

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/18/2022 04:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	9
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	63
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	69

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - EIR Early Phase - 16: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

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:

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. (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates the significant impact of the proposed project on student re-engagement as a lever for change. The proposal uses Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR) strategies to create a LISTEN (Listen and Inquiring with Students Through Engagement Networks) LAB. The applicant provides a clear link between engagement and student achievement. The applicant uses the promising strategy of CS-LISTEN as a basis for the LISTEN LAB strategies. This is a logical approach. The proposed project is somewhat unique in that it will investigate how the inclusion of student voice through YPAR will increase student engagement and then remedy low student achievement rates.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

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: 25

Sub

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. (10 points)

Strengths:

One of the key frameworks for the proposed project is YPAR which involves youth constructing knowledge by identifying, researching, and addressing social problems through youth-adult partnerships. This is a solid framework that relates directly to the planned interventions and provides for support for the quality of the project design. The proposed project will expand on this framework by including impacts on academic outcomes and student engagement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

Strengths:

Each of the four goals, objectives and outcomes are clearly specified and measurable. The goals, objectives, and outcomes are aligned and demonstrate the potential use of qualitative and quantitative data. For example, to address goal 1, academic achievement data will be gathered annually. To address goal 3, students' perceptions of school climate will be gathered and analyzed. The specified goals, objectives, and outcomes will ensure that the progress and success of the proposed project will be measured appropriately.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

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. (15 points)

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates a clear understanding of student needs, especially those who struggle with academic, social, and emotional engagement. The SEL interventions planned for this proposed project will address those needs.

The proposed project does plan to recruit teachers from a variety of schools, including both large and small schools. These schools do represent a variety of student backgrounds.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not specifically address the students who are not engaged to be part of the LISTEN LAB. Therefore, it is difficult to determine if students with the most need will be part of the Huddle Teams. It is not clear how those students will become more engaged.

The applicant does not clearly define the basis for the decision to randomize at the student level. It is not clear how students with the most need will be served or if only those "interested" will be selected.

Sub

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

1. The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)

Strengths:

The qualifications of the key personnel demonstrate clearly that the proposed project will be supported by individuals who have relevant training and experience. Several of the key personnel have experience in the applications of YPAR pedagogy, research processes and grant administration. The applicant uses a strong GEPA statement supporting equity for both participants and employees.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant has a strong GEPA statement, the applicant does not have a specific plan to address employment for those who have been underrepresented.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 9

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. (10 points)

Sub

Strengths:

The management plan for the proposed project includes clearly identified responsibilities and milestones for the proposed project. The milestones include specific key activities that will need to be completed in a timely manner. The milestones build upon each other to ensure that the project will be completed on time and within budget. For example, the development of recruitment tools are to be prepared prior to the student's recruitment for the academic year.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly justify why the timeline includes year-long preparation prior to the implementation process. Therefore, it is not clear if the proposed project will be completed in a timely manner.

Reader's Score: 9

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). (20 points)**

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

- 2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)**

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

- 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**

Sub

implementation. (5 points)

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points).

Projects designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students in middle school or high school that examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, including rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including one or more of the following:

- (a) Student-centered learning models that may leverage technology to address learner variability (e.g., universal design for learning (as defined in this notice), K–12 competency-based education (as defined in this notice), project-based learning, or hybrid/blended learning) and provide high-quality learning content, applications, or tools.
- (b) Middle school courses or projects that prepare students to participate in advanced coursework in high school.
- (c) Advanced courses and programs, including dual enrollment and early college programs.
- (d) Project-based and experiential learning, including service and work-based learning.
- (e) High-quality career and technical education courses, pathways, and industry-recognized credentials that are integrated into the curriculum.

