activity, which makes the proposal unclear on how professional learning activities will be aligned to research (e24-e25).

   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 proposal provides clearly outlined and aligned goals, measures and objectives. By providing clear goals, objectives, and outcomes, it is apparent that these grant elements are aligned with one another (e26-e28).

   Weaknesses:

   The grant proposal includes a goal that does not pertain to outcomes. Goal 2 examines the evaluation methods of the grant and does not contain appropriate connections between measures and outcomes, which weakens the overall program design (e27).

   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:

   Overall, the grant proposal contains interventions and grant activities developed for the target audience that should, if implemented with fidelity and with the correct audiences, will address the needs of the students (e30).

   Weaknesses:

   The grant proposal lacks specific details on how classrooms and teachers working with high numbers of EL/multilingual and high needs students will be identified, which makes unclear the full impact of the grant activities on the intended audience (e30).

   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: 20

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 proposal provides linkages between timelines, activities and responsible parties, which ensures activities are aligned in implementation (e31).

   Weaknesses:

   Although linkages for project plan elements are present, the project plan is vague and does not contain management details for the various project components, which threatens the grant's full implementation (e31).

   Reader's Score: 8

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

   Strengths:

   Overall, the grant's key personnel provide expertise in each of the components of the grant proposal which will allow for expert implementation of grant activities (e33-e35).

   Weaknesses:

   The grant proposal does not specify district level partners with implementation experience in schools nor individuals, which undermines the implementation of grant activities with full fidelity (e33-e35).

   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 grant provides needed information that shows that costs are reasonable and support the potential significance of the project (e129).

   Weaknesses:

   Although the grant proposal provides adequate information regarding the costs, the overall cost per child is high, which may be cost prohibitive for scalability purposes (e129).

   Reader's Score: 4

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

   Strengths:

   The grant proposal includes a project team and data collection methods that will provide up-to-date information on how each grant activity is implementing and if any needed changes are necessary, which will ensure that the project

is implemented with fidelity (e37).

Weaknesses:

The grant proposal suggest that process evaluation data will be provided to inform the continuous improvement process, however, details on this component are not adequate, which makes unclear how this data will be used to inform improvement efforts (e37).

Reader's Score: 4

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:

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 grant proposal provides access to rigorous coursework in computer science to underrepresented students through a multi-pronged, holistic approach.

   Weaknesses:

   NA

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 grant proposal provides several activities that will address challenges associated with COVID and mitigate learning loss.

   Weaknesses:

   Although the grant activities will mitigate learning loss, the grant activities do not appear to be designed to support COVID learning loss.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

Overall, the grant proposal provides access for students to critical resources, including access during summer activities with free transportation and tuition.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/15/2021 03:33 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/15/2021 03:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of New Hampshire (S411C210138)
Reader #2: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	14
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	29
Sub Total	50	43
Resources & Management Plan		
Resources & Management Plan		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	22
Sub Total	25	22
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	1
Sub Total	5	1
CPP3		
CPP3		
1. CPP3	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	115	76

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: University of New Hampshire (S411C210138)

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: 14

    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 applicant is proposing to pair STEM learning with language enrichment for the purposes of broadening the participation of multilingual and English learners in STEM education pathways. Program components designed to achieve this goal include near-peer mentorship and extended learning opportunities for students, and cross-disciplinary teacher professional development to improve integrate language arts and STEM and computer science (CS) instruction. The project does build on existing strategies and has the potential to add the efficacy of near-peer mentoring. The development of a professional development institute for teachers to gain expertise in integrating STEM and language arts through responsive teaching practices is compelling.

   Weaknesses:

   Although the proposed project builds on existing and proven approaches to improve academic achievement and foster STEM identity in traditionally underserved populations, the intervention as described does not reflect a dramatic innovation in this space.

   Reader's Score: 9

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 applicant describes in detail adequate strategies to potentially disseminate findings to both the research and practitioner communities (p. e17).

   Weaknesses:

   None.

   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: 29

    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 model is clearly articulated and substantiated (pp. e18-20) – academic success and interest in STEM requires rigorous STEM content delivered through approaches that consider the target populations' related competencies and culture. They provide an excellent description of how their project is designed in direct support of this model.

    Weaknesses:

    None.

    Reader's Score: 15

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

    Strengths:

    The applicant describes, in sufficient detail, measurable outcomes, goals and objectives. The table on pages e26 though e28 offer a clear depiction of how the proximal and distal impacts of this project will be measured.

    Weaknesses:

    Outcomes related to iteratively improving the professional development framework are not clearly articulated (p. e27).

    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:

    The applicant is proposing that the program will be designed and implemented by individuals with backgrounds similar to those of the target population – first generation scholars, women scientists, bilingual scholar, and scientists of color – and are proposing to do so in order to adequately match participants to mentors with similar backgrounds. This demonstrates an intentionality on the part of the applicant to ensure the program is designed for a specific population. The demographic profile on the initial school receiving the intervention substantiates that the intervention will reach English learning/multilingual and high-needs students.

    Weaknesses:

    None.

