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

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)
Reader #1: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Summary Statement			
Summary Statement			
1. Summary Statement		0	
	Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need for Project		35	33
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	25
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	18
	Sub Total	80	76
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
1. Competitive Preference 6		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
1. Competitive Preference 7		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
1. Competitive Preference 9		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 10			
Competitive Preference Priority 10			

1. Competitive Preference 10		1	
	Sub Total	1	
	Total	85	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 84.411C Panel - 1: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. **Summary Statement (Optional)**

   General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   (2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

   (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

   Strengths:

   1) The proposed program will develop high quality teachers with the professional development model, Exceptional Coaching for Early Language and Literacy-Enhanced (ExCELL-E). The teachers will utilize strategies to improve ELL low socioeconomic students language an literacy outcomes.(page e21)

   2) Based on research (page e22), of approximately 14 million children growing up in poverty, 49% are not proficient readers by 4th grade. Approximately 50% of African American and Hispanic children fell below the basic level for reading proficiency, and 71% of ELL students read at below-basic levels.

   3) The proposed program is based on the expansion of an existing model. According to the application, the ExCELL model has been shown to improve the language and literacy instruction of early childhood teachers serving at risk students. With the implementation of ExCELL-E, highly qualified teachers will be recruited, developed, and retained. (e21)

   Weaknesses:

   The need for the program did not address meeting the needs of students with disabilities or developmental delays. (page e22)

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

   (2) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

   Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both (a) to assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and (b) to understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Development grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

   (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

   (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

1) (a)The proposed ExCELL-E will train Pre-K -1st grade teachers to address the needs of ELL students with oral language, phonological sensitivity, alphabet knowledge, and writing.(e28)

(b) The goals are high and attainable. The application included goals and objectives to achieve the desired outcomes of the program. (pages e28-e37)

2) (a) The proposed costs for the program are reasonable. The first year of implementing the program is the most expensive due to the development of the website, webinars and interactive videos.(page e38)

(b) The proposed cost per student is approximately $30. The scaling targets included costs for 1000,000 to 500,000 students.(page e39)

3) ExCELL has proven to have a positive impact on students language and literacy skills. Based on noted research (page e38), early intervention improve student achievement and reduces failure when the focus is on literacy.

4) An ExCELL-E Systems Support Team will be created the first year to ensure sustainability. The program has support from partnerships within the district. (e40)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

   (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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

   (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

(1) The management plan included a project timeline and milestones for completing the goals and objectives. (Page e45, e48-e49))

(2) Applicant has defined responsibilities for the project director and personnel.

Weaknesses:

The key personnel overseeing the project have extensive qualifications, however, the project responsibilities and timeline lacks specific details regarding the assigned duties. (pages e47-e53)

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

   (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

   (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome

measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

The proposed program addresses improving children's oral language and literacy skills in Pre-K - 1st grades.

Weaknesses:

a) Emotional readiness was not addressed the Overview of the ExCELL-E. (page e111)

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

   (a) address students'preparedness and expectations related to college;

   (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

   (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or

the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

The proposed program addresses training ELL teachers to implement specific strategies for supporting English Language Learners. ELL achievement gaps were noted on page e25.

Weaknesses:

The proposed program did not address increasing high school graduation rates for ELL students.(e45)

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)**

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)**

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)
Reader #3: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Summary Statement			
Summary Statement			
1. Summary Statement		0	
	Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need for Project		35	31
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	25
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	18
	Sub Total	80	74
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
1. Competitive Preference 6		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
1. Competitive Preference 7		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
1. Competitive Preference 9		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 10			
Competitive Preference Priority 10			

1. Competitive Preference 10		1	
	Sub Total	1	
	Total	85	74

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 84.411C Panel - 1: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. **Summary Statement (Optional)**

   General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   (2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

   (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

   Strengths:

   The applicant discusses the lack of effective language and literacy instructions as a critical gap in services of ethnic minority student who are not proficient readers, including English Language Learners.
   The applicant presents a meaningful solution to an ongoing weakness of the lack of collaboration between Pre-K and Primary Grade programs early childhood education (pg 26).The project will build on past success of ExCELL (supported teacher's professional development and learning). This projects will enhance these successes by expand the collaboration efforts to develop for support of teachers in the areas of early grades transition, language and literacy development and instruction practices.

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant failed to address gaps and services related to children with disabilities or developmental delays (pg.31). Research constantly indicate the need for early intervention programming to provide appropriate services to children with exceptionalities from the inclusionary approach rather than in isolation.

Reader's Score: **31**

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

   (2) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

   Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both (a) to assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and (b) to understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Development grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

   (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

   (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

Design
The project will incorporate evidence based practices for improving early childhood education teachers' