

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2016 10:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	40
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Total	100	75

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - i3 Development - 7: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

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 purpose of the proposed project is to build upon existing practices for the Santa Ana Unified School District to improve school climate, behavioral supports and correctional education. SAUSD is the 7th largest school district in California with 54 schools and serving over 53,000 students. It was noted that 92% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch and 82% of the students are categorized as English Learners (EL) (Page 1).

The applicant mentioned that the Department for Urban Housing (HUD) designated four Santa Ana areas as in severe and immediate need for intervention in the areas of economic development, health care, housing, childcare and transportation (Page 1).

The applicant has focused on building positive school climate and culture in its schools for the past 4 years using the PBIS framework in developing these goals. It was noted that in 2008 seven schools in the district received support from the Orange County Department of Education for PBIS training and implementation (Page 2).

The applicant has noted that an active role is being taken to monitor attendance, suspension, expulsion data (Tables 1, 2 and 3 Page 4-5). In addition a Restorative Practices and culturally relevant social emotional learning curriculum pilot has been initiated in 5 schools in 2014-15 and has expanded to 11 schools with the continued support of community partners (Page 2).

The applicant conducted a needs assessment and principals indicated that they spend 10-20 hours a week with office discipline referrals which limits their time to be a presence in the classroom, around the building and time to support teachers (Page 5).

The applicant notes that even with the current services provided by the district, more students need to be served through the expansion of services to provide a safe and secure school environment and where every student feels positively engaged in the school community (Page 7).

With all of the aforementioned data, the proposed plan will provide students with the strategies needed to improve student-adult behavior, create social skills program and could provide the structure students need academic expectations.

The proposed project will provide enhancements to its current School Climate Model and will include PBIS and RP components by proposing to utilize new strategies; provide certification training for the school staff on Targeted 3 interventions, coordinating RP to support mental health and anti-bullying prevention, implement a behavior coach

program, implement social learning groups and create a first time violence program and re-entry program to reduce recidivism (Page 7-8).

Weaknesses:

I have not identified areas of weakness to be noted in this area.

Reader's Score: 35

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 listed a narrative of the goals and objectives for the proposed project. The SAUSD Positive School Climate Logic Model (Table 4: Page 11-12) was included to display the inputs, activities and outputs.

The applicant mentions that SAUSD will track progress toward the program objectives each year of the grant (Page 12) and indicates that the stated objectives are going to be progressed monitored by document analysis (Table 5: Page 13).

The applicant states that they intend to ensure feedback and continuous improvement through the use of qualitative and quantitative data collection. The data will be collected through the use of surveys, focus groups, interviews and observations. The data will be reported to the implementation team on an on-going basis to provide performance feedback and an assessment of progress towards meeting the proposed programmatic goals (Page 19).

The applicant listed a plan for information dissemination using newsletters, stakeholder meetings, social media platforms and the school district's news channel. It is also noted that the applicant intends to conduct presentations at national and international conferences (Page 20).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not clearly state in the proposed plan how they intend to improve the attendance rate and reduce suspension as mentioned in the program objectives (Page 15).

A management timeline was included that listed very broad tasks and the milestones where not clearly listed to ensure that the stated objectives were going to be accomplished (Table 6: Page 17-19).

Reader's Score: 40

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:

N/A – scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

N/A – scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2016 10:28 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/26/2016 10:37 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	34
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	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - i3 Development - 7: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

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 applicants demonstrate a significant population of students in need of support. The school district serves students where 91% qualify for the program, and 82% of its students categorized are as English Learners (EL), making it the number one port of entry for new EL students in the country (p.1) Evidence is provided that the hardship in the community is extreme; "The Los Angeles Times ranked Santa Ana as number one in the nation for "urban hardship" and "the nation's toughest place to survive" (p. 1).

The proposal intends to expand on the successes of a district wide implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) strategies. "SAUSD is one of the only districts in California, and the only district of its size that has implemented PBIS district-wide. This initiative began in 2008 when seven schools received support from the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE) for PBIS training and implementation (p. 2). These past successes are well documented through the data provided in the application; "Since SAUSD implemented PBIS and support programs such as Restorative Practices, SAUSD has recovered over 10,254 days of instruction (per academic year as compared to 2011-2012 baseline) through suspensions and expulsions reductions (p/ 3)." The proposed project intends to expand on the PBIS and Restorative Practices model for addressing discipline issues in schools. The past successes are laudable, but feedback from the school principals indicates a strong need for additional support implementing Tier 2 and 3 strategies of the PBIS model (p. 6).

The requirements of Absolute Priority 3 are met in that the project schools serve students where 91% are ESL and 82% low-income. The proposal's primary focus is to implement alternative strategies to exclusionary discipline, and identify the root causes of discipline issues for students through a variety to techniques identified. This is a component of PBIS Tier 2 and 3.

Weaknesses:

The proposal discusses the need for additional tier 2 and 3 support (p. 6), but data related to the outcome of these assessments is missing from the proposal.

