

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/26/2022 09:04 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	16
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	28
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	8
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	61
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	3
<b>Total</b>	106	64

# Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - EIR Early Phase - 9: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 16

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant describes a plan to refine and validate an existing science assessment system to improve outcomes for middle school science students and conduct a randomized controlled trial to assess its effectiveness. Details are provided that describe how the use of visuals, graphics, animations, and onscreen assists are likely to support the academic achievement of English learners and student who struggle with reading (pg. e16). Plans to provide teacher training and support for implementing the assessments is a strength of this proposal (pg. e22).

#### Weaknesses:

Details that describe how the project activities will provide new strategies or alternatives to existing strategies are not clearly described. The assessment item examples in the appendix do not appear realistic or engaging for students. It is unclear how innovative the project activities are since much of the project design involves conducting a validation study of an existing assessment system, which may be more appropriate for a Mid-phase EIR grant competition.

Reader's Score: 16

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 28

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

Sub

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a clear logic model that includes inputs, resources, outputs, and outcomes (pg. e78). The inclusion of details that describe how the project will build the capacity of teachers to support students by using data to guide instruction (pg. e21) is a strength of this application.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes four clearly specified goals (pgs. e21-e23). A table is provided that provides details about each goal and includes objectives for each year of the project and outcomes with targets that are measurable (pgs. e24-26).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes a clear plan to support the needs of teachers by providing training and support for using an assessment system that includes reports that potentially can improve instruction. The use of graphics, animations, and innovative item types to support students with disabilities and English learners is likely to successfully address the needs of the target population (pg. e27).

**Weaknesses:**

Details are limited that describe how the item types are innovative. It is unclear if the items are culturally appropriate for the target population.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

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

**Reader's Score: 9**

Sub

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes a highly qualified principal investigator, co-principal investigator, and evaluator (pgs. e28-e29), and includes resumes in the appendix.

**Weaknesses:**

Details are limited that describes how the applicant plans to encourage applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability (pg. e30). Though the proposal states that 'the project will seek applications representing diverse backgrounds, it is unclear how this will be accomplished.

**Reader's Score:        9**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

**Reader's Score:        8**

**Sub**

1. **The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a table that describes the roles and responsibilities of key personnel (pgs. e32-e33). A timeline is provided (pg. e92). The budget narrative is clearly described (pg. e112-e119).

**Weaknesses:**

Milestones are not clearly described in the timeline. The timeline is cut off in the appendix (pg. e92).

**Reader's Score:        8**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

## **Priority Questions**

### **Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

#### **1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes a plan to refine and validate an existing technology-based science assessment system and provide training to teachers in the use of data to meet the needs of students, including English learners and students with disabilities (pg. e13).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this criterion.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/26/2022 09:04 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/25/2022 10:02 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	7
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	61
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	3
<b>Total</b>	106	64

# Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - EIR Early Phase - 9: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 15

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The ONPAR program has produced middle school science materials that is put together around NGSS and 3-dimensional learning through 5 large grants over a number of years and have a large user base, approximately 55,000. This proposal aims to determine whether the program can successfully improve student achievement and attainment for high-need middle school students (refine and validate).

#### Weaknesses:

The project does not seem to propose any new strategies. The applicant disclosed that five large projects had contributed to ONPAR's research base, however the fidelity of implementation was not systematically studied. That raises questions on why the fidelity of implementation was not studied until now especially when there are approximately 55,000 users.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 30

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant references the theory of change as a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. The applicant included a logic model. The model provided on page e78 disclose information on the beliefs that guide the project, resources/inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes (short, intermediate and long term).

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. The plan for feedback and improvement is included in the narrative. The applicant listed four goals. Each goal corresponds to objectives and outcomes associated with them.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant aims to meet the assessment needs of teachers and students (assessment as a catalyst) in the context of NGSS and three-dimensional learning to support teaching and learning. According to the applicant, the average reading proficiency of middle school students in Detroit is 13%, and 12% of students are designated as ELs. While 72% of middle school students are proficient in reading in St. Martin Parish, 54% are in poverty and deemed at risk. Thus, the design of the proposed project is appropriate, and it has the potential to address successfully the needs of the target population in reading and science.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

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

**Reader's Score:** 9

**Sub**

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

**Strengths:**

Qualifications, including relevant training and experiences of the key project personnel, PI, Co-PI, and Technical Advisory Committee, were included in the narrative. Those experiences well match and align well with the project's goal. The key project personnel represent the very much needed experiences and expertise. The project included key personnel who had content expertise, e.g., ESOL language and science. The applicant stated that they would follow the UW, state, and federal policies prohibiting discrimination when hiring contractors. Further, the applicant stated that the project would seek applicants from diverse backgrounds.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant stated that they seek applicants representing diverse backgrounds. However, there is no information on how and from where.

**Reader's Score:** 9

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

**Reader's Score:** 7

**Sub**

- 1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant adequately described the management for achieving the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant grouped the work of key personnel into four key areas: project management, teacher outreach and support, research, and technical. The applicant included a project management team, staff roles and responsibilities, and a timeline in the proposal.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not include milestones in the proposal. Additionally, commitment of senior personnel (FTE) concerns the quality of the management.

