



0746-1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

July 23, 2009

Dr. William B. Fischer
Portland State University
Foreign Languages and Literature
PO Box 751
Portland, OR 97201-7510

REF: P017A090367

Dear Dr. Fischer:

We regret to inform you that your application to the FY 2009 Title VI International Research and Studies (IRS) program was not recommended for funding. Your proposal was reviewed by a panel of academic peer reviewers who evaluated all pertinent selection criteria.

We appreciate your interest in the IRS program and the time and effort spent in the preparation and submission of your application. Details on the evaluation of your application, including the scores and comments from the academic review panel, are enclosed. Please keep in mind that the Department of Education does not necessarily endorse all comments made by the reviewers.

If you would like further information concerning the competition, please write to Beth MacRae, Advanced Training and Research Team, 6th Floor, 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20006-8521 or by email beth.macrae@ed.gov.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Samuel D. Eisen, Ph.D.
Team Leader
Advanced Training and Research Team
International Education Programs Service

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2009 2:47 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Portland State University - Foreign Languages & Literature (P017A090367)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary		
1. Summary Comments	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. Need for the Project: Maximum Points- 10	10	7
2. Potential for the Use of Materials in Other Programs Maximum Points: 5	5	2
3. Account of Related Material Maximum Points: 10	10	6
4. Likelihood of Achieving Results: Maximum Points: 10	10	9
5. Expected Contribution to Other Programs Maximum Points 5	5	3
6. Plan of Operation: Maximum points: 10	10	10
7. Quality of Personnel: Maximum Points: 5	5	2
8. Budget and Cost Effectiveness: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
9. Evaluation Plan: Maximum points: 15	15	15
10. Adequacy of Resources: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
11. Description of Final Format: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
12. Provisions for Pretesting and Revision: Maximum Points: 15	15	15
13. Competitive Priority: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
TOTAL	105	89

Technical Review Form

Instructional 5: 84.017A

Reader #1:

Applicant: Portland State University - Foreign Languages & Literature (P017A090367)

Summary

1. Please summarize the application's strengths and weaknesses:

The strength of the proposal is its grounding in the dominant proficiency-based learning model.

The weakness is the complete absence of any academic market for a proficiency-based Albanian curriculum. The proposal operates in total ignorance of what is going on with Albanian in the U.S. academy.

Selection Criteria

1. Need for the Project:

- a) **Is there a need for the proposed materials(s) in the educational area to be served?**
b) **Are the (i) language(s); (ii) region or country; or, (iii) the issues or studies, for the study of which the materials are to be developed, of sufficient priority for, and of potential significance to the national interest to warrant support at this time?**

The proposal is to produce a proficiency-based one-year college course in Albanian using a software shell developed by similar courses in German and Spanish. Albanian is the official language now in two countries, Albania and Kosovo, and has status in Montenegro (and although not mentioned, I believe also in Macedonia) and, with the considerable diaspora, the proposed figure of 6 million speakers is realistic. The unrest in the Balkans, particularly the 1997 war, and subsequent security cooperation of Albania and Kosovo with the U.S. on several fronts gives Albanian enhanced significance. That being acknowledged, the strategic importance of Albanian alongside the languages of, say, Central and South Asia or the Horn of Africa pales in comparison.

There is now no published course of the type proposed available, on the one hand, but the proposal also points out that Albanian is not presently taught in U.S. universities, a claim that I will address presently, so there is a kind of 'Field of Dreams' ("If you build it, they will come.") quality to it.

Reader's Score: 7

2. Potential for the Use of Materials in Other Programs:

- a) **Will the proposed materials have a good potential for being utilized by appropriate educational programs in other institutions in the United States?**

The course package created by the proposal would be eminently usable for general undergraduate instruction in a proficiency-based Albanian course. As the proposer admits, there is presently no such course in the U.S. There are, however, a couple of U.S. universities where Albanian is regularly taught. Prof. Victor Friedman at the University of Chicago regularly teaches a one year and sometimes two year Albanian course, for which, I believe, he has for many years been preparing and reworking his own teaching materials. Also Prof. Brian Joseph regularly includes Albanian in courses he teaches at the Ohio State University, and he has argued in a publicly available paper for the approach of incorporating (some) less-commonly taught languages (using Albanian as his specific example) into other course frame works.