"Assessments identified a need for more Tier 2 and Tier 3 level support. Other gaps and weaknesses in current services include: 1) training and coaching for administrators and teachers working with high need students and 2) few referral resources for students with more complex needs."

Reader's Score: 34

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 application provides specific goals and objectives that are reasonable in scope, and measurable in terms of outcomes. As an example, Objective 4 states: "Office referrals will be reduced by 25%" (p. 15). All objectives are written in a similar format with clearly defined outcomes. The management plan is thorough in its scope and sequence, and includes specific responsibilities. Beginning on page 16 of the application, all personnel and roles are clearly outlined. The timelines for implementation are clear and attainable (p. 17-19). Multiple methods for disseminating information about the project and its progress are listed within the application (p.20).

Weaknesses:

Though the applicants do indicate that there is a plan to disseminate information to key stakeholder groups (p. 19), this information is limited in the application. Great detail regarding who the stakeholders are, and when the information will be shared would be beneficial.

The information provided on how the applicant plans for further development or replication is limited as well. More specifics on how this plan will be shared in terms of replication is needed.

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/26/2016 10:37 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 07:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

Reader #3: *****

	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	41
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Total	100	74

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - i3 Development - 7: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

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:

Immediately the applicant is sharing information regarding the building of ongoing capacity which explains sustainability and an ongoing feedback loop. The applicant lays out the framework for creating a positive school climate in the abstract. The applicant further elaborates on page 1 as they are looking to improve not only school climate but behavioral supports and correctional education. They give detail on the same page that 91% of the students qualify for free and reduced lunch and the fact that 82% are EL's. The significance section does point out that this community is the #1 port of entry for EL students. The LA Times ranked Santa Ana as the toughest place to live in America (Page 1). The applicants does indicate that they are planning to integrate PBIS and RP so as to address tier 2 and 3 behaviors. In the applicants baseline data they indicate that they have recovered 10,254 instructional days. The applicants are introspective as they examine various programs that were attempted but failed to be as successful as the district hoped for. The applicant does not necessarily believe that their service model will cure all issues but that they will tie the two models together to increase the levels of success they have seen. The applicant has indicated that there can no longer be a waiting to fail model (page 6). The district proposes an 8 point process that enhance the school climate. The applicant points out with some detail as to what they anticipate doing in the school (page 7).

Weaknesses:

It does not appear that there is an explanation of how or why the applicant is pairing RP with PBIS. It would be of interest as to why the two are paired together. Such information will of interest to those the applicant disseminates background and data to at the completion of the project. On page 6 the applicant points outs that they do more than work in school, that there will be a community component. However, it would have been good to see additional information as to what will be provided for families as they appear on line one of page 6 but then are dropped as the applicant continues on regarding Tier 2 and 3 supports which appear to be discussions inside of the school day. The reason is that not only can supports come from inside school but from the home and community as well.

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:

The applicant points out that targeted school that scores below 80% on the TFI will be targeted for capacity building with ongoing training with coaches (page 9). The objectives use detailed scoring to assess school improvement from a climate perspective and have predetermined courses of action should the benchmarks and milestones not be met (pages 12-15). The information is not only on the school climate but each student will have a plan to help them move from tier 2 and tier 3 to what is hoped will be tier 1 (page 14). The applicant lays out the roles and responsibilities of the leadership team in a fashion that is easy to read and to understand. The applicant lays out a process for disseminating information across the district as well as the community and in other enumerated ways (page 20).

Weaknesses:

The applicant should spell out what Tier 2 and Tier 3 expectations are. the applicant could add detail as to what tier 2 and tier 3 might look like as it is to be delivered in this project. Community members, students and staff may not all know what they represent or how what their significance is. The applicant will hire personnel through the project but does not state if personnel will be in place after the grant project ends. It is unclear what the leadership will look like after the grant. The timeline lays out the tasks, responsibilities and milestones; however, it is unclear examining the model on pages 17 and 18 what the benchmark dates are that it anticipates to be attained. The milestone indicates a month but it is unclear during which year the benchmarks are to be completed (pages 17 & 18).

Reader's Score: 41

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:

N/A scored by other reviewers

Weaknesses:

N/A scored by other reviewers

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 07:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2016 08:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

Reader #4: *****

	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 #7 - i3 Development - 7: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

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:

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 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:

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 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:

As related to addressing Criterion C.2, the applicant is proposing a randomized control design. In meeting WWC with reservations a RCT is the strongest design possible. In postulating causal claims, these claims are strengthened when randomization is possible. As related to Criterion C.1, the six research questions on page (22) are directly related to the proposed project design. To address the impact question, most importantly measure changes in student learning, the applicant proposed analytical method will be hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). Given that the data are nested (districts-schools-classrooms-teachers-students), HLM is an appropriate method to address the impact research questions. The applicant provided a detail discussion of the Level-1, and Level-2 exogenous variables in Appendix J1, pages 10-11. In addition, the evaluation plan included specific information related to the expected effect sizes, hence, the ability to estimate the sampling sizes needed for acceptable power. The applicant provided the reliability estimates for all of the key instruments that will be used to measure the outcomes variables for the research questions. The reliability estimates indicate that each instrument is highly reliable in measuring the purported constructs. Finally, the external evaluator for this project will be the WestEd, a highly respected institution with high-caliber researchers and statisticians. Given this, the plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Weaknesses:

The only areas of concern that the applicant did not address is how attrition will be incorporated into the statistical analyses to reduce biased estimations, as well as how cross-contamination will be addressed within the statistical analyses.

