

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/13/2019 01:28 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Mt. San Antonio College (P031S190126)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Comprehensive Development Plan</b>		
1. Development Plan	25	25
<b>Quality of the Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	15
<b>Quality of the Activity Objectives</b>		
1. Activity Objectives	10	10
<b>Quality of the Implementation Strategy</b>		
1. Implementation Strategy	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Management Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Key Personnel</b>		
1. Key Personnel	5	4
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	15	15
<b>Quality of the Budget</b>		
1. Budget	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	99
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Grad/Professional Students</b>		
1. CPP 1	10	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Financial Literacy</b>		
1. CPP 2	10	10
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	10
<b>Total</b>	120	109

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - DHSI - 6: 84.031S

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

Applicant: Mt. San Antonio College (P031S190126)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Comprehensive Development Plan

#### 1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion.

Reader's Score: 25

##### Sub

1. Are the strengths, weaknesses, and significant problems of the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability clearly and comprehensively articulated in the application and was this analysis a result from a process that involved major constituencies of the institution? (up to 5 points)

##### Strengths:

The applicant presents a well-developed comprehensive development plan that includes a thorough analysis of the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability. Identified issues included gaps in student outcomes among underrepresented populations; lack of faculty development; limited opportunities for discussions on issues of equity; and fiscal issues stemming from a shortfall of funding. The planning process was inclusive of major constituencies of the institution including stakeholders from the institution, community, and strategic planning resources.

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

2. Are the goals for the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability realistic and based on comprehensive analysis? (up to 5 points)

##### Strengths:

The applicant's institutional goals were developed based on the analysis of strengths, weaknesses, and significant problems. The applicant identifies seven goals as the Title V five-year institutional goals. These goals are related to addressing the issues identified in the comprehensive analysis. Goals include supporting faculty, improving practices, building the capacity of faculty, enhancing student's personal development; increasing student financial literacy, and improving campus-wide cultural competence and cross-cultural dialogue.

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub

- 3. Are the project objectives that the applicant proposed measurable, related to institutional goals, and, if achieved, will contribute to the growth and self-sufficiency of the institution? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

Proposed objectives are measurable, related to institutional goals and will contribute to the growth and self-sufficiency of the institution. Nine measurable objectives are presented that relate to improving faculty, increasing course completion, increasing technology use, and empowering students. The applicant is explicit in identifying how each objective relates to institutional goals. Each objective related to multiple institutional and HSI goals.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 4. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively describe the methods and resources the institution will use to institutionalize practices and improvements developed under the proposed project, including, how operational costs for personnel, maintenance, and upgrades of equipment will be paid with institutional resources. (Up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

Sustainability and institutionalization of project activities are illustrated via a post-grant continuation plan. The project anticipates the continuation of some personnel positions, student travel, equipment, supplies, maintenance, replacement, and upgrades, diversity speaker, and publication expenses. These costs will be sustained by increases from student retention.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 5. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively describe the five-year plan to improve its services to Hispanic and other low-income students? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant includes a comprehensive description of a plan that serves Hispanic and other low-income students. For example, the applicant articulates 17 goals within the HSI Five-Year plan. These relate to the Institutional Goals and include providing professional development to address the needs of ethnically diverse students; increasing the number of classes using open educational resources to address textbook affordability for Hispanic and low-income students; collaborating with Hispanic and low-income students to develop and offer programs that focus on personal and leadership development; and increasing the college's awareness of the unique needs of Hispanic and low-income students.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

- 1. The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in the Notice). (up to 15 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Sub**

**1. To what extent does the applicant's proposed project demonstrate a rationale? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a well-described logic model that clearly demonstrates a rationale based on a needs-responsive approach to build institutional capacity. the logic model includes proposed inputs, outputs (activities and participation), and short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**2. Is the applicant's proposed project supported by promising evidence? (up to 10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's project is supported by moderate evidence as demonstrated by two studies in the What Works Clearinghouse. These studies and the corresponding strategies were chosen based on institutional data analysis, focus groups, and a literature review. These studies are based on using technology to enhance student and faculty outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Activity Objectives**