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately addresses Competitive Preference Priority 1. The LISTEN LAB directly engages high school youth from low-income and racial minority groups. It is a student-driven approach that includes 24 student teams. These teams will define and drive critical research on school engagement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID–19 pandemic, including

impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through:

(a) conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K–12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The applicant does identify research on the needs of students after COVID-19 lockdowns. The research includes studies completed in 2021 and 2022 that includes the impacts of COVID-19 interruptions on SEL. The logic model includes appropriate needs assessment information regarding absenteeism and lack of engagement. One of the major goals and focus of LISTEN LAB is to improve student engagement. It is evident that the applicant adequately addresses Competitive Preference Priority 2.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/18/2022 04:44 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2022 08:47 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	9
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	63
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	69

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - EIR Early Phase - 16: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

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:

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. (20 points)

Strengths:

The applicant clearly recognizes a need for improved student re-engagement post-Covid-19 to improve academic, social, and emotional engagement schoolwide. The applicant provides ample research to back up their claims and show a clear need for re-engagement as a "lever for change". The proposal aims to directly engage high school youth in student-driven research (LISTEN LAB) to study and innovate ways to increase student engagement and improve school climate. The proposal clearly recognizes the impact of Covid-19 on our most at-risk students and creates a clear plan to address this need at 6 California high schools. This project is particularly intriguing because the LISTEN LAB's findings will have national significance and applicability by addressing this key crisis of student disengagement. The applicant references a similarly structured study with successful outcomes but offers a completely unique data point and promising new strategy to address re-engagement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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: 25

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. (10 points)

Sub

Strengths:

The applicant provides a well-thought-out framework to meet their goals. This proposal calls for a Randomized Control Trial (RCT) to select participating students at 6 California high schools including 2 teachers and 40 students per school for a total of 240 students. The design of this project follows a logical sequence building upon itself over time. Upon the results of the LISTEN LAB, students will be able to lead change in their respective schools. The Design Team will submit articles and conference papers to national venues for peer review. The total LISTEN LAB project will measure both student and school-level outcomes. The design of the project carefully considers a rollout of the program with PD, weekly meetings, tailored support, workshops, and events designed to ensure proper implementation and follow through. The LISTEN LAB includes design features that are grounded in evidence and provide relevant research to back up its claims.

Weaknesses:

There were no noted weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)**

Strengths:

This proposal excellently sets clear and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes. The project sets 4 main goals. Each goal has clear objectives and is tied to specific, measurable outcomes. These outcomes include improved school engagement resulting in improved academic outcomes, increased knowledge and skills related to self-direction and employability, improved school climate, and an increased sense of self-efficacy for participating teachers. Overall, these goals support the aim of the project excellently.

Weaknesses:

There were no noted weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

- 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. (15 points)**

Strengths:

The proposal somewhat notes that efforts will be made to ensure diverse participation. The project includes the involvement of 6 schools in San Diego County and provides research to establish a need based on ELL, homelessness, Free/reduced lunch, disability, and race to show an underserved population. The proposal also identified students struggling with SEL.

Weaknesses:

While the proposal notes data on students in San Diego County, specific school participants have yet to be determined and specific data is not yet available. The applicant does not clearly define the randomization and it is not clear as to a plan that those schools/students who are most in need will be those selected to participate.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project.**

In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

1. The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)

Strengths:

The applicant provides data including relevant training and experience of a diverse group of key project personnel. Team members collectively represent 70+ years of teaching experience with racially and economically diverse high school populations. They also provide details for participating partners highlighting relevant experience and ability. Project personnel responsibilities are outlined and aligned with project goals.

Weaknesses:

Although the GEPA statement was strong there is no specific plan mentioned for the inclusion of staffing from groups that are underrepresented.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 9

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. (10 points)

Strengths:

Table 1 provides a detailed management plan broken out by year including task, timeline, and responsibility to meet project objectives. The proposal notes successes with current state and federal grant management and its long, trusting relationship with the involved school district. The project will rely on this expertise to ensure the project is managed on time, and within budget, human subjects, and fiscal and data privacy controls.

Weaknesses:

The timeline for year 1 suggests that it would take a whole year to hire staff, which seems a bit long to get the project started.