    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: 22

   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 and Gantt chart clearly and competently articulate how, when, and by whom the project will be implemented and evaluated (p. e31). What is more, the applicant ties the activities noted in the plan to specific project goals. This detail further substantiates what is described in the narrative regarding the rationale for intervention components.

   Weaknesses:

   None.

   Reader's Score: 10

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

   Strengths:

   The proposed personnel have the background, skills, and training to execute this project as designed. All intervention components are supported by an appropriate subject matter expert. The applicant also provides a description of the role each named personnel serves across the lifecycle of the project (pp. e123-125).

   Weaknesses:

   There does not appear to be a school-level person named or bio provided therefore it is difficult to determine that there is a point person in the school/district that can adequately support implementation.

   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:

   As detailed in the budget narrative (pp. e126-128), the proposed costs appear reasonable given the project described.

   Weaknesses:

   It is unclear what share of the personnel budget is going to each proposed key team member.

   Reader's Score: 4

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

Sub

Strengths:

The process evaluation has the potential to provide feedback to inform continuous improvement across the lifecycle of the project. For instance, the applicant is proposing formative qualitative data collection in the form of teacher interviews (p. e37), which has the potential to yield insights on how teachers are experiencing and perceiving the implementation of the program.

Weaknesses:

The applicant notes the collection of usage data from summer institute online platforms (p. e37), but it is unclear how these data will be used to inform program improvement.

Reader's Score: 4

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.**

Sub

    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:

   This project is aligned to competitive preference priority 1 – the intervention is designed to improve student achievement in computer science.

   Weaknesses:

   None.

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 applicant suggests that the proposed intervention represents a rapid response to address the educational disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Namely, that CS curriculum intended to be rolled out during the 2020-2021 school year was delayed.

   Weaknesses:

   It is unclear how the proposed intervention was designed to address COVID-19 related educational disruptions, or how such disruptions are being mitigated by this project.

Reader's Score: 1

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:

   Recruitment and participant materials will be provided in multiple languages, which helps to ensure equitable access to the intervention. Student mentor participants are being compensated for their time, which is an important aspect in ensuring equitable research practices.

   Weaknesses:

   None.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/15/2021 03:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of New Hampshire (S411C210138)
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	16
	Sub Total	25	16
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	16

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - EIR Early Phase - 6: 84.411C

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

Applicant: University of New Hampshire (S411C210138)

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: 16

     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:

    Applicant proposes multiple baseline case study method to collect data on p.38, providing details regarding the design with clear linkage to WWC standards.

    Weaknesses:

    On e38, multilevel modeling is cited as method of analyzing results from study, but is not explained in detail. The method by which students will be randomly assigned to groups is not clear from the plan. The inclusion of a control group in this type of design is not standard. Many of the figures and tables within the document are not labeled and the reference to exhibit 3 and 6 and appendix G on e39-40 sends the reader looking for content that is not in the narrative. Additional evaluation information is not included in appendix J. This evaluation lacked some of the key details that would have enabled the reader to clearly understand the data collected and the plans for analysis.

    Reader's Score: 7

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:

    Table b2 on e26 provides a clear explanation of tools used for collecting formative data. Applicant noted that evaluation reports will be used to support formative project efforts during implementation, which strengthened the application.

    Weaknesses:

    This section did not provide a clear timeline or mechanism for communicating results back to stakeholders, which weakened the formative evaluation.

    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:

    Applicant noted the design had potential to increase interest in middle school computer science learning. This provided the reader with a sense for the larger importance of the project. Table on page e31 notes presentations and publications.

    Weaknesses:

    none 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: 10/14/2021 05:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University of New Hampshire (S411C210138)
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	15
	Sub Total	25	15
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	15

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - EIR Early Phase - 6: 84.411C

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

Applicant: University of New Hampshire (S411C210138)

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: 15

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:

   Proposal is for an RCT with cluster level assignment which has the potential to meet WWC Standards Without Reservations.

   Study will use archival data and standardized test scores which prevents over-alignment with the study and helps ensure that the study will produce reliable evidence about the project's effectiveness. (p. e45)

   Weaknesses:

   Proposal mentions survey on teacher attitudes, but there no mention of the instrument's reliability or validity. If the study uses instruments that do not have a reliability coefficient above .50, it will not meet WWC standards.

   The applicant intends to use small sample sizes (n=264) but after the sample is halved for control and experimental groups, and then divided further for a multilevel model, the sample sizes may be insufficient for the analytical model and may not produce evidence about the project's effectiveness.

   Reader's Score: 7

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:

   Study includes impact assessment with specific measurable outcomes and detailed plans for assessment of progress towards those outcomes and how feedback will be used to improve the process. (p. e26)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 5

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

   Strengths:

   Plans to present at conferences and publish in academic journals are included, which represents a contribution to the existing knowledge base (p. e28).

   Weaknesses:

   As the intervention includes so many unrelated elements, it may be difficult to discern which parts made significant impact on outcomes, and as such limits the potential contribution to knowledge about successful strategies.

   Reader's Score: 3

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: 10/14/2021 12:22 PM