**1. The extent to which the objectives for each activity are: (Up to 10 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Sub**

**1. Did the applicant propose activity objectives that are realistic and defined in terms of measurable results? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

Nine clearly defined objectives are presented and are measurable to assess if activities have a positive impact. The objectives are realistic in increasing student and faculty outcomes related to professional development, technology use, and course completion.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

- 2. Are the proposed activities directly related to the problems to be solved and to the institution's goals outlined in the Comprehensive Development Plan? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly illustrates that project activities are directly related to institutional goals, HSI goals, and significant problems identified in the CDP. For example, Objective 1 is directly related to institutional goals (1,2,3,7), HSI goals (1a,1b, 2b, 3a, 7b)and significant problems (1,2,3,5,)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Implementation Strategy**

- 1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 15 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 15

Sub

- 1. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively outline the implementation strategy for each activity? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly and comprehensively describes the implementation strategy which consists of seven components that support the single activity of the project. The applicant provides detailed descriptions of the seven components which include supporting faculty in exploration of new research and teaching models; improving practices that integrate technology with academic excellence; building the capacity of faculty to access, understand, and use data; providing staff with the knowledge and skills for culturally responsive student engagement; enhancing students' cultural awareness, personal development, and leadership skills; increasing students' financial literacy; and improving campuswide cultural competence and cross-cultural dialogue.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

- 2. Is the rationale for the implementation strategy for each activity clearly described and is it supported by the results of relevant studies or projects? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly articulates the rationale for each implementation strategy and indicates how it is supported by the results of relevant studies or projects. The applicant includes a table that illustrates the institutions and

**Sub**

organizations consulted, conferences attended, and the literature reviewed during the planning process.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted

**Reader's Score:** 5

**3. Is the applicant's timetable for implementing each activity realistic and likely to be attained? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

A comprehensive timeline for project implementation is included. The timeline includes activities for each year of implementation and provides monthly timelines for the completion of activities. Responsible personnel are identified for each activity.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

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

**1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 10 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Sub**

**1. Are the applicant's procedures for managing the project likely to ensure efficient and effective project implementation? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a detailed management plan that clearly describes the procedures that will be used to monitor the project and institutionalization. Management procedures are described as regular meetings, regular progress reports, and personnel evaluations.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**2. Did the applicant state that the Project Coordinator (may also be called Project Director or PI) and Activity Directors will have sufficient authority to conduct the project effectively, including access to the president or chief executive officer? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

Sufficient authority is demonstrated for the Project Director. The applicant states that the President of the institution will delegate authority to the Project Director for oversight, and the Project Director will have full authority and autonomy to manage the project.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Key Personnel**

**1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 5 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 4

Sub

**1. Does the past experience and training of key personnel proposed in the application directly relate to the stated activity objectives of the applicant's project? (up to 2 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant indicates the relevant experience and training of key personnel. Key personnel are identified as the Project Director and Instructional Designer. The applicant provides a job description that includes the responsibilities, required education, required experience, and required knowledge/abilities for these roles. They are appropriate to support the implementation of the project. For example, the Project Director will be required to have a Bachelor's degree in an appropriate field, with preference shown for candidates with a Masters in addition to five years of experience in higher education, and two years of experience with management of federal programs such as Title V.

**Weaknesses:**

No information is provided about the relevant experience and training of key personnel of other staff. For example, the applicant included other personnel within the key staff description such as the Senior Research Analyst, Administrative Specialist IV, Faculty Coordinators, Data Coaches, faculty, student assistants, peer mentors, and tutors. More information would be desirable to ascertain if their experience and training relate to the goals and objectives of the project.