Reader's Score: 9

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). (20 points)

Strengths:

na

Weaknesses:

na

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

na

Weaknesses:

na

Reader's Score: 0

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. (5 points)

Strengths:

na

Weaknesses:

na

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points).

Projects designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students in middle school or high school that examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, including rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including one or more of the following:

- (a) Student-centered learning models that may leverage technology to address learner variability (e.g., universal design for learning (as defined in this notice), K–12 competency-based education (as defined in this notice), project-based learning, or hybrid/blended learning) and provide high-quality learning content, applications, or tools.
- (b) Middle school courses or projects that prepare students to participate in advanced coursework in high school.
- (c) Advanced courses and programs, including dual enrollment and early college programs.
- (d) Project-based and experiential learning, including service and work-based learning.
- (e) High-quality career and technical education courses, pathways, and industry-recognized credentials that are integrated into the curriculum.

Strengths:

The LISTEN LAB aims to directly engage high school youth from low-income, racial minoritized groups in YPAR to study and innovate on increasing school engagement. The LISTEN LAB will use YPAR as a decidedly student-driven (rather than teacher-driven) approach to investigate and address school engagement and climate issues. The applicant creates a clear indication that every effort will be made to be inclusive and respond to the needs of the underserved.

Weaknesses:

There were no noted weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID–19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through:

- (a) conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K–12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The proposed project is clearly designed to address the impacts of Covid-19 and focuses on underserved students and educators. The applicant clearly intends to address disengagement and aims to find ways to improve upon re-engaging

students. The application clearly demonstrates evidence-based approaches and ensures an opportunity to participate for the underserved. The applicant provides relevant, recent research to demonstrate clear needs for re-engagement post-Covid-19 and has provided county-level data regarding demographics and chronic absenteeism. The applicant clearly indicates a needs assessment.

Weaknesses:

There were no noted weaknesses.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/19/2022 08:47 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2022 03:13 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	24
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	9
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	62
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. COVID-19	3	3
Sub Total	6	6
Total	106	68

Technical Review Form

Panel #16 - EIR Early Phase - 16: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

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:

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. (20 points)

Strengths:

The proposal demonstrates support for an innovative approach to re-engaging high school students in behavior, emotional, and cognitive facets. The proposal involves a new strategy of a Listen Lab to implement change for school engagement and climate. The proposal addresses the importance of engaging secondary schools where there is a historical drop in students, particularly Black, Hispanic, English Learners, and students with disabilities. The proposal will provide data on student engagement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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: 24

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. (10 points)

Strengths:

The conceptual framework detailed specific roles and responsibilities for implementing the program. The study will be the first to use RCT methodology to assess Youth Participator Action Research (YPAR) related academic

Sub

outcomes and student engagement. The LISTEN LAB design is to engage all students. The proposal details how the LISTEN LAB project will provide for measurement.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not provide current research that connects to its conceptual framework. More detail is needed in this area.

Reader's Score: 9

2. (2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (5 points)

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a sufficient plan. They have identified appropriate goals, objectives, and outcomes. The roles, activities, milestones, and timelines were specified (p.e32) The outcomes were defined as increasing student engagement and improving school climate.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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. (15 points)

Strengths:

The proposal provides a design to address the needs of the target population by engaging students that struggle with academic, social and emotional engagement. The proposal aims to engage high school youth from low-income and racial minority groups in the YAPR study. Students participants will reflect the demographics of San Diego County to include students with high-needs: English Language Learners, homeless, disabilities, and students who qualify for free/reduced price meals. The proposal is committed to ensuring equal access to students who are traditionally underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disabilities.

Weaknesses:

The proposal did not identify how many low-income students would be served, so it is difficult to know how their needs will be met through the proposed plan. The applicant did not show how the students would be selected.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 9

Sub

Sub

1. **The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The qualifications of the personnel included individuals with expertise to implement the program. All design team members are well-versed in YPAR pedagogy and processes. The team is represented by various members of ethnic groups such as Asian Pacific American females, three Latino males, one White female, and one African American male. Personnel included research-based experience.