Since to my knowledge these are the two places where Albanian language instruction is being given--neither of which the proposer gives any indication of having contacted--and they have their own approaches apparently inimical to what is being proposed here I do not expect the course package would be picked up by them. I note also that PSU itself does not presently teach Albanian and plans to do so primarily to develop the course package.

Reader's Score: 2

3. Account of Related Materials

- a) Have all the existing, similar materials (for the study of the language(s), region or country, or issue in question) been cited and accounted?
- b) Is there a critical commentary on the adequacy of such similar materials and is this commentary accurate?
- c) Will the proposed material(s) duplicate other materials already in existence or already in progress?

The survey of Albanian language teaching materials is relatively complete, although a few older courses, e.g. Drizari and Pipa, are not mentioned.

The critical commentary is, in my opinion, unfair to Prifti and Newmark's Spoken Albanian. While it does follow an audio-lingual model, it is still a very usable package for both classroom and individual instruction and will--with some diligence on the part of the students--produce results equivalent to those for the proposed package, I would expect. In any case, it would be worth proficiency testing some students who have been through the course.

As I mentioned above, my understanding is that Prof. Friedman has an on-going project preparing Albanian language instructional materials. He and Prof. Joseph, both eminent figures in Balkan languages, should have been consulted about this.

Reader's Score: 6

4. Likelihood of Achieving Results:

- a) Are the objectives, which the proposed material(s) are to serve, clearly defined?
- b) Are the outlined methods and procedures for preparing the material(s) practicable and can they be expected to produce the anticipated results?
- c) Does the application reflect a sufficient degree of knowledge in the pertinent areas to assure a successful completion of the project (e.g., for language materials: modern language pedagogy, modern linguistics theory; for area studies and related materials: history, political and social structure, economics, etc.)?

The objectives are clearly stated in terms of ACTFL proficiency guidelines and current thinking

in pedagogy. The examples and careful explication and sample materials make the nature of the course very clear. Given past performance of the PI, I would expect the materials to be produced in the form described.

The one area in which I would have some reservations would be the apparent lack of sensitivity to the facts of language variation specific to Albanian which is not mirrored in German or even Spanish and that is Gheg diglossia. While the standard language is Tosk-based, a majority of Albanian speakers have Gheg as their dialect base. Educated Ghegs can use the standard language, but others cannot or choose not to so that what students who have completed the course might encounter in ordinary situations in Kosovo or the northern half of Albania itself is seemingly not addressed.

Reader's Score: 9

5. Expected Contribution to Other Programs:

a) Will the proposed materials contribute significantly to strengthening, expanding, or improving instructional programs concerned with the language(s), area(s), or international studies in the United States?

The proposer feels--with some justification, in my opinion--that the question has been dealt with section 2. Potential For Use ...

There is, however, the issue of how the course might fit into larger configurations, either the preparation of academic specialists in the Balkans or other professionals with congruent interests. The material is obviously slanted toward linguistic performance, indeed by all appearances everyday use of spoken language. It might begin to build a base for working through Albanian print materials, but the colloquial style of the Albanian in the examples (sometimes reflected in the English glosses, e.g. the 'go and (verb)' expressions) means that students completing the course might need help adjusting to the higher registers of the standard language. To put what I am saying a bit more concretely, the course might not serve that well to prepare students for documentary work for historical studies.

In any case, the criticisms made in my comments on section 2 still hold

Reader's Score: 3

6. Plan of Operation:

- a) Does the design of the project show high quality?**
- b) Is the plan of management effective? Will it ensure proper and effective administration?**
- c) Is there a clear description of how the objectives of the project relate to the purpose of the Section 605 International Research and Studies program?**
- d) Is the way in which the applicant plans to use its resources and personnel to achieve the project objectives appropriate and adequate?**
- e) To what extent will the applicant provide equal access treatment for eligible members of racial and ethnic minority groups, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly?**

The design is clear and shows high quality. The management and administration appear effective. IRS 605 is addressed. The use of resources and personnel to achieve objectives is (within limits, cf. the following section) appropriate. A statement of institutional commitment to equal access is given.

Reader's Score: 10**7. Quality of Personnel:**

- a) Is there evidence of professional competence to direct this project on the part of the project director or principal investigator?
- b) Is there evidence of the qualifications of the other key personnel, if any, to participate in the project?
- c) Is the amount of time that the key person(s) plan to commit to the project appropriate to the project's need?
- d) To what extent does the applicant, as part of its non-discriminatory employment practices, encourage applications for employment from members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as members of ethnic minorities, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly?