**Reader's Score:** 1

**2. Is the time commitment of key personnel realistic? (up to 3 points)**

**Strengths:**

Time commitments of key personnel are realistic. The Project Director and Instructional Designer will be full time. Additional part-time personnel will include a Senior Research Analyst (0.5 FTE), Administrative Specialist IV (0.5 FTE), Faculty Coordinators (35%), and hourly faculty, student assistants, peer mentors, and tutors.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

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



**1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 15 points)**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub**

- 1. Are the data elements and the data collection procedures clearly described and appropriate to measure the attainment of activity objectives and to measure the success of the project in achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The proposed plan of evaluation is thorough in identifying data elements and the data collection procedures that will be in place during implementation. The applicant provides a chart that illustrates the data elements to be collected for each objective and the collection process/sources. Examples of data elements include the number of faculty who complete professional development, student academic data, and the number of students using technology.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. Are the data analysis procedures clearly described and are likely to produce formative (or developmental) and summative (or cumulative) results on attaining activity objectives and measuring the success of the project on achieving the project's goals; (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

Data analysis procedures are clearly described and will produce formative and summative results. Formative data will be assessed each term to make recommendations for improvement. A summative evaluation will be conducted at the end of each year of implementation.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. Will the evaluation provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly describes efforts that will be made to ensure strategies suitable for replication will be disseminated. For example, the applicant will create a webpage that will be updated annually to share project findings. The Project Director will present findings at professional conferences or publish in professional journals.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Budget**

**1. Are the proposed costs necessary and reasonable in relation to the project's objectives and scope?**

**Strengths:**

The budget is adequate to support project operations. Line items such as staff, supplies, and evaluation costs are crucial to the success of the project. Other budget areas such as travel for professional development, supplies, and electronic equipment are necessary for day-to-day operations of the project. The budget costs are reasonable and necessary when compared to the scope and design of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Grad/Professional Students**

- 1. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively design a project that will expand the number of Hispanic and other underrepresented graduate and professional students that can be served by the institution by expanding courses and institutional resources? (up to 10 points)**

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address this criterion.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Financial Literacy**

- 1. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively design a project that supports instruction in personal financial literacy, knowledge of markets and economics, knowledge of higher education financing and repayment (e.g., college savings and student loans), or other skills aimed at building personal financial understanding and responsibility? (up to 10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly and comprehensively details how the project will support instruction in personal financial literacy. The project will provide workshops to students in addition to creating online modules that will provide information.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/13/2019 01:28 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/13/2019 04:26 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Mt. San Antonio College (P031S190126)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Comprehensive Development Plan</b>		
1. Development Plan	25	25
<b>Quality of the Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	15
<b>Quality of the Activity Objectives</b>		
1. Activity Objectives	10	10
<b>Quality of the Implementation Strategy</b>		
1. Implementation Strategy	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Management Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Key Personnel</b>		
1. Key Personnel	5	4
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	15	15
<b>Quality of the Budget</b>		
1. Budget	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	99
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Grad/Professional Students</b>		
1. CPP 1	10	
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Financial Literacy</b>		
1. CPP 2	10	10
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	10
<b>Total</b>	120	109

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - DHSI - 6: 84.031S

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

Applicant: Mt. San Antonio College (P031S190126)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Comprehensive Development Plan

#### 1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion.

Reader's Score: 25

##### Sub

1. Are the strengths, weaknesses, and significant problems of the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability clearly and comprehensively articulated in the application and was this analysis a result from a process that involved major constituencies of the institution? (up to 5 points)

##### Strengths:

The applicant presents a comprehensive analysis of institutional strengths, weaknesses, and significant problems related to the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability. The applicant articulates a clear understanding of the planning process that led to the analysis of the CDP, including constituents involved, and documents consulted (pp. 3). Institutional data was included throughout to support the CDP analysis and the data presented was disaggregated by race/ethnicity to demonstrate how significant problems identified disproportionately impact Hispanic students.

##### Weaknesses:

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. Are the goals for the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability realistic and based on comprehensive analysis? (up to 5 points)

##### Strengths:

The applicant's goals for improving the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability are fully developed, realistic, and emerged from the CDP analysis. The proposed 5-year goals are culturally responsive and specifically designed to improve student outcomes of a diverse student body (pp. 13).

