

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/29/2022 10:14 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	6
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	9
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	65
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. COVID-19	3	0
Sub Total	6	3
Total	106	68

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - EIR Early Phase - 17: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

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 provided a comprehensive discussion of the significance of Project HATC, including the demographics of the school system and how the proposed project will support the wellbeing of students. Because Rock Island-Milan School District #41 (RIMSD) is a relatively large high-poverty, low-income school district with a school population where approximately 52% (e18) of the children qualify for free lunch and where there are high absenteeism and suspensions rates, and below average math and reading scores, it has been demonstrated that social emotional learning has a positive impact on student success. Therefore, the proposed project will address some of the most prevalent inequities of the school system: "the deep inequities in access to, and engagement and success in curricula that increase social competence; and the lack of SEL supports that amplify authentic learning" (e20).

The applicant provided a thorough description of the proposed project, Project HATC, which will implement and rigorously evaluate the Connect With Kids (CWK) social emotional learning evidence-based curriculum, along with project-based learning (PBL). Project HATC will build upon the two strategies (CWK and PBL) to "generate an evidence-based solution to problems of student underachievement and disengagement, particularly among high needs students" (e18). The resulting curriculum, HATC Curriculum, will be implemented in "50 classrooms in the first year and 100 classrooms the following years" (e18).

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: 30

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 applicant provided an exhaustive description of the highly recognized conceptual framework inherent in the unique approach of Project HATC. The proposed project builds upon two successful evidence-based approaches: 1) CWK, which has shown “a decrease in physical and verbal aggressive behaviors among students and an increase in positive social and emotional behaviors among students” (e21) and PBL, a student-centered instructional approach. CWK, for example, has been designated an “Effective Producer of Programs” by the U.S. Department of Education, appears on the U.S. Department of Education’s What Works Clearinghouse List, and on the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Agency’s National Registry of Effective Programs” (e21).

To provide supportive documentation of the quality of the proposed conceptual framework, the applicant provided a thorough description of the relationship and positive impact of CWK on behavior. For example, research of CWK, which uses video as an integral component of its instructional approach, has demonstrated that: “Through the power of video and technology, students, parents and educators learn at an emotional and intellectual level that provides a greater opportunity for positive behavior change” (e22).

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses Noted.

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:

The applicant provided a summary of the implementation process and a detailed description of defined and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes for Project HATC. For example, Table 1 (e25-26a) includes two goals with specific objectives and outcomes (i.e., Goal 1 included the following Objective “RIMSD and CWK will meet on a regular basis to ensure training completion, fidelity of implementation, and local adaptation needs throughout the five-year grant life” (e25).

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses 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 applicant provided a comprehensive description of the conceptual framework for Project HATC, which builds upon and includes the essential components of CWK and PBL to meet the needs of the target population (“70% high needs”) (e28). To support the appropriateness of the proposed project, the applicant shared that the resulting

Sub

Project HATC curriculum will address the needs of the district’s target population of high needs students who have poor academic achievement and high disciplinary problems by providing enhanced instruction for both students and teachers that include “weekly SEL activities and professional development on best practices” (e27). In addition, implementation of the new refined evidence-based curriculum will “provide the tools for decreasing disciplinary practices and creating a sustainable model for equity with the school community” (e27), resulting in increased social emotional competence and improved behavioral and academic outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses Noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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: 6

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 provided a brief but comprehensive statement of Project HATC staff. The documentation included Table 2: Personnel and Responsibilities (e28-29) and a curriculum vitae (CV) for each team member (Appendix B, e84). The table included the individuals responsible for leadership of the project. For example, Dr. Kathy Ruggeberg, Assistant Superintendent, Teaching and Learning of the Rock Island will “provide overall leadership of the project” (e28) and has an extensive background in Educational Administration as indicated in her CV: “Illinois State University Ph.D. Education, Educational Administration and Foundations, May 2011 Dissertation: A Disparity in Principal Accountability M.S. Education, Educational Administration and Foundations” (Appendix B, e115).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence or documentation to support the commitment to encourage applications from underrepresented individuals. Instead, the applicant provided a general statement of its intent to “advertise the position to underrepresented groups” (e28) as team members of Project HATC.