The PI is not an Albanian specialist, and indeed apparently (cf. 'languages' section of his CV) makes no claim to knowing Albanian. Instead, the expertise he brings to the task is his experience with the template or shell, which he has successfully applied to German, his primary language, and Spanish. The language expertise is to be supplied by two Albanian speakers, both products of PSU's Spanish programs. The overall approach then is not unlike those utilized by those producing commercial language courses like Rosetta Stone. Indeed, the absence of a Rosetta Stone Albanian course is mentioned at one point.

Therein lies my objection to the entire enterprise. If IRS language materials is simply about producing proficiency-based software packages (plus or minus some supplementary printed material) for 'funny languages', then the job ought to be turned over to the Rosetta Stone and Berlitz folks.

What I have tried to show is that this approach misses important differences among languages (e.g. Albanian diglossia) and that the market for materials may not necessarily conform to ACTFL views (e.g. Albanian at UC and OSU). Minimally I would like to see Prof. Fischer get in touch with Albanian specialists like Profs. Friedman and Joseph (they are both quite accessible) and others (they do exist) to solicit their wisdom on both substantive matters (the type(s) of Albanian to used) and the objectives to be served by the end-product.

Reader's Score: 2**8. Budget and Cost Effectiveness:**

- a) Is the proposed budget adequate to support the proposed project activities?
- b) Are the costs reasonable in relation to the anticipated product (or objectives) of the project?

The discussion of the budget is thorough and informed by experience. It seems adequate and reasonable for the undertaking.

Reader's Score: 5**9. Evaluation Plan:**

- a) Does the application include a plan for evaluating periodically the work accomplished under the project?
- b) Is there a realistic time schedule for accomplishing the work?

The application proposes to utilize the services of two unnamed evaluators to regular on-site visits to examine materials, observe field-testing, speak with students and so forth.

The proposal also calls for students to serve as evaluators during field testing, and each student will be subject to an ACTFL oral proficiency interview.

The time schedule is realistic.

Reader's Score: 15

10. Adequacy of Resources:

- a) Does the applicant have adequate facilities to conduct the project?
b) Are the equipment and supplies which the applicant plans to use adequate?

PSU has the facilities and equipment to support the project.

Reader's Score: 5

11. Description of Final Format:

- a) Are the contents and final form of the projected material(s) sufficiently well described?

The contents have been well-described previously and the final form of the project is made clear here.

Reader's Score: 5

12. Provisions for Pretesting and Revision

Has sufficient provision been made for pretesting the material(s) (with students and/or in the classroom) for possible revision before general dissemination or publication?

The pretesting plan follows the m.o. used in the previous German and Spanish projects and is thorough and adequate to allow for revisions before general dissemination.

Reader's Score: 15

13. COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES:

FOR FY2009 International Research and Studies - Instructional Materials the competitive priority is:

The development of specialized instructional or assessment materials focused on any of the following seventy-eight (78) languages selected from the U.S. Department of Education's list of Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs): Akkan (Twi-Fante), Albanian, Amharic, Arabic (all dialects), Armenian, Azeri (Azerbaijani), Balochi, Bamanakan (Bamana, Bambara, Mandikan, Mandingo, Maninka, Dyula), Belarusian, Bengali, (Bangla), Berber (all languages), Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cebuano (Visayan), Chechen, Chinese (Cantonese), Chinese (Gan), Chinese (Mandarin), Chinese (Min), Chinese (Wu), Croatian, Dari, Dinka, Georgian, Gujarati, Hausa, Hebrew (Modern), Hindi, Igbo, Indonesian, Japanese, Javanese, Kannada, Kashmiri, Kazakh, Khmer (Cambodian), Kirghiz, Korean, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Kurdish (Sorani), Lao, Malay (Bahasa Melayu or Malaysian), Malayalam, Marathi, Mongolian, Nepali, Oromo, Panjabi, Pashto, Persian (Farsi), Polish, Portugueses (all varieties), Quechua, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala (Sinhalese), Somali, Swahili, Tagalog, Tajik, Tamil, Telugu, Thai, Tibetan, Tigrigna, Turkish, Turkmen, Ukrainian, Urdu, Uyghur/Uigur, Uzbek,

Vietnamese, Wolof, Xhosa, Yoruba, and Zulu.