##### Weaknesses:

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. Are the project objectives that the applicant proposed measurable, related to institutional goals, and, if achieved, will contribute to the growth and self-sufficiency of the

Sub

**institution? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's objectives are fully developed, with clear measures that are directly related to institutional goals. For example, many of the objectives are designed to address inequities in teaching pedagogy and the need for data literacy (i.e., understanding of course level equity gaps) among faculty thereby contributing to the growth and self-sufficiency of the institution to better serve Hispanic students.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 4. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively describe the methods and resources the institution will use to institutionalize practices and improvements developed under the proposed project, including, how operational costs for personnel, maintenance, and upgrades of equipment will be paid with institutional resources. (Up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a fully developed post-grant continuation plan for how the project will be institutionalized. The applicant has given much considered the institutionalization of positions and operations for continued success (pp.16).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 5. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively describe the five-year plan to improve its services to Hispanic and other low-income students? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The five-year plan was fully developed and comprehensive in its aim to improve services to Hispanic and low-income students specifically. The intended outcomes of the five-year plan are designed to address inequities that disproportionately impact Hispanic and low-income students as identified in the CDP. The goals are measurable and clearly articulated.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

- 1. The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in the Notice). (up to 15 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Sub**

**1. To what extent does the applicant's proposed project demonstrate a rationale? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a fully developed logic model. The logic model uses a need-responsive approach to demonstrate alignment with solutions/strategies identified in the CDP analysis, project goals and objectives.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**2. Is the applicant's proposed project supported by promising evidence? (up to 10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a supporting narrative to document the ways that the project is supported by promising evidence. Specifically, the applicant cites two WWC studies that demonstrate moderate evidence for the use of technology among students, faculty, and staff, to improve the teaching and learning environment. The applicant provides a clear summary of key elements that overlap with the project design as detailed on page 20.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Activity Objectives**

**1. The extent to which the objectives for each activity are: (Up to 10 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 10

**Sub**

**1. Did the applicant propose activity objectives that are realistic and defined in terms of measurable results? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided fully developed activity objectives, with clear identification of the target population and baseline data. The objectives are realistic and appropriate measures are identified to achieve measurable outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

Sub

2. Are the proposed activities directly related to the problems to be solved and to the institution's goals outlined in the Comprehensive Development Plan? (up to 5 points)

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates alignment between proposed activities and strategies to solve problems identified in the CDP analysis. Activity objectives are represented in relation to institutional goals, HSI goals, and significant problems (pp. 21).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Implementation Strategy**

1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 15 points)

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively outline the implementation strategy for each activity? (up to 5 points)

**Strengths:**

The applicant provided a clear overarching goal, to create an equity-minded campus culture to improve the educational outcomes of Hispanic, low-income, and other students traditionally underrepresented in higher education, which is supported by the CDP analysis. The implementation strategy is well organized and comprehensive for each of the seven components proposed. For some components as appropriate, the implementation strategy takes into account the value of including student voice and perspectives on the Title V Steering committee (pp. 33). Included in component # 6 is the narrative for CPP #2.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. Is the rationale for the implementation strategy for each activity clearly described and is it supported by the results of relevant studies or projects? (up to 5 points)

**Strengths:**

The rationale for the implementation strategy for each activity fully developed and clearly described. Throughout, the applicant provides references to relevant studies that support the rationale for each implementation strategy.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.



Sub

Reader's Score: 5

**3. Is the applicant's timetable for implementing each activity realistic and likely to be attained? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a fully developed and organized implementation timetable that is attainable. Timeframes are realistic and personnel responsible for the implementation of major tasks and activities are clearly identified.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

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

**1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 10 points)**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub

**1. Are the applicant's procedures for managing the project likely to ensure efficient and effective project implementation? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a fully-developed plan to support efficient and effective project implementation. The plan clearly articulates procedures to monitor ongoing management of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

**2. Did the applicant state that the Project Coordinator (may also be called Project Director or PI) and Activity Directors will have sufficient authority to conduct the project effectively, including access to the president or chief executive officer? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly describes that the President will delegate authority to the Project Director for the day-to-day project management, with full authority and autonomy to administer the project. The Project Director will have ongoing access to the President's Cabinet.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

## **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Key Personnel**

### **1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 5 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 4

#### **Sub**

- 1. Does the past experience and training of key personnel proposed in the application directly relate to the stated activity objectives of the applicant's project? (up to 2 points)**

#### **Strengths:**

The key personnel section is fully developed. For example, responsibilities, required education, and required experiences are clearly articulated and summarized for each key personnel position. Position descriptions clearly show how the required knowledge and abilities are related to the activity objectives.

