

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2016 08:56 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	31
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	42
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Total	100	73

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Development - 3: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

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 extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths:

The project proposes meeting the needs of a highly targeted group of students who are under-performing, backed by local needs assessment and research. Further, the narrative proposes a highly effective cross-functional design (p.2) that aims to partner not only school districts, but several colleges and universities for longitudinal effect. Within the LEA, the application builds upon current teacher knowledge and proposes a diverse and meaningful cross-section of teacher-level, administrator-level, and counselor-level support, and the creation of new courses with input of key stakeholders to meet student achievement needs (pp.10-12). A clear alignment with Common Core Standards and internationally-benchmarked assessment usage is established for program direction.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the approaches proposed in the narrative show a divergent or innovative approach to increase student achievement. For example, much of the cited research is from 1996 (p.9), 2001 (p.10), and (2005), leaving a discrepancy in the claim for innovation if the cited research is more than eleven years old. The application could also provide additional background on current practices and contrast those with the strategies and methods proposed by the project to clearly show divergence. The application could go deeper by focusing on particularly troublesome or challenging standards and trends in performance in those standards to analyze specific needs, learning strands, or concepts to help bring the focus of the project into stronger focus.

Reader's Score: 31

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the 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 mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The outlined goals are clearly identified and most are measurable. Numerous goals are provided to drive solid program management (pp.8-9). Timelines are clear, as well as proposed duties for core staff members. Staff have an abundance of experience in educational arena to carry out this work, which will strengthen its overall effect. Continuous feedback is evident with numerous opportunities to include such. A broad dissemination plan includes participation at the national, state, and regional levels, offering a strong opportunity to share lessons learned, application, and further collaboration.

Weaknesses:

Goals lack specificity in many instances. For example, goal 2c (p.8) states, "significantly higher levels," which vague and lacks meaning. It is unclear what "significantly high" denotes in this instance; a statistically measurable quantifier would be preferred, such as "25% growth" in this instance. Additionally, there is no comparison baseline measure provided to which to compare formative measures in the same goal. While the levels will be "higher", it is unclear what this means; it is recommended that the goal capture the essence of a phrase such as "25% higher than pre-survey data collected from participants at project onset" to make the comparison and quantifiers both clear. The project would benefit from more opportunities for participant feedback from affected constituents to leaders could be included, such as in survey form on a regular basis. There is no mention of students and parents as stakeholders who provide feedback, which could be vital to project vitality. Finally, while the application also focuses upon meetings and conferences as sources of dissemination, other possible venues such as publication, and/or web-based approaches of outcome dissemination are not mentioned.

Reader's Score: 42

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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 Evidence Standards with reservations.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/22/2016 08:56 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 04:52 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Total	100	18

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Development - 3: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

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 extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the 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 mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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 Evidence Standards with reservations.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

They will implement a quasi-experimental design with matched group of non-participating students which meets the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations. Given this, the results will produce evidence about the effectiveness of the project in raising students' math understanding and their placement at the college level. In addition, there are plans to review data about increased teacher knowledge and competency, as well as effect differences by student subgroup, both of which will be important to sustainability of the project and adjustments to the program if subgroup differences are evident.

An external evaluation group is identified and sufficient funds have been set aside for evaluation; the evaluators are very well qualified.

Weaknesses:

A weakness is the lack of information about how student scores on remedial math or placement in math at CSU will be obtained and how the students will be followed once they graduate. In addition, some measures on the impact on students not going on to higher education would add to the project.

Reader's Score: 18

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 04:52 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/20/2016 06:42 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Total	100	18

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Development - 3: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

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 extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

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 proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the 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 mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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 Evidence Standards with reservations.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The applicant provides strong evidence of the clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed. The applicant offers seven Implementation research questions and three Impact research questions (p 22), and will gather data pertaining to the questions through methods that include surveys of students, teachers and principals perceptions to measure student learning motivation and perceived confidence, teacher efficacy, and principal-led feedback loops (p 21).

The applicant provides strong evidence of 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 Evidence Standards with reservations. The proposed QED non-equivalent group design will be utilized, incorporating baseline equivalence matching on demographic characteristics and mathematics achievement (p 23). The design will also include pre- and post-test comparisons of various psychosocial factors as reported in the various surveys (p 24).

The applicant provides strong evidence of the extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively. The proposed evaluator has extensive experience and knowledge of the applicant's school districts, and has evaluated numerous federally- and state-funded grants, including a previous I3 development grant (p 20). The 8.5% of the overall budget allocated to evaluation seems reasonable and appropriate for the scope of the proposed evaluation (Budget Justification, Appendix).