The proposal meets the competitive priority.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2009 2:47 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 06/01/2009 10:05 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Portland State University - Foreign Languages & Literature (P017A090367)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary		
1. Summary Comments	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. Need for the Project: Maximum Points- 10	10	8
2. Potential for the Use of Materials in Other Programs Maximum Points: 5	5	3
3. Account of Related Material Maximum Points: 10	10	8
4. Likelihood of Achieving Results: Maximum Points: 10	10	8
5. Expected Contribution to Other Programs Maximum Points 5	5	3
6. Plan of Operation: Maximum points: 10	10	10
7. Quality of Personnel: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
8. Budget and Cost Effectiveness: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
9. Evaluation Plan: Maximum points: 15	15	14
10. Adequacy of Resources: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
11. Description of Final Format: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
12. Provisions for Pretesting and Revision: Maximum Points: 15	15	13
13. Competitive Priority: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
TOTAL	105	92

Technical Review Form

Instructional 5: 84.017A

Reader #2:

Applicant: Portland State University - Foreign Languages & Literature (P017A090367)

Summary

1. Please summarize the application's strengths and weaknesses:

One of the better drafted proposal in terms of following directions and submitting information in the correct order.

Content was the issue.

3 short resumes much appreciated.

=====
Below are some suggestions to consider.
=====

1. Limit length of resume to a targeted 3-page document with each item directly related to proposal not the entire CV
2. Provide a specific format for the academic resume (whatever format used, must be consistent for All personnel -- not be a narrative) & include only relevant information (not related, dated, or peripherally information)
 - a. Personal ID
 - b. Education
 - c. Instruction - last 10 yrs
 - d. Publications - last 10 yrs
 - e. Memberships - current
 - f. Presentations/workshops/invited papers - last 10 yrs
 - g. Indicate on the resume (by check or *) which activity was key to selection
 - h. Language
 - i. Technology
 - j. Linguistics
 - k. Administration
3. Do NOT include extra, interesting information
 - a. Don't mention dissertation title unless directly appropriate for proposal
 - b. Don't list items older than 10 years
 - c. Don't write resume as a narrative
 - d. Don't vary the resume format (pick on style & use for everyone)
 - e. Proof read for style as well as grammar and spelling (details)
4. Include budget line-item description
5. Include a sample of product
6. Include institutional support by letter

7. Do not repeat abstract as 'introduction' in proposal text (5 short paragraphs)
 - a. Needs
 - b. Materials
 - c. Personnel
 - d. Activities/project
 - e. Evaluation
8. Include letter from external evaluator to serve (don't assume individual will)
9. Government grants require a statement of inclusion of minorities. Be specific and precise about this feature.
10. Adhere to the directions and use grant headers & numbers

Selection Criteria

1. Need for the Project:

- a) **Is there a need for the proposed materials(s) in the educational area to be served?**
- b) **Are the (i) language(s); (ii) region or country; or, (iii) the issues or studies, for the study of which the materials are to be developed, of sufficient priority for, and of potential significance to the national interest to warrant support at this time?**

It is hard to justify an elementary Albanian language program for higher education when there are none and there is little demand. The issue of Rosetta Stone not having a program may relate to the difficulty of finding clients.

With the two dialects, the author did not address the need for instruction in both. Nor the need in various countries in Eastern Europe. In the future, argue for a wider use. Since the war is over, US students presently are not interested.

Reader's Score: 8

2. Potential for the Use of Materials in Other Programs:

- a) **Will the proposed materials have a good potential for being utilized by appropriate educational programs in other institutions in the United States?**

One reviewer mentioned several Albanian language teachers/linguists that had prepared materials. There may be programs for the government.

Reader's Score: 3

3. Account of Related Materials

- a) **Have all the existing, similar materials (for the study of the language(s), region or country, or issue in question) been cited and accounted?**
- b) **Is there a critical commentary on the adequacy of such similar materials and is this commentary accurate?**
- c) **Will the proposed material(s) duplicate other materials already in existence or already in progress?**

The list is a good start.

One reviewer knew of additional materials which were not mentioned.

Also, there are private programs not mentioned.

Rosetta Stone, Tell-Me-More, etc. commercial software should be consulted. They may not

meet your needs; however, the design and marketability may provide ideas.

Finally, the discussion of some of the textbooks did not reflect the positive nature of the textbooks by Albanian writers.