#### **Weaknesses:**

This section would have been strengthened if qualifications were listed for additional personnel.

**Reader's Score:** 1

- 2. Is the time commitment of key personnel realistic? (up to 3 points)**

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant articulates the importance of additional personnel to successfully implement the project. Time commitments for the Project Director and Instructional Designer are reasonable at 1 FTE each. Faculty Coordinator positions will be reassigned to leveraging expertise.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

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

### **1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 15 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 15

#### **Sub**

- 1. Are the data elements and the data collection procedures clearly described and appropriate to measure the attainment of activity objectives and to measure the success of the project in achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan? (up to 5 points)**

## Sub

### Strengths:

The applicant presents a fully developed data collection procedures appropriate to measure the attainment of activity objectives and goals. For example, data elements are clearly articulated for each activity objective with accompanying details for data sources and data collection process.

### Weaknesses:

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. Are the data analysis procedures clearly described and are likely to produce formative (or developmental) and summative (or cumulative) results on attaining activity objectives and measuring the success of the project on achieving the project's goals; (up to 5 points)**

### Strengths:

Several data analysis procedures are referenced that support both formative and summative results related to process measures for ongoing improvement (formative) longitudinal data to inform summative evaluation efforts. Statistical analyses procedures described are appropriate for the type of data collected and for determining the extent of the impact of project activities on institutional goals. In addition to internal evaluation efforts, the applicant will make use of an external evaluator to assist with evaluation design and appropriate analysis procedures. The expertise and experience of the external evaluator are directly aligned with the focus of the project to advance equity-minded/culturally relevant practices.

### Weaknesses:

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. Will the evaluation provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings? (up to 5 points)**

### Strengths:

The applicant presents a fully-developed plan for effective strategies that may be suitable for replication or testing in other settings. The applicant broadly identifies two potential areas: improve achievement and service delivery to students from diverse backgrounds and strategies and programs that best serve students and close equity gaps.

### Weaknesses:

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Budget

- 1. Are the proposed costs necessary and reasonable in relation to the project's objectives and scope?**

### Strengths:

The applicant includes a fully developed budget narrative and justification. The rationale for determining if costs are necessary and reasonable in relation to the project objectives and scope is sound.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Priority Questions****Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Grad/Professional Students**

1. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively design a project that will expand the number of Hispanic and other underrepresented graduate and professional students that can be served by the institution by expanding courses and institutional resources? (up to 10 points)

**Strengths:****Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Financial Literacy**

1. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively design a project that supports instruction in personal financial literacy, knowledge of markets and economics, knowledge of higher education financing and repayment (e.g., college savings and student loans), or other skills aimed at building personal financial understanding and responsibility? (up to 10 points)

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a fully developed plan for addressing CPP#2 in the Project Implementation Strategy section (pp. 33- 35). Financial literacy workshops will be offered to students, online modules will be developed, and a Consumer Resource Center.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant fully addressed the review criteria. No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score:** 10

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/13/2019 04:26 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/13/2019 03:14 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Mt. San Antonio College (P031S190126)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Comprehensive Development Plan</b>		
1. Development Plan	25	25
<b>Quality of the Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	15
<b>Quality of the Activity Objectives</b>		
1. Activity Objectives	10	10
<b>Quality of the Implementation Strategy</b>		
1. Implementation Strategy	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Management Plan	10	10
<b>Quality of the Key Personnel</b>		
1. Key Personnel	5	4
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	15	15
<b>Quality of the Budget</b>		
1. Budget	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	99
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Grad/Professional Students</b>		
1. CPP 1	10	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Financial Literacy</b>		
1. CPP 2	10	10
<b>Sub Total</b>	10	10
<b>Total</b>	120	109

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - DHSI - 6: 84.031S

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

Applicant: Mt. San Antonio College (P031S190126)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Comprehensive Development Plan

#### 1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion.

Reader's Score: 25

##### Sub

1. Are the strengths, weaknesses, and significant problems of the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability clearly and comprehensively articulated in the application and was this analysis a result from a process that involved major constituencies of the institution? (up to 5 points)

##### Strengths:

The applicant presents strong evidence of a comprehensive analysis. Table 3 identifies the major constituents in the planning that included the institution's faculty and staff. Strengths, Weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) were identified through the Strategic Planning Resources found in Table 2. Through the SWOT process, the institution was able to identify significant strengths and weaknesses.