**Reader's Score:**      7

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

**Reader's Score:**      0

**Sub**

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

Sub

Reader's Score:

### Priority Questions

#### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

##### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

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

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

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

#### Strengths:

The project is designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunities for underserved students in middle school via student-centered learning (assessment) that leverages technology to provide high-quality learning content and assessment tools -an entrepreneurial, evidence-based, field-initiated innovative assessment.

#### Weaknesses:

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 3

#### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

##### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

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

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

- (a) conducting community asset-mapping and needs assessments that may include an assessment of the extent to which students, including subgroups of students, have become disengaged from learning, including students not participating in in-person or remote instruction, and specific strategies for reengaging and supporting students and their families; and
- (b) using evidence-based instructional approaches and supports, such as professional development, coaching, ongoing support for educators, high quality tutoring, expanded access

to rigorous coursework and content across K–12, and expanded learning time to accelerate learning for students in ways that ensure all students have the opportunity to successfully meet challenging academic content standards without contributing to tracking or remedial courses.

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

This priority was not addressed by the applicant.

**Reader's Score:**      **0**

---

**Status:**               Submitted  
**Last Updated:**      08/25/2022 10:02 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/26/2022 10:58 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	16
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	8
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	58
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
1. COVID-19	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	6	3
<b>Total</b>	106	61



# Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - EIR Early Phase - 9: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 16

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies. (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The proposal builds on an existing ONPAR assessment product to expand its capabilities in supporting students who may struggle with language-heavy assessments (p e13, 1, 2) and targets examining specific components for the ONPAR evaluation through additional research questions (p 4). Prior research on ONPAR suggests that it has the potential to improve teachers' options in formative assessment (p 2-3), so this proposal appears to focus on the demonstration of a relatively new strategy for improved assessments in science for diverse learners. Additionally, the ONPAR tool prompts students and teachers to make decisions about "next steps for learning" (p 2), extending its capacity beyond most available assessment tools.

The research approach targets results that meet the What Works Clearinghouse "without reservations" standard (p 1), suggesting that the project may yield results that can contribute to the literature in meaningful ways.

#### Weaknesses:

It appears that the project is not proposing innovations in the product, which exists, but rather that it will further examine the usage and impacts of the product. The question raised for the reviewer is whether the proposal would be a better fit for a mid-phase proposal.

Reader's Score: 16

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Sub**

- 1. (1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework. (10 points)**

**Strengths:**

A logic model is provided that details the interactions of project activities, outputs, and outcomes (p e78), and a basis within the research is provided (p 5) in lieu of a conceptual framework. Evidence is provided from prior studies of the ONPAR product (p 3-4), providing a foundation for extending those prior studies to this evaluation.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal does not specify a particular conceptual or theoretical framework for its approach or the product, as the project at hand is for a rigorous evaluation. Nonetheless, a bit more detail on the frameworks underlying the actual design of ONPAR may help recognize its potential for impact across learners.

**Reader's Score: 8**

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

**Strengths:**

The delineation of performance measures (p 120-125) aligns well with the broader goals, objectives, and outcomes delineated on pages 9-11. Needs assessments conducted in Year 1 (p 11) ensure appropriate metrics can be developed, and processes for feedback and periodic assessment (p 22-23) provide spaces where adjustments to timelines and outcomes may be made. Goals, as further supported by objectives and performance measures, are specific and measurable and well aligned to the evaluation and research components as described (p 18-25).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. (3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)**

**Strengths:**

Proposed partner school districts have demonstrated the need to support learners whose reading proficiency may be low (p 13). The strategies used within the tool design are presented as promising for addressing those needs (p 1). Evidence from prior studies on the ONPAR platform has demonstrated effects with exactly the student groups that are also targeted in this evaluation project (p 3-4, e131).

**Weaknesses:**

It isn't clear how much of a market there is for a tool like this in schools or will be in five years, but understanding that would help determine what future impact ONPAR could have in later scale-up activities. It would also be helpful to understand how readily ONPAR will be implemented in classrooms to know how professional development will be provided to teachers adopting this program. It is difficult to determine the extent to which the materials provided as samples (p e93-98) are novel or will remain novel in five years at the project's conclusion.

**Reader's Score: 12**

## **Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

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

**Reader's Score: 9**

### **Sub**

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

#### **Strengths:**

The proposal includes a statement related to the UW-Madison policies as an equal opportunity employer (p 14). Project staff demonstrate in brief bios and resumes (p 13-14, e48-e66) a variety of expertise and experiences appropriate to the project and the ability to collaborate on projects of this size and scope. Several personnel have participated in earlier projects related to ONPAR in particular (p 13, 15).

#### **Weaknesses:**

A clearer statement related to strategies for recruiting diverse applicants would be helpful to ensure the engagement of a diverse team.

**Reader's Score: 9**

## **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

**Reader's Score: 8**

### **Sub**

- 1. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (10 points)**

#### **Strengths:**

The proposal clearly delineates staff roles (p 13-17), including regular communication and connections across staff (p 16-17). The organization of project staff into four key teams (p 16) increases the likelihood of progress in all initiatives, and the cross membership of individuals on teams ensures communication across them. Letters of support demonstrate a high level of commitment necessary to maintaining timelines (p e68-73).