Reader's Score: 8

4. Likelihood of Achieving Results:

- a) Are the objectives, which the proposed material(s) are to serve, clearly defined?
- b) Are the outlined methods and procedures for preparing the material(s) practicable and can they be expected to produce the anticipated results?
- c) Does the application reflect a sufficient degree of knowledge in the pertinent areas to assure a successful completion of the project (e.g., for language materials: modern language pedagogy, modern linguistics theory; for area studies and related materials: history, political and social structure, economics, etc.)?

The project in an of itself might succeed; however, without institutional support and a client base, one is not certain that the materials will meet any need. The objectives were vague.

The mention of ACTFL guidelines, standards, and OPIs is most helpful; however, the standards need to be articulated into each step of the curricula.

There was some discussion as to the usefulness of the project for enabling students to attain a proficiency level necessary for use in the government etc.

Reader's Score: 8

5. Expected Contribution to Other Programs:

- a) Will the proposed materials contribute significantly to strengthening, expanding, or improving instructional programs concerned with the language(s), area(s), or international studies in the United States?

NO text available. Reference to # 2.

Not sufficient information.

Reader's Score: 3

6. Plan of Operation:

- a) Does the design of the project show high quality?
- b) Is the plan of management effective? Will it ensure proper and effective administration?
- c) Is there a clear description of how the objectives of the project relate to the purpose of the Section 605 International Research and Studies program?
- d) Is the way in which the applicant plans to use its resources and personnel to achieve the project objectives appropriate and adequate?
- e) To what extent will the applicant provide equal access treatment for eligible members of racial and ethnic minority groups, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly?

a. Yes

b. Appears to be (reference to #7 Personnel)

c. yes (refers to other sections for evidence)

- d. yes (other sections)
- e. yes

This reader had no major problem with the plan.

NB: Integration of both dialects is essential. Use of ACTFL standards, guidelines, and OPI result in best practices.

Reader's Score: 10

7. Quality of Personnel:

- a) Is there evidence of professional competence to direct this project on the part of the project director or principal investigator?**
- b) Is there evidence of the qualifications of the other key personnel, if any, to participate in the project?**
- c) Is the amount of time that the key person(s) plan to commit to the project appropriate to the project's need?**
- d) To what extent does the applicant, as part of its non-discriminatory employment practices, encourage applications for employment from members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as members of ethnic minorities, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly?**

- a. yes - German literature (familiar with ACTFL - OPI rating)
teacher training
(focus resume on language instruction and curriculum development, leave the rest out)
no evidence of travel in Albania or knowledge of
Albanian
- b. Aliaj - Spanish major, Albanian teaching experience
OPI tester Albanian (Leave off references & non-academic work experience (focus only on experience appropriate for this proposal)

Tasi - Spanish major, Albanian speaker no teaching experience in Albanian (leave out non language materials - references)
- NO ALBANIAN SPECIALIST
- c. no time allocation mention
- d. mentioned

Reader's Score: 5

8. Budget and Cost Effectiveness:

- a) Is the proposed budget adequate to support the proposed project activities?**
 - b) Are the costs reasonable in relation to the anticipated product (or objectives) of the project?**
- a. chart, narrative, appendix
Use standard accounting notation common in the U.S. dropping digits is not helpful, rather confusing

b. yes.

Reader's Score: 5

9. Evaluation Plan:

- a) Does the application include a plan for evaluating periodically the work accomplished under the project?
- b) Is there a realistic time schedule for accomplishing the work?

Yes
suggest potential students/institutions.

Reader's Score: 14

10. Adequacy of Resources:

- a) Does the applicant have adequate facilities to conduct the project?
- b) Are the equipment and supplies which the applicant plans to use adequate?

a. yes, reader assumes that PSU administrators will provide space, resources, equipment. IN FUTURE, OBTAIN A LETTER THAT STATES THAT FACT.

b. yes, reader assumes so.

Reader's Score: 5

11. Description of Final Format:

- a) Are the contents and final form of the projected material(s) sufficiently well described?

No example of product here. Visual in Planning section.

Reader's Score: 5

12. Provisions for Pretesting and Revision

Has sufficient provision been made for pretesting the material(s) (with students and/or in the classroom) for possible revision before general dissemination or publication?

Need some students for piloting.

Reader's Score: 13

13. COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES:

FOR FY2009 International Research and Studies - Instructional Materials the competitive priority is:

The development of specialized instructional or assessment materials focused on any of the following seventy-eight (78) languages selected from the U.S. Department of Education's list of Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs): Akkan (Twi-Fante), Albanian, Amharic, Arabic (all dialects), Armenian, Azeri (Azerbaijani), Balochi, Bamanakan (Bamana, Bambara, Mandikan, Mandingo, Maninka, Dyula), Belarusian, Bengali, (Bangla), Berber (all languages), Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cebuano (Visayan), Chechen, Chinese (Cantonese), Chinese (Gan), Chinese (Mandarin), Chinese (Min), Chinese (Wu), Croatian, Dari, Dinka, Georgian, Gujarati, Hausa, Hebrew (Modern), Hindi, Igbo, Indonesian, Japanese, Javanese, Kannada,

Kashmiri, Kazakh, Khmer (Cambodian), Kirghiz, Korean, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Kurdish (Sorani), Lao, Malay (Bahasa Melayu or Malaysian), Malayalam, Marathi, Mongolian, Nepali, Oromo, Panjabi, Pashto, Persian (Farsi), Polish, Portugueses (all varieties), Quechua, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala (Sinhalese), Somali, Swahili, Tagalog, Tajik, Tamil, Telugu, Thai, Tibetan, Tigrigna, Turkish, Turkmen, Ukrainian, Urdu, Uyghur/Uigur, Uzbek, Vietnamese, Wolof, Xhosa, Yoruba, and Zulu.

Albanian

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/01/2009 10:05 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/30/2009 2:39 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Portland State University - Foreign Languages & Literature (P017A090367)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary		
1. Summary Comments	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. Need for the Project: Maximum Points- 10	10	7
2. Potential for the Use of Materials in Other Programs Maximum Points: 5	5	3
3. Account of Related Material Maximum Points: 10	10	10
4. Likelihood of Achieving Results: Maximum Points: 10	10	8
5. Expected Contribution to Other Programs Maximum Points 5	5	2
6. Plan of Operation: Maximum points: 10	10	10
7. Quality of Personnel: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
8. Budget and Cost Effectiveness: Maximum Points: 5	5	2
9. Evaluation Plan: Maximum points: 15	15	15
10. Adequacy of Resources: Maximum Points: 5	5	4
11. Description of Final Format: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
12. Provisions for Pretesting and Revision: Maximum Points: 15	15	15
13. Competitive Priority: Maximum Points: 5	5	5
TOTAL	105	91

Technical Review Form

Instructional 5: 84.017A

Reader #3:

Applicant: Portland State University - Foreign Languages & Literature (P017A090367)

Summary

1. Please summarize the application's strengths and weaknesses:

Excellent team of scholars.

This is an interesting project but proposal does not make the case for the actual need and does not show what programs would benefit from it.

Selection Criteria

1. Need for the Project:

- a) Is there a need for the proposed materials(s) in the educational area to be served?
- b) Are the (i) language(s); (ii) region or country; or, (iii) the issues or studies, for the study of which the materials are to be developed, of sufficient priority for, and of potential significance to the national interest to warrant support at this time?

There is a need for language materials in general, but proposal addresses issue of who speaks Albanian worldwide as opposed to making the case of actual need for materials in program in colleges within the United States.

Reader's Score: 7

2. Potential for the Use of Materials in Other Programs:

- a) Will the proposed materials have a good potential for being utilized by appropriate educational programs in other institutions in the United States?

Proposal does not give details on what programs offer Albanian and who would use the materials once it was produced.

Reader's Score: 3

3. Account of Related Materials

- a) Have all the existing, similar materials (for the study of the language(s), region or country, or issue in question) been cited and accounted?
- b) Is there a critical commentary on the adequacy of such similar materials and is this commentary accurate?
- c) Will the proposed material(s) duplicate other materials already in existence or already in progress?

Proposal gives a full and thoughtful account of available materials

Reader's Score: 10

4. Likelihood of Achieving Results:

- a) Are the objectives, which the proposed material(s) are to serve, clearly defined?
- b) Are the outlined methods and procedures for preparing the material(s) practicable and can they be expected to produce the anticipated results?
- c) Does the application reflect a sufficient degree of knowledge in the pertinent areas to assure a successful completion of the project (e.g., for language materials: modern language pedagogy, modern linguistics theory; for area studies and related materials: history, political and social structure, economics, etc.)?

There is a long detailed section of the proposal offered here but is not totally relevant to this point. The examples given here are useful, however, the section starts with general proficiency literature, and ends with emphasis on the general technology shell.

The case made for the Albanian version was not found sufficient by the panel.

Reader's Score: 8

5. Expected Contribution to Other Programs:

- a) Will the proposed materials contribute significantly to strengthening, expanding, or improving instructional programs concerned with the language(s), area(s), or international studies in the United States?

This section is not clearly answered. Reader is referred back to item #2 which is hard to follow and locate in proposal

Reader's Score: 2

6. Plan of Operation:

- a) Does the design of the project show high quality?
- b) Is the plan of management effective? Will it ensure proper and effective administration?
- c) Is there a clear description of how the objectives of the project relate to the purpose of the Section 605 International Research and Studies program?
- d) Is the way in which the applicant plans to use its resources and personnel to achieve the project objectives appropriate and adequate?
- e) To what extent will the applicant provide equal access treatment for eligible members of racial and ethnic minority groups, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly?

The proposal offers a clear and detailed plan of operation.

Reader's Score: 10

7. Quality of Personnel:

- a) Is there evidence of professional competence to direct this project on the part of the project director or principal investigator?
- b) Is there evidence of the qualifications of the other key personnel, if any, to participate in the project?
- c) Is the amount of time that the key person(s) plan to commit to the project appropriate to the project's need?

d) To what extent does the applicant, as part of its non-discriminatory employment practices, encourage applications for employment from members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as members of ethnic minorities, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly?

This is a team of excellent scholars.

Reader's Score: 5

8. Budget and Cost Effectiveness:

- a) Is the proposed budget adequate to support the proposed project activities?**
- b) Are the costs reasonable in relation to the anticipated product (or objectives) of the project?**

This budget is very brief and seems incomplete. The figures look confusing and are accompanied with no narrative.

Reader's Score: 2

9. Evaluation Plan:

- a) Does the application include a plan for evaluating periodically the work accomplished under the project?**
- b) Is there a realistic time schedule for accomplishing the work?**

There is an evaluation plan provided which will include ACTFL OPI testing, hiring and external evaluator and the construction and following of two rubrics

Reader's Score: 15

10. Adequacy of Resources:

- a) Does the applicant have adequate facilities to conduct the project?**
- b) Are the equipment and supplies which the applicant plans to use adequate?**

Although this section is very brief, one assumes that the university has the adequate resources. The three person team seems as a very small operation and would need more technical support from university staff which is not mentioned here.

Reader's Score: 4

11. Description of Final Format:

- a) Are the contents and final form of the projected material(s) sufficiently well described?**

Final format is fully and clearly described

Reader's Score: 5

12. Provisions for Pretesting and Revision

Has sufficient provision been made for pretesting the material(s) (with students and/or in the classroom) for possible revision before general dissemination or publication?

There is already a tested "shell" model that works. The Albanian content will be pretested and revised. External evaluators will be involved in this

process.

Reader's Score: 15

13. COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES:

FOR FY2009 International Research and Studies - Instructional Materials the competitive priority is:

The development of specialized instructional or assessment materials focused on any of the following seventy-eight (78) languages selected from the U.S. Department of Education's list of Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs): Akkan (Twi-Fante), Albanian, Amharic, Arabic (all dialects), Armenian, Azeri (Azerbaijani), Balochi, Bamanakan (Bamana, Bambara, Mandikan, Mandingo, Maninka, Dyula), Belarusian, Bengali, (Bangla), Berber (all languages), Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cebuano (Visayan), Chechen, Chinese (Cantonese), Chinese (Gan), Chinese (Mandarin), Chinese (Min), Chinese (Wu), Croatian, Dari, Dinka, Georgian, Gujarati, Hausa, Hebrew (Modern), Hindi, Igbo, Indonesian, Japanese, Javanese, Kannada, Kashmiri, Kazakh, Khmer (Cambodian), Kirghiz, Korean, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Kurdish (Sorani), Lao, Malay (Bahasa Melayu or Malaysian), Malayalam, Marathi, Mongolian, Nepali, Oromo, Panjabi, Pashto, Persian (Farsi), Polish, Portugueses (all varieties), Quechua, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala (Sinhalese), Somali, Swahili, Tagalog, Tajik, Tamil, Telugu, Thai, Tibetan, Tigrigna, Turkish, Turkmen, Ukrainian, Urdu, Uyghur/Uigur, Uzbek, Vietnamese, Wolof, Xhosa, Yoruba, and Zulu.

priority requirement is met

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/30/2009 2:39 PM