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. Are the goals for the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability realistic and based on comprehensive analysis? (up to 5 points)

##### Strengths:

Identified goals for the project are realistic and based on the comprehensive analysis. Examples of planning resources utilized included HIS Five-year Plan, visiting team reports and the educational master plan. Table 12 identifies the goals for the project based on the comprehensive analysis.

##### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. Are the project objectives that the applicant proposed measurable, related to institutional goals, and, if achieved, will contribute to the growth and self-sufficiency of the institution? (up to 5 points)

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

Nine Identified objectives for the project are presented in Table 13 on pages 13-14. The objectives are clearly aligned with the Instructional goals of the project, the HSI goals and the significant instructional problems. Objectives are measureable and appear to be attainable the institution's self-sufficiency.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 4. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively describe the methods and resources the institution will use to institutionalize practices and improvements developed under the proposed project, including, how operational costs for personnel, maintenance, and upgrades of equipment will be paid with institutional resources. (Up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant will institutionalize several staff positions as noted in the budget on page 52. Table 14 identifies other areas of sustainability following the grant period. The institution will look at two options for future funding, reallocation of resources and an increase to state reimbursement collection through increased student enrollment.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 5. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively describe the five-year plan to improve its services to Hispanic and other low-income students? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's outlines activates, strategies and programs of the five-year plan that will meet the needs of the Hispanic and low-income students as noted in Table 16. This plan was derived from the extensive comprehensive analysis.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

- 1. The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in the Notice). (up to 15 points)**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub**

- 1. To what extent does the applicant's proposed project demonstrate a rationale? (up to 5**

**Sub**  
**points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a needs-responsive approach as the rationale for the project. The Logic model on page 19 clearly outlines inputs, outputs and the outcome impacts. Examples of best practices noted to have a positive impact on the target population are faculty professional development, student personal leadership development, financial literacy and equity/cultural competence events.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**2. Is the applicant's proposed project supported by promising evidence? (up to 10 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides moderate evidence from WWW to support the use of technology to meet the goals of the project. "Using Technology to Support Post-secondary Student Learning" does connect with some elements of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Activity Objectives**

**1. The extent to which the objectives for each activity are: (Up to 10 points)**

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Sub**

**1. Did the applicant propose activity objectives that are realistic and defined in terms of measurable results? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

Table 17 on pages 21-22 provides the objectives and expected outcomes. Activities seem to be realistic, specific and measurable. For example, the number of classes using open educational resources will increase from a baseline to 5% by 2020.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**2. Are the proposed activities directly related to the problems to be solved and to the institution's goals outlined in the Comprehensive Development Plan? (up to 5 points)**



**Sub**

**Strengths:**

Table 17 on pages 21-22 detail the applicant's activity objectives with the CDP goals and significant problems of the institution. Each objective includes a measurable outcome and is time-based.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**      5

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Implementation Strategy**

**1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 15 points)**

**Reader's Score:**      15

**Sub**

**1. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively outline the implementation strategy for each activity? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a comprehensive implementation strategy for each activity of the project. All activities align with the institution's goals.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**      5

**2. Is the rationale for the implementation strategy for each activity clearly described and is it supported by the results of relevant studies or projects? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides relevant, supporting studies for each activity proposed. For example, What Works Clearinghouse's Using Technology to Support Post-secondary Student Learning practice guide supports the goal to integrate technology with academic excellence. Activities under this goal will include open educational textbooks such as online textbooks. Page. 38

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**      5

**3. Is the applicant's timetable for implementing each activity realistic and likely to be attained? (up to 5 points)**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's timetable is feasible and would likely be attained. Page 37-41. All critical tasks listed include the responsible person for the task and the timeframe.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