Weaknesses:

The project did not define how teachers would be selected for the project. Since teachers are an integral part of the plan, more detail here would strengthen this section.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 9

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. (10 points)**

Strengths:

The proposal provides for clearly defined objectives, responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The proposal identifies 4 goals; (1) Student participants in the YPAR Listen Lab Design Cycle (Youth Participator Action Research) will have improved school engagement resulting in improved academic outcomes, (2) Student participants in the YPAR Design Cycle will have improved school engagement resulting in increased knowledge and skills related to self-directions and employability, (3) Schools will use their Student Participant YPAR results to guide huddles to improve school climate, and (4) Teacher participants in the LISTEN Lab will increase their capacity for engaging and supporting diverse students in YPAR. Objectives were clearly defined with outcomes.

Weaknesses:

The proposal needs to specify individual roles for teachers. The proposal timeline is lengthy for hiring the design team.

Reader's Score: 9

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). (20 points)

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 0

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 0

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. (5 points)

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points).

Projects designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for underserved students in middle school or high school that examine the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implement responses, including rigorous, engaging, and well-rounded (e.g., that include music and the arts) approaches to learning that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status and prepare students for college, career, and civic life, including one or more of the following:

(a) Student-centered learning models that may leverage technology to address learner variability (e.g., universal design for learning (as defined in this notice), K–12 competency-based education (as defined in this notice), project-based learning, or hybrid/blended learning) and provide high-quality learning content, applications, or tools.

(b) Middle school courses or projects that prepare students to participate in advanced coursework in high school.

(c) Advanced courses and programs, including dual enrollment and early college programs.

(d) Project-based and experiential learning, including service and work-based learning.

(e) High-quality career and technical education courses, pathways, and industry-recognized credentials that are integrated into the curriculum.

Strengths:

The proposal provides for a student-centered learning model through the LISTEN LAB. The proposal encourages equity to access for all, especially underrepresented groups, based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Students, Educators, and Faculty (up to 3 points).

Projects that are designed to address the impacts of the COVID–19 pandemic, including impacts that extend beyond the duration of the pandemic itself, on the students most impacted by the pandemic, with a focus on underserved students and the educators who serve them through:

(a) conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and

(b) using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high quality tutoring, expanded access to rigorous coursework and content across K–12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

Strengths:

The proposal provides support for an innovative, engaging program since COVID-19. The proposal addresses the Impact of COVID. The proposal clearly addressed the impact of COVID-19 on the project's design. The proposal addressed needs assessment and mapping. The proposal provides local data for the strategies.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/24/2022 03:13 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2022 11:16 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
Total	30	30

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Tier 2 - 1: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

Questions

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: 30

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). (20 points)

Strengths:

The evaluation plan strongly aligns with the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Standards Handbook, V 4.1 Group Design Standards without Reservation by demonstrating the use of randomized control trial with students blocked into teacher groups before random assignment and uses the WWC's accepted method of dummy variables that differentiate subsamples with different assignment probabilities for the Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR) approach (p. e37). The proposed number of participants is 960 including 480 control group and 480 treatment group participants, which exceeds the minimum sample size of 350 study participants for the WWC guidelines proposing to produce evidence of the project's effectiveness (pp. e20-22, p. e27). Further, in alignment with the What Works Clearinghouse, attention to participant attrition is described indicating that the identified quantitative data for approximately 95% of students exists across all potential study high schools (p. e38). Additionally, the project proposes acceptable strategies to maximize response rates for survey responses and includes research-based plans to calculate the lower and upper bounds of treatment effects to find differential attrition meeting the Work Works Clearinghouse attrition bias standard (p. e37). An estimate of the effectiveness of the intervention will be addressed using a two-sided test to determine equivalence in outcomes between treatment and control groups, which meets the What Works Clearinghouse Group Design Standards and has the potential to ensure evidence of the project's effectiveness (p. e38). The evaluation plan indicates that all data collection and analysis will be conducted by an expert external evaluator, SanDERA, meeting the What Works Clearinghouse guidelines for outcome collection (pp. e32-33, p. e34). Finally, based on supporting research, use of the What Works Clearinghouse approved method of a randomized control trial with a YPAR methodology will be the first of its type to be implemented across multiple schools and classrooms, which has the potential to enhance the significance of the project evaluation plan (p. e27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Sub

