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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)
Reader #1:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		10	9
Strategy to Scale			
1. Strategy to Scale		35	33
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan			
1. Project Design/Management		35	32
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	0
	Total	100	74

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

   (2) The national significance of the proposed project.

   (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   Strengths:

   There is a defined the need for the project (severity of the problem) through references to current educational initiatives and data. The applicant has referenced the national Common Core Standards movement and it emphasis on connections between reading and writing and the importance of developing student skills in text based analysis and writing in order to better prepare them for post high school experiences. The applicant supports their proposal with data from national NAEP tests that show students performing below standards and also highlight the significant achievement gaps displayed by second language learners (Hispanic). The applicant provides targeted supporting statements that Hispanic students (majority of EL's) large literacy gaps and correlates this with low graduation rates in the project's targeted serving states (Page 1-3).

   Based on their prior experiences, the applicant has demonstrated local and statewide success in implementing their pathway program over the past twenty years. In the references provided, their program has met What Work Clearinghouse standards and demonstrated a positive impact on improved student writing performance. The potential expansion of the project at a national level offers the opportunity to target a specific, but high needs population of students in second language learners and other at-risk students (Page 6-9).

   The applicant has demonstrated over twenty years with data/evidence that their program yields positive impacts on student writing performance. They have also demonstrated the ability to apply the professional development process over time in multi local and state venues. Finally, they have built a regional infrastructure (Writing Project Centers) that can collaborate at a national level with the National Writing Center and The Council of Great City Schools that will serve as foundation of support for their national expansion (Page 3-9).

   Weaknesses:

   The project proposal lacks specific evidence or details to support their statements about the magnitude or severity of the problem that exists. For example, the applicant states that "El's enroll in college and graduate from college at far lower rates". Another example is "ELs are the fastest growing segment of the K-12 student population with the largest increases coming in grade 7-12" (Page 1-3)

   Few details and data regarding the local populations that would be served by the proposed grant project are provided in the proposal (Page 1-3).

   The grant proposal references expansion to all fifty states and outside the United States, but lacks details about how the

project will address English learner needs in those areas (Page 4).

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

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

   (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

   Strengths:

   With the research and evidence presented by the applicant, there is a little formal support and few established practices and professional development for teachers of second language learners, the project proposal demonstrates a need for its implementation. They reference research reports and surveys through the Association of Latino Administrators and Teach for America. These surveys provide evidence that is needed and the opportunity to expand their programming (professional development) to scale up to an additional eight sites/seven states where targeted teachers of EL's and ESL students can be supported.   The states that have been targeted by the applicant have expanding populations of second language learners. The applicant also has referenced that they have the current infrastructure (National Writing Project & Council of Great City Schools) in place to provide support for meeting the needs identified and for expanding on a national level (Page 12-16).

   The project proposal includes a comprehensive professional development strategy that will assist teachers in developing their writing instruction for second language learners (Page 16-20).

   Multiple barriers that will impact their scale up model of the grant have been addressed. They have addressed: processes for hosting professional development trainings within a multi-state project, how to provide appropriate coaching, communication between sites and distances, and costs (Page 16-24).

   An outline of their logic and reasoning for managing the cost barriers associated with implementing the program was

presented and they also described the impact on the number of students that will be progressively added over the course of the project (Page 16-25).

The project proposed by the applicant has presented multiple avenues by which they will disseminate their results of their work and resources and materials. They have identified these areas as: the use of the established National Writing Project and Council of Great City Schools established organizational framework and networks partnerships, videotaping and developing course modules, making professional development available for a subscription fee, open source sharing, publishing in journals, and use of social media tools (Page 26-28).

Weaknesses:

Few specific details or supporting reasons about why this particular professional development plan and approach will be the most effective approach to serve the needs of second language teachers and students were provided by the applicant (Page 16-25).

Limited information about how English Language learner students who are not Hispanic will be served through the grant project was provided. It was a limited description of creating additional modules for teachers of these students (Page 21).

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

   (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

   (4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g.,SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

   Strengths:

   A chart (Figure 4) on page 30 and 31 that presents information on their Project Design and Management Plan was provided in the proposal. The comprehensive chart provides information on goals, objectives, benchmark measures of success, strategies and activities, key implementation dates, and responsible parties for implementation. They have specific and measureable goals and objectives. (Page 30-31).

   A comprehensive management plan and described the key phases of implementation that will need to be completed during the implementation of the grant process was provided in the project proposal (Page 32-33).

   A hierarchy for communication among the different leadership teams established for the grant project was presented by the applicant. They have also described who will be involved the pathway intervention feedback process (Page 33-34).

   The applicant and its potential future partners (National Writing Project – Council of Great City Schools) are established organizations with a track record of success (Page 36-37).

Weaknesses:

Within the project proposal, the applicant has described how they will charge a subscription fee for future professional development services that they offer. The costs for the services may prohibit future access by additional schools/teachers who would benefit from the services. They indicate that their goal is to "become more entrepreneurial, not unlike a business" (Page 27-28).