#### **Weaknesses:**

The timeline presented on page e92 is cut off and misses key details regarding milestones and years after three. The time commitments clarified for the evaluator and researcher roles are low, with each less than 0.1 FTE (p 14), although their roles are significant in key parts of the project. It may help to understand how the small assignment of

**Sub**

FTE translates into adequate time to accomplish the project's activities.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1:

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The ONPAR system targets learners for whom reading proficiency may interfere with adequate science assessment (p 1) and promotes increased student learning outcomes in middle school science courses.

#### **Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:      3**

### Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

#### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2:

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

Not addressed.

**Weaknesses:**

Not addressed.

**Reader's Score:**      **0**

---

**Status:**              Submitted

**Last Updated:**    08/26/2022 10:58 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/02/2022 10:27 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
<b>Total</b>	30	29

# Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - EIR Tier 2 - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Reader's Score: 29

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant describes methods of evaluation that will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that could meet the WWC standards with or without reservations. Research questions that will be explored by implementing an HLM analysis are described. Data analytic models that include the equations to be utilized are provided in the appendix. Details are provided regarding a clear plan for using an RCT. A strength of the proposal is a description of a plan to create treatment and control groups using a stratified random sampling process. Another strength is a description of a power analysis that accounts for attrition and indicates the study will have sufficient power to detect small effect sizes. A plan to control for contamination by using unique portals to access materials is also described. A plan to account for construct irrelevant variance is also a strength of the proposal.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant describes methods of evaluation that are likely to provide performance feedback that will permit the periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Examples include document reviews, the use of teacher surveys, student assessment data, interviews, quarterly memos, and annual reports. A strength of the proposal is a plan to have the evaluator meet every two weeks with the project team to ensure project milestones are being met.



Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly articulates the key project components and connects them to short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes in a logic model that is well specified. A measurable threshold is described in relation to teacher support for NGSS assessment and instruction. A strength is a table that clearly describes project goals, objectives, and outcomes that includes well specified targets.

**Weaknesses:**

Details regarding mediators, that can provide information about the impact of the project on outcomes, are not clearly described.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 10/02/2022 10:27 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/02/2022 09:28 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
<b>Total</b>	30	29

# Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - EIR Tier 2 - 7: 84.411C

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

Applicant: The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (S411C220116)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

Reader's Score: 29

#### Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice). (20 points)

#### Strengths:

The applicant's evaluation plan was sufficiently described. The applicant summarized mostly all the important criteria related to how the research design will meet What Works Clearinghouse without reservations in implementing a randomized control trial. The most important aspect of a randomized control trial (RCT) is ensuring all units have a non-zero probability of being in either the treatment or control group; this is the case with this applicant's RCT design. The RCT will be based on a stratified random sample to ensure a balance of key demographic factors, which is also a best practice. The applicant sampling will be appropriately powered at .80, with a minimum detectable effect size of .35 standard deviations, which is considered to detect a small impact if one exists. The applicant addressed attrition which is another critical factor for meeting WWC. The applicant sample was 20% higher than needed to add a buffer to account for attrition (pg. 23). The applicant discussed confounds in stating the study will control for construct irrelevant variance (pg. 24). The applicant provided appropriate implementation and impact evaluation questions directly aligned to the intervention. In addressing baseline equivalence, the applicant provided extensive details in Appendix J in discussing their analytic data models based on hierarchical linear modeling. The applicant included appropriate covariates to account for any differences at baseline. Finally, in addressing contamination concerns (pg. 20), the applicant will create separate portals for the treatment and control groups.

#### Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 20

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly discussed how they would meet this criterion. The applicant will use data from document reviews, surveys, and interviews for the purpose of continuous process improvement (pg. 22). There will be

**Sub**

quarterly data memos, annual reports, and monthly meetings between the project team and the evaluator. During the project's second year, the evaluator will meet with the project team bi-weekly to ensure all milestones are being met. If any changes are required, these changes will be incorporated between the second and third year of the project to allow for sufficient exposure to the changes prior to the impact evaluation. As noted by the applicant, the yearly reports will provide accurate and high-quality data before the federal deadlines (pg. 23).

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score:**      5

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant, in the logic model, graphically illustrated the key project components. These project components align with the project components discussed in the narrative. The applicant provided some details about the measured outcomes. The information provided face validity and at least one of the WWC requirements for reliability. For instance, the applicant will utilize a standardized test for measuring science. WWC considers mostly all standardized assessments as meeting reliability and validity requirements. The applicant also addressed measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation. For example, (pg. 25), the applicant expects that 90% of the treatment teachers will report increased support for utilizing the NGSS assessment. This is a clear example of a measurable threshold for the project.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not discuss mediators, which can be distinctly different from moderators. If the applicant did not think there would be mediating factors, this should have been discussed in the evaluation section.

**Reader's Score:**      4

---

**Status:**               Submitted  
**Last Updated:**      10/02/2022 09:28 PM