Weaknesses:

Some of the proposed Implementation Research questions are helpful but not actionable throughout the course of the project. The questions would be strengthened by more detail and rigor regarding implementation fidelity and its effects. For example, in addition to recording the number of principals and counselors attending the workshops, perhaps the evaluation can determine what obstacles there are to 100% (or another percentage goal) attendance by these groups, perhaps leading to implementation adjustments.

The proposed QED model does not include steps to manage any attrition issues.

Reader's Score: 18

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/20/2016 06:42 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/26/2016 12:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	30
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	43
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Total	100	73

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Development - 3: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

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 extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a well-developed Significance of the project. The applicant built a strong case for the magnitude of the local conditions which address the problem of graduating students who are not college math ready (pm 1-2). The proposal contains multiple sources of local data such as 2014 Community Indicators Report, which reported that San Bernardino County is the least college-educated metropolitan area in the United States and 2015 Early Assessment Placement math exams only 6% of Riverside County and 7% of San Bernardino County students scored "college prepared" (p. 1). The applicant proposes to address the great gap in secondary math through the development of a 4th year math course (p. 1). The proposal meets Absolute Priority 2 by being strongly aligned to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Standards of Mathematical Practice as the topics, problems, and practices will require multiple steps and cross curricular connections, the applicant has pilot tested one module to determine the appropriateness (p. 5-6). The results will be used to inform classroom and professional development practices (p. 6).

Weaknesses:

The applicant proposes to build on work already in process across California by making use of a cross-sectoral, bi-county collaboration to address the need for a fourth year high school math course that aligns with Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to bridge into multiple college and career options by addressing deficits found among college students in the region (p. 2-3), yet the narrative fails to adequately describe or explain how this approach constitutes new or alternative strategies.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the 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 mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

The applicant has a fully developed Project Design and Management Plan. The proposal contains clear and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes in Table 4 (p. 7-8). Table 5 has a detailed explanation of Team member's roles and responsibilities (p. 13-14). Thus positively indicating the level of planning and the strength of the leadership framework to ensure project objectives/outcomes will be accomplished. Additionally, Table 6 contains Implementation Timeline and Milestones with Key Team Members listed, again evidencing the level of structural support for accomplishing project goals (p. 15-17). The proposal contains effective procedures for feedback and continuous improvement which will ensure the most stake holders are involved in the loop (p. 17-18). The procedures encompass face to face training/dialogue, by-monthly curriculum development and implementation meetings, monthly administrative leadership meetings, and Quarterly Advisory Board meetings (p. 18). Finally, the applicant has a robust plan for disseminating information which include presenting at professional meetings/conferences, a written and oral presentation of findings at the end of each funded and at the completion of the grant, and at least one article for publication in a peer-reviewed journal (p. 19).

Weaknesses:

The parents (key stake holders) are not engaged at any point in the feedback and continuous improvement procedures.

Reader's Score: 43

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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 Evidence Standards with reservations.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

na

Weaknesses:

na

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/26/2016 12:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2016 10:26 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	33
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	43
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Total	100	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Development - 3: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Riverside County Office of Education (U411C160101)

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

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths:

- Data supporting the need was gleaned from community census reports, school level course content exams, college admission data.
- Project involves a collaboration between school districts, community colleges, universities and local education agencies.
- Proposed project is designed to provide students with a bridge into multiple college and career options.
- Currently being piloted in 11 schools which represent a diversity of performance levels to aid in the determination of what different needs may exist.
- Data from teachers participating in the pilot testing will be used to inform the creation of the remaining curriculum and professional development.
- Addresses priority 4 by positively influencing the perseverance of students and their understanding of and approaches to learning strategies.

Weaknesses:

- Does not adequately expound on how the proposed project addresses Internationally Benchmarked College and Career Standards, but references common core state standards (CCSS).

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the 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 mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

- Has five program goals with specific measurable objectives activities and outcomes outlined
- Contains a concise explanation of the professional development procedures and content and expectations for administrative support and counselor roles
- Outlines roles for the project's team members
- Implementation tasks identified for years 1 through 5
- Lists numerous processes and procedures for feedback such as Edmodo, online surveys, bi-monthly meetings, monthly administrative meetings, and advisory board meetings, formative evaluations and reviews of the evaluative procedures
- Identifies strategies for dissemination of information such as professional meetings and conferences, through avenues within the non-educational partner entities involved with the project; through advocacy across California and within postsecondary teacher prep programs

Weaknesses:

- Expected outcomes 3c1 & 2 do not specify the measuring instrument for determining how effectively teachers are able to report significantly higher perceptions of positive impact of the various components of MRWC on student mathematics achievement and higher levels of student learning engagement with MRWC
- Expected outcome 4b does not specify how principals/administrators will demonstrate that they recognize and can explain the standards of mathematical practices

Reader's Score: 43

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 clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) 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 Evidence Standards with reservations.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

no comment

Weaknesses:

no comment

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2016 10:26 AM