**1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 10 points)**

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Sub**

**1. Are the applicant's procedures for managing the project likely to ensure efficient and effective project implementation? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The project management plans appears feasible for the project's implementation. Creation of a project manual will specifically detail staff responsibilities, lines of authority, as well as all policies and procedures. Table 21 on pages 41- 42 provides procedures to monitor the project and initialization. Table 22 on page 42 provides the procedures to provide information to key institutional administrators. This table will help support lines of communication with the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**2. Did the applicant state that the Project Coordinator (may also be called Project Director or PI) and Activity Directors will have sufficient authority to conduct the project effectively, including access to the president or chief executive officer? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

The Project Director will have day-to-day responsibility for the management of the project and full authority for management of the plan. He will report directly to the President of the institution as well as other administrative staff members of the institution. The organizational chart for lines of authority are on page 43.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Key Personnel**

**1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 5 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 4

**Sub**

- 1. Does the past experience and training of key personnel proposed in the application directly relate to the stated activity objectives of the applicant's project? (up to 2 points)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant identifies key personnel who will lead and support the project. Specific job responsibilities are presented for each position. The experience and training of key personnel will relate directly to their responsibilities.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant presents several other positions under key personnel. There are no qualifications listed for these individuals. It is difficult to determine if they will have relevant experience and training for the stated activity objectives.

**Reader's Score:** 1

- 2. Is the time commitment of key personnel realistic? (up to 3 points)**

**Strengths:**

Time commitments for all key personnel are provided. It is highly likely the time commitments are realistic for the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

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

**1. Complete Strengths and Weaknesses for each sub-criterion. (Up to 15 points)**

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Sub**

- 1. Are the data elements and the data collection procedures clearly described and appropriate to measure the attainment of activity objectives and to measure the success of the project in achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan? (up to 5 points)**

**Strengths:**

Data collection and procedures presented by the applicant appear to be feasible and are likely to produce the desired outcomes. Data outcomes align with the activity objectives.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

2. Are the data analysis procedures clearly described and are likely to produce formative (or developmental) and summative (or cumulative) results on attaining activity objectives and measuring the success of the project on achieving the project's goals; (up to 5 points)

**Strengths:**

Table 26 on pages 47-49 detail the objectives, data elements, and the collection process for the evaluation plan. Several personnel will be responsible for the collection of the data to include the external evaluator, senior research analyst, project director and faculty coordinators. Collection of formative data each term will help identify possible modifications for the program. A comprehensive summative evaluation will be conducted at the end of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

3. Will the evaluation provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings? (up to 5 points)

**Strengths:**

The applicant has a feasible plan for replication of effective strategies from the project. Publications and presentations at conference by faculty will be encouraged by the Project Director. Creation of a website linked to the college's home page will be a means of sharing professional learning and student modules.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Budget**

1. Are the proposed costs necessary and reasonable in relation to the project's objectives and scope?

**Strengths:**

The budget presented appears reasonable and necessary to the goals and objectives of the project. A major portion of the budget allocation is for personnel. The costs are consistent with salaries within the institution. The budget defines which personnel positions will not continue once the grant period has ended and includes institutionalizing of some expenditures.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Grad/Professional Students

1. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively design a project that will expand the number of Hispanic and other underrepresented graduate and professional students that can be served by the institution by expanding courses and institutional resources? (up to 10 points)

**Strengths:**

Not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable

**Reader's Score:**      **0**

### Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Financial Literacy

1. Did the applicant clearly and comprehensively design a project that supports instruction in personal financial literacy, knowledge of markets and economics, knowledge of higher education financing and repayment (e.g., college savings and student loans), or other skills aimed at building personal financial understanding and responsibility? (up to 10 points)

**Strengths:**

The applicant plans to address Financial Literacy through workshops, a Consumer resource Center, online literacy modules, a resource fair and peer mentors. Workshops will focus on student loans, as well as financial aid.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**      **10**

---

**Status:**              Submitted

**Last Updated:**    08/13/2019 03:14 PM