Reader's Score: 18

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2016 08:16 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2016 09:38 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

Reader #5: *****

	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	19
Total	100	19

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - i3 Development - 7: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Santa Ana Unified School District (U411C160074)

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:

not reviewed

Weaknesses:

not reviewed

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:

not reviewed

Weaknesses:

not reviewed

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 proposed project is for the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) for the purpose of reducing problematic student behavior specifically by reducing suspensions, reducing office disciplinary referrals, and increasing attendance (Abstract).

The proposal has four specific objectives (P 12 – 15) and for each objective there is a measurable outcome and a target score. For example, the first objective is for low performing schools on the TFI to show a 15% implementation fidelity increase at the end of a year (P 12). For determining the outcome, the narrative provides a description of documentation in tables called "Documents used for analysis and interpretation" (P 13). The second objective is that schools will reduce suspensions by 50% the narrative noting that data that will be used (P 13 – 14). The objectives are consistent with the purpose of the proposed project. Each objective is clearly stated and is measurable, and there are target values. All of this is critical information for an effective evaluation plan.

There is to be both formative and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation will monitor the fidelity of implementation (P 13, 18, 25). Implementation will be done by tiers with tier level determined by a Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) score (P9 – 10). Each school will get a Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) score for each tier implemented. Plans for monitoring fidelity are a strength of the proposal.

The impact study will begin with baseline data on suspensions, expulsions, and attendance rates (P4 – 5), as well as school climate scores. The impact evaluation will use five data sources: district and school data on discipline and attendance; "social and emotional skills surveys" from students; staff surveys; and teacher interviews (P 25). Much of the data will come through the existing tracking system for disciplinary referrals and the "annual administration of the School Climate, Health, and Learning Survey (Cal-SCHLS) system and the California Office to Reform Education (CORE) Social Emotional Skills survey (Appendix J). The data is to be disaggregated, which is important especially in the study involving so many schools (P 15). The narrative provides psychometric information plus citations for the survey instruments (Appendix J). The instrumentation to be used is appropriate for the goals of the proposed project and are all properly documented.

Interview data is also to be collected. Teachers and school staff will be interviewed with respect to the efficacy of the implementation (Appendix J). The qualitative data will add important background information for understanding the implementation.

It is noteworthy that the evaluation plan specifies deliverables (Appendix J) with respect to the impact and formative

evaluations as well as collaboration and communication. The deliverables are appropriate with respect to the purpose of the evaluation and providing the specificity of deliverables is a strength of the evaluation plan.

Proposal includes a logic model (P 11 – 12) that summarizes the inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes for the proposed project. This kind of information can be helpful for planning the evaluation.

The narrative includes a discussion of sample size and statistical power. The power analysis is appropriate and described in sufficient detail (P 24 – 25, Appendix J). The sample size is adequately justified (P 24). The narrative appropriately observes that it will only be at the elementary level that they will have a sample size large enough to have sufficient power. They will not have adequate power at the secondary level (P 25). Hence, the impact study will focus on the elementary grades.

The proposed project calls for a group randomized experimental design; the design is well described (Appendix J). The design will involve a conditional multilevel regression model with hierarchy linear modeling analysis. 36 elementary schools will be randomly assigned to treatment or control condition. The control condition is referred to as “treatment–as–usual.” The randomized assignment of middle and high schools will be handled similarly. In the control condition there will be PBIS and restorative practices but without the “support of school climate specialists and community liaisons.” The narrative discusses the handling of random effects as well as fixed effects. The discussion of the experimental design and the analyses are thorough; the discussion suggests that the study will be able to produce strong evidence of efficacy (Appendix J).

Evaluation agency has the appropriate expertise and experience, which is a strength of the proposal (E 21). Moreover, the appendices include resumes that document the evaluation team’s credentials (Appendix J). The evaluation budget is set at a reasonable 12%. The breakdown of the budget is also strength of the proposed evaluation plan.

Weaknesses:

While the narrative includes a logic model, the weakness of the logic model is that it is an “everything leads to everything” model. In other words, there is very little articulation. The model offers little more information than a series of columns. A stronger proposal would include a much more fine-grained logic model. Moreover, the logic model does not contain any entries specific to evaluation. It is also noticeable weakness that nothing in the logic model specifically refers to the project objectives. A stronger proposal would integrate evaluation with the logic model.

While fidelity of implementation is to be monitored, there is no indication discussion of how failures of fidelity could influence the impact study. There is no discussion of how, for example, or might be used within the impact evaluation. Addressing the possible failure of fidelity would strengthen the proposal.

Reader's Score: 19

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/14/2016 09:38 AM