The process for feedback and continuous improvement describes the personnel that will be involved in the process, but does not describe "how" this will happen or the areas that they desire to continuously review to gauge improvement and growth (Page 33-34).

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

   (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

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

   Strengths:

   Not Applicable

   Weaknesses:

   Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/07/2018 04:33 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)
Reader #2: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Total	100	20

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

   (2) The national significance of the proposed project.

   (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

   (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

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

   (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

   (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

   (4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g.,SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

   (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

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

   Strengths:

   The methods of evaluation will successfully produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that will meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations because the applicant proposes to conduct a randomized control trial (RCT) evaluation design blocked by district and school level to ensure balance across grade levels and district contextual factors. The applicant strengthens the RCT design by including adequate strategies to minimize differential attrition, prevent the inclusion of joiners, and test for baseline equivalence (p. 41).

   The proposed evaluation has the capacity to provide valuable guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings via the analysis of multiple measures of implementation including artifact analysis, teacher surveys, observations of training, and classroom observations. For example, the evaluation will carefully examine sites' experiences with the supports provided by the project, how sites develop expertise and sense of ownership of the intervention, and teachers' use of and experience with project components. This information is likely to be of value to sites seeking to replicate or test the intervention in other settings (p. 42). Particularly strong is the plan to triangulate local site contextual data with site-level fidelity of implementation and impact data, which will provide important guidance for

replication and sustainability (p. 42-43).

The methods of evaluation will adequately provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. For example, valid and reliable state assessments will be used to measure student outcomes (p. 44, 46). The applicant provides data confirming the inter-rater reliability and convergent validity of the Analytic Writing Continuum for Literacy Analysis (AWC-LA) that will be used to measure key attributes of writing (p. 45). The applicant provides extensive and effective strategies for ensuring independence and impartiality for the scoring of writing assessments (p. 45). The applicant provides sufficient confirmation of the predictive validity of the Protocol for Language Arts Teaching Observation (PLATO), which will be used to evaluate instructional practices (p. 47).

The evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation. For example, the logic model (p. 23) carefully identifies the project's activities (key project components), outputs, short-term outcomes (mediators), mid-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes. The applicant includes a comprehensive list of key components, with specific indicators for each component and measurable thresholds for each indicator (p. 51).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/06/2018 04:06 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/07/2018 01:45 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)
Reader #3: **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Total	100	20

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

   (2) The national significance of the proposed project.

   (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   Strengths:

   n/a

   Weaknesses:

   n/a

Reader's Score: **0**

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

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

   (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

   Strengths:

   n/a

   Weaknesses:

   n/a

Reader's Score: **0**

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

   (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

   (4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g.,SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

   Strengths:

   n/a

   Weaknesses:

   n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

   (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant did a strong job of showing the extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook.

   The project's power analysis predicts a Minimum Detectable Effect Size of .183 with .8 power. The RCT design is strong for its block level treatment of teachers within a school district; additionally, it features a plan for minimizing attrition while excluding joiners, which suggests a serious approach to data integrity (pg 41).   The rigor of the proposed RCT in terms of the multiple data collection strategies to measure teacher and student growth is impressive, including multiple writing/ELA assessment instruments (pg. 40), monitoring, and site visits with interviews and student focus groups. The student focus groups are of particular interest because they will uncover attitudes and feelings of self-efficacy in a setting that encourages reflection.

   The applicant did a strong job of showing the extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective

strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings. The evaluation plan suggests a three-pronged approach to studying how well the project's activities can be replicated across other settings, including the resources provided, the growing expertise of the test sites, and teachers' actual utilization of the various project components (pg. 42). Doing so with qualitative and quantitative data collection offers researchers strong insights into which activities will work best within different settings.

The applicant did a strong job of showing the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The proposed tests of student writing and scoring rubrics have been rated very highly in terms of reliability and consistency, and the evaluation will also utilize WWC-recognized standardized state testing scores (pg. 45). What's particularly strong is the planned testing of both standard grammar and reading (emphasized in state tests) and a more nuanced measure of student writing ability through another rubric (pg. 44).

The applicant did a strong job of showing 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. The Program's Logic Model, found on page 22, provides short-, mid-, and long-term outcomes culminating in increased student English Language Arts test scores and increased high school graduation rates. The research questions include specific questions about mediators in order to identify those teacher practices that lead to improved student writing scores (pg. 39); the hypotheses related to the proposed mediation analyses appear to hone in well on the key success of the project, particularly those regarding explicit strategy usage and instruction (pg. 52). The Implementation Thresholds discussed in the chart on page 51 seem ambitious yet achievable.

Weaknesses:

The application was thoroughly reviewed, and no weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/07/2018 01:45 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)
Reader #4: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	35
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Total	100	75

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion - 1: 84.411A

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

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

   (2) The national significance of the proposed project.

   (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   Strengths:

   The project addresses the severity of the problem by the proposed project as a prioritizing the ability to analyze and interprets challenging texts. The project gives significant evidence of the need for a program using statistics from NAEP on page 1, (e25) and Figure 1 of disparities between student race/ethnicity.

   The proposed project states that the national significance ranges from University of California, Irving Writing Project (UCIWP), National Writing Project (NWP) and Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS). The project states on page 3 (e27) that 8 sites and partner districts that serve high needs and the high percentage of EL's will be involved.

   The extent to the which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority established for the competition is stated in writing for grades 7-11, on pages 9-10, (e33-34). The approach is to use strategy instruction and the eleven key elements of writing instruction. The priority focuses on EL's and the explicit focus on language, compression, use of types of cognitive strategies.

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

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

   (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The project acknowledges that the effective practices for teaching text based academic writing to EL's is nearly untapped with no real qualitative studies. Thus, using a different study found on ages 12-13 (e35-36) the focus was on teacher instructional practices, quality of instructional materials and in adequate teacher capacity.

The extent to which the applicant identifies specific strategies is well laid out on pages 16-25 (e40-49). The level of scale ranges from focusing on teacher PD and training on how to teach writing to scholars to cost analysis that breaks it down per cost of student. In this section potential barriers were addressed, and strategies were addressed on pg. 20 (e44) to include Teacher consultants, coaching and a time frame.

The results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in a cohort, sharing of sample materials, case study of students. Partnership with the NWP and CGCS to create and design 10 modules for sale to other groups after the funding for the grant terminates.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

    (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

    (4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g.,SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

    Strengths:

    The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes are to be achieved by the proposed project are stated to be monthly conference calls, attending a conference, several types of feedback, the establishment of resources beyond the length of grant such as summer program and professional development.

    The proposal presented a multi-year financial model that would involve members and non- members purchasing Modules and Platforms with partnerships with CGCS and UCIWP. Operational budget was included in the appendix that was easy to understand and evidence of support from stakeholders, ability to accomplish tasks and realistic.

    Weaknesses:

    The timeline and management of the proposed project on ensuring feedback is present but limited details on collection and assessment of feedback in some areas, pgs. 34-35 (358-59)

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

   (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

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

   Strengths:

   Not Applicable

   Weaknesses:

   Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/12/2018 12:51 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)
Reader #5:   **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	8
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	35	33
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Management	35	31
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Total	100	72

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion - 1: 84.411A

Reader #5:   **********
Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Irvine (U411A180004)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

    (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

    (2) The national significance of the proposed project.

    (3) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

    Strengths:

    In terms of strengths in Significance, the proposal aptly identifies the literature from What Works Clearinghouse related to second-language learners, and this reviewer was particularly impressed with the focus on upper grade levels given—quite frankly—the alarming statistic on the minimal number (1%) of English learners who score proficient on writing and only 4% who score proficient in reading (p. 2). Too often these learners do not get enough attention, which supports the exceptionality of this approach. Proposal clearly identifies the national importance of English-language learning, and the project is well-articulated in general as its explains its purpose and the unique demands it meets.

    Weaknesses:

    One element that was not addressed in depth was the wide discrepancy in graduation rates among EL learners across states (p. 3); given this range, more could be offered here in terms of why there is such discrepancy across the 8 states.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

    (1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy, or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

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

    (3) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

    Strengths:

    In terms of Strategy to Scale, the proposal certainly addresses and unmet demand. In terms of leveraging an existing strategy and expanding upon it, yes, the team builds upon a i3 Validation grant involving four CA Writing Project sites;

NWP has 96 local Writing Projects across 41 states using their College, Career, & Community Writers Program (C3WP), which reinforces the scale-ability of such a model for EL learners. The team knows the challenges around such outreach and evaluation and clearly articulate this around barriers to scale. Dissemination plan is well articulated and thorough, addressing the needs of not only the academic and research communities for future interventions but the practical consideration of the NWP as they use such results to inform hands-on practice.

Weaknesses:

One minor weakness was the question of further articulating what such a mental "Tool Kit" looks like and how the team will foster this mind set among participating educators/ locations.

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

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

    (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

    (4) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any partners; evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g.,SEAs, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success; or more than one of these types of evidence.

    Strengths:

    In terms of the Quality of Project Design & Management, the Pathway Project has a 20-year track record of project effectiveness and the NWP has a wide reach nationally; the team is well qualified to conduct this outreach and evaluation and has the requisite resources to operate the project beyond the timeline of the funding. The Project Design and Management Plan (pp. 30-31) does an effective job aligning goals/ objectives/ measures/ activities as each logically connects to the other, and the added timeline supports in terms of offering the broader sequence of implementation.

    Weaknesses:

    Two areas that could have been further articulated is the question of further articulating the cycle of Feedback (pp.34-35) that will inform and adjust the program; the application reads "teacher responses will be used to improve the program" but per the perceived and expected barriers (pp. 20-22), the proposal would have been stronger here if it returned to what barriers may be reported and how the model would adapt accordingly.

Reader's Score: 31

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/11/2018 06:57 PM