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

The project proposes to use quantitative and qualitative data collection methods from a variety of measurement tools, including grades, standardized test scores, attendance, and courses taken as quantitative measures, and observation of teacher professional development, student and teacher surveys, focus groups, weekly YPAR Research Cycle Meetings, Quarterly LISTEN Lab Meetings, and Annual Advisory Board meetings, as a means of measuring the fidelity of implementation providing evidence of periodic assessment toward anticipated outcomes (pp. e27-28, pp. e32-33, pp. e35-37, p. e41). Further, the use of two validated instruments, including the California Healthy Kids Survey and the Teacher's Sense of Self-Efficacy (TSSE) Scale, are incorporated as measures of qualitative data that have the potential to inform project refinements and assess progress toward the intended outcomes on a periodic basis (pp. e36-37, pp. e40-41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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. (5 points)

Strengths:

The scope of the project key components align the goals, objectives, and outcomes with the research questions demonstrating a consistent focus across the project design, personnel, and management plan with the evaluation plan (p. e20, p. e27, p. e29, pp. e31-33, p. e34). The project proposes to mediate for teacher related factors on the effects of the intervention, such as level of experience, level of participation in YPAR professional development, and self-efficacy, to determine the effects of the assignment on the outcomes (p. e41). A plausible plan for the use of data collected and lessons learned from the first cohort in year 2 is proposed as a threshold for year three cohort implementation (pp. e40-41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/07/2022 11:16 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2022 11:17 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Total	30	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Tier 2 - 1: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: The Regents of the Univ. of Calif., U.C. San Diego (S411C220114)

Questions

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: 27

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). (20 points)

Strengths:

The evaluation uses a randomized design (at the student level – which minimizes non-independence or cluster effects) with procedures for establishing baseline equivalence and determining and correcting for differential attrition (pp. e20, e35-e39) – all of which will support the evidence produced meeting What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations – the highest level of rigor in the standards.

The total number of student participants (480, p. e21) exceeds the 350 suggested by the WWC to generate “moderate” levels of evidence.

The vast majority of measures to be used, standardized test scores and two surveys, (pp. e27-e28, e36-e37) are reliable and valid for the evaluation questions, and published where relevant.

The data analysis and model are appropriate for the evaluation questions and data (p. p. e37), so the study can generate evidence that meets WWC standards.

Weaknesses:

The study is powered to detect an effect as small as 0.217, or – if fewer 11th grade students, who will have standardized test scores, participate – 0.285 (pp. e38-e39). Even the smaller of these is a “moderate” effect and no justification is given from the literature that an effect of that size is reasonably expected for the outcomes of interest. Therefore, the study still has the potential to be underpowered for a reasonable effect (i.e., the study as designed may “fail to detect” effects because a real, but smaller than the study was powered for, effect size was realized – a type 2 error.)

In evaluation question 1, academic grades are proposed as one outcome measure, which are known to be unreliable, and may reduce the ability of evidence produced from this analysis to meet WWC standards.

Reader's Score: 17

Sub

2. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (5 points)

Strengths:

Various feedback loops from students, teachers, and the evaluation team to the design team are proposed using appropriate data and at different intervals (pp. e22 – e25, e40-e41). These feedback loops are designed to provide performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress toward outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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. (5 points)

Strengths:

Key project components, mediators, and outcomes are clearly outlined (e.g., p.e41). While a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation is proposed to be determined based on observations as a measure of fidelity during the evaluation – a tentative one is proposed (teachers participating in 50% of professional development activities, p. e41).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/07/2022 11:17 AM