Reader's Score: 6

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:

To support the ability of the management plan to facilitate Project HATC, the applicant provided an excellent descriptive summary of the implementation strategies, including statements of the responsibilities of each project member toward objective achievement. The description of strategies also included the use of Asana, a cloud-based monitoring tool (e29) and bimonthly monitoring meetings with the project team and evaluators. The management plan also included Table 3: Management Plan, Timeline and Milestones with clearly defined responsibilities and milestones (i.e., "Milestone-Train teachers/staff on HATC SEL Curriculum and PBL-14 hours" (e31).

Weaknesses:

The timelines in the management plan, Table 3 (e31), were expressed in general time spans (i.e., 12-month, 2–3-year intervals), which may impact the ability to accurately monitor the progress of project goals, objectives, and outcomes.

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:

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. (5 points)**

Sub

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

Project HATC is designed to promote educational equity for underserved students in RIMSD. The project includes a partnership with CWK, a media company, which uses technology (via videos) to improve student behavior and wellness and also incorporates the student-centered approach, project-based learning. Through Project HATC, the CWK evidence-based social emotional learning curriculum will be refined along with project-based learning to “generate an evidence-based solution to problems of students underachievement and disengagement” (e18) of high needs students.

Weaknesses:

No Weaknesses 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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/29/2022 10:14 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/26/2022 01:56 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	5
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	10
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	65
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. COVID-19	3	0
Sub Total	6	3
Total	106	68

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - EIR Early Phase - 17: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

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 proposed project will develop and demonstrate a new strategy and associated intervention that builds on two existing evidence-based strategies, which are social-emotional learning and project-based learning (p. e20). Through the integration of the two strategies, the applicant seeks to address urgent educational problems, such as inequities in access and student engagement in school.

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: 30

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 proposed project's social-emotional learning (SEL) program has been designated as an Effective Producer of Programs by What Works Clearinghouse List (p. e20). Based on previous research, its SEL program has demonstrated a decrease in physical and verbal aggressive behaviors among students, while improving

Sub

communication among students, teachers, and parents. The conceptual framework underlying the proposed research uses the art of storytelling to inspire positive behavior and motivate social action (p. e20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

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:

The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. For instance, Goal 1 (When the social-emotional learning curriculum encompassed with project-based learning components are implemented students will demonstrate positive effects with increased social-emotional competence.) is aligned to Objective 2 (The applicant will provide training and ongoing support to high school teachers and administrators to implement the social-emotional learning curriculum with fidelity to improve student social-emotional competency and behavior outcomes.) to achieve measurable Outcome 2c (By the end of Year 1, 40-45 teachers will complete 25 lessons on social-emotional learning competencies during advisory period, by using the curriculum 4-5 days per week for 20 minutes per day.) (pp. e25-e26).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population, which are high-needs students who are living in poverty, students of color, English learners, students with disabilities, and homeless students (e.18). The applicant plans to focus on developing personal and interpersonal skills essential to emotional and relational health for both teachers and students to promote a positive school climate. In addition, it should also increase students' academic and social engagement (p. e27).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 15

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: 5

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 some of the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel on the leadership and independent evaluation teams (pp. e28-e29). The applicant has a predetermined, designated school district that will oversee all aspects of the project, including recruiting teachers, hiring instructional coaches, and supervising school staff (p. e28).

Weaknesses:

The applicant stated it would advertise the position to traditionally underrepresented groups and referenced the job description (p. e28). Upon a review of the job description, the applicant did not address whether it 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 (pp. e61-e64).

The district's assistant superintendent of teaching and learning is listed on the leadership team. The omission of this individual's qualifications, including relevant training and experience impact understanding of this key project personnel's role in the proposed project (pp. e114-e116).

Reader's Score: 5

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: 10

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 applicant provides a 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 (pp. e29-e31). For instance, the applicant and the school district are responsible for designing the social-emotional learning and project-based learning curriculum between January through May of 2023.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 10

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:

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. (5 points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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 plans to promote equity in student access to educational resources by implementing, evaluating, and refining their social-emotional learning curriculum in conjunction with project-based learning (p. e18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/26/2022 01:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/29/2022 09:56 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	6
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	8
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	64
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. COVID-19	3	0
Sub Total	6	3
Total	106	67

Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - EIR Early Phase - 17: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

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 proposed program integrates two well-documented strategies, an SEL curriculum and project-based learning. The combination of these two elements is a promising new strategy (e20).

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: 30

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 narrative explains the research base for the work. The logic model provides activities and related outcomes for the various stakeholders, providing a high-quality framework for the project that is logical and consistent (e128).

Sub

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

The goals, objectives, and outcomes for this project are clearly defined with measurable benchmarks (e25-26). This information provides a clear roadmap for accountability.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 applicant identifies the need for SEL instruction in the target student population and the teachers who support them. The proposal provides evidence that the proposed SEL and PBL components have addressed the needs of this population in other studies (e27-28). The narrative establishes a strong likelihood that this program will achieve its goals.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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: 6

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:

Key personnel, including district employees and contractors, have extensive experience in topics related to this project. The qualifications of key personnel provide a strong foundation for the proposed project (e28-e29, e90-

Sub

e123).

Weaknesses:

Diversity is not addressed. The applicant does not include their present staff demographics which would demonstrate their current practice of attracting employees from underrepresented groups.

Reader's Score: 6

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: 8

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 a timeline for major activities and milestones and the teams responsible for each task (e29-e31). The budget narrative is comprehensive and clearly aligns the expenses with project goals (e138-e146).

Weaknesses:

Responsibilities are defined to each team and individual responsibilities are discussed in summary, but the plan does not clearly lay out responsibilities for individual accountability. This may impact the ability to monitor progress toward goals.

Reader's Score: 8

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)**

Sub

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. (5 points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

3. (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. (5 points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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 proposed program is designed to include project-based learning to address the needs of identified underserved students in high school. Proposed practices are inclusive and have the potential to help prepare students for college, career, and civic life through improved social-emotional skills. With these elements, this proposal meets the criteria for CPP1 (e18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

Not addressed.

Weaknesses:

Not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/29/2022 09:56 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/05/2022 08:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

Reader #1: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - EIR Tier 2 - 10: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

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 application outlines a plan for a cluster RCT that has the potential to meet WWC standards without reservations. There is a plan for appropriate random assignment to groups by teacher to account for various contextual factors. There is a clear plan for recruitment and a plan for how attrition will be addressed by the study. The proposed outcomes match with appropriate measures that will meet WWC domains. The data collection plan provides sufficient evidence that student behavior and achievement outcomes can be measured to determine if these outcomes can be improved by the HATC program. Appropriate analytic models are thoroughly described for the evaluation of the project and the power analyses suggest the project will have an appropriate effect size. In addition, the plan appropriately addresses how missing data will be handled. Finally, given the extensive experience of the external evaluation team, it is likely the evaluation plan will be carried out as described and that the team will be able to adjust as issues arise.

Weaknesses:

Additional evidence is needed to describe how baseline equivalence will be established and what specific measures will be used to establish baseline equivalence.

Reader's Score: 18

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 applicant has clearly outlined multiple measures that will assess implementation fidelity and teacher and student outcomes that are likely to provide necessary formative feedback to the project. A sufficient plan for providing the implementation team with regular feedback is detailed. There is also a clear plan for collecting and analyzing data to answer the formative research questions and to assess the project's progress on intended outcomes quarterly and annually. Taken together, it is likely the methods of evaluation will provide feedback on any changes needed in the design and implementation of the program to achieve the intended outcomes.

Sub

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how qualitative data will be analyzed to provide feedback to the project team.

Reader's Score: 4

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 evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes. The plan provides sufficient evidence of how mediators will be explored. In addition, the plan appropriately articulates how the evaluation team will apply measurable thresholds of fidelity and implementation.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses on this aspect of the proposal.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 10/05/2022 08:05 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2022 11:13 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	26
Total	30	26

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - EIR Tier 2 - 10: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Rock Island School District (S411C220176)

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: 26

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 applicant proposes to use a randomized controlled trial design in which teachers are randomly assigned to the treatment condition or a business-as-usual comparison group within grade-level strata. This design is eligible to Meet WWC Standards Without Reservations.

With 50 teachers in the treatment group and 50 teachers in the comparison group, the study has adequate power to detect statistically significant effects of the intervention on student outcomes. The applicant indicates that the MDES for the student social-emotional learning (SEL) competency measure is 0.16, the MDI for student suspension rates is -11.6%, and the MDI for the student attendance outcome is 8.4%. These are adequate for detecting effects on the types of student outcome measures included in the evaluation.

The student outcomes are aligned with a domain included in the current version of the WWC Study Review Protocol—Intrapersonal Competencies, Student Behavior, and School Attendance.

The applicant clearly describes the process for recruiting teachers to participate in the evaluation. The applicant intends to work with the program team to recruit teachers from within the school district, provide information about the rationale for the program, provide compensation for attending training and coaching session, and provide stipends for participation in data collection.

The proposed methods for addressing missing data—multiple imputation and dummy variable method with listwise case deletion of cases missing pre-intervention measures—are aligned with WWC standards for handling missing data.

In the appendix, the applicant clearly describes the analytic models for the student impact models. The application includes the equations for the analytic model, and it is specified correctly. The model includes students nested in teachers, nested in blocks, with the treatment indicator included at the teacher level.

Sub

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly describe the process to be used to track and assess attrition at the classroom or student level. This is important because RCTs with high attrition must demonstrate baseline equivalence in order to Meet WWC Standards With Reservations, which is the minimum requirement of this grant. Similarly, the applicant does not clearly describe the process to be used to demonstrate baseline equivalence of treatment and comparison students. The applicant only states that they will use procedures aligned with the WWC standards.

Reader's Score: 17

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 applicant presents a well-developed plan for providing performance feedback and monitoring progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The applicant plans to follow Plan-Do-Study-Act cycles, which focus on data collection and analysis for continuous improvement. Within the cycles, the applicant will collect data from data using a variety of sources including quarterly teacher surveys, annual interviews of a sample of teachers and administrators, and other implementation data.

The applicant includes a clear line of communication between the evaluation team and the program team, which will help to ensure that evaluation results are used for continuous improvement. The evaluation team and program team will meet bi-weekly to discuss progress of the evaluation and findings.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly describe how data from teacher and administrator interviews or surveys would be analyzed and summarized for the project team. For example, the applicant indicates that the evaluation team will share data with the program team, but it does not indicate the form in which these will take such as memos, reports, presentations, etc.

Reader's Score: 4

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 applicant clearly identifies the four key program components—RIMSD-CWK partnership, professional learning and ongoing support, CWK curriculum, and CWK problem-based learning activities. These are clearly aligned with the logic model included in Appendix G. For each key program component, the applicant clearly specifies how fidelity of implementation for each component will be measured and the minimum threshold for acceptable implementation for each.

The applicant clearly specifies each of the confirmatory and exploratory teacher and student outcomes. In Appendix J, the applicant lists each of the outcomes, provides a detailed description of what is measured by each outcome, and the reliability coefficient for each outcome.

The applicant clearly identifies potential mediators for student outcomes (p. e29), The applicant proposes to address a research question focused on whether the impact of the intervention on student SEL competence, attendance, or suspension rate mediates impacts on student achievement. The applicant clearly describes the process to be used to assess mediation using a multilevel framework.

Sub

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses for this component.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/07/2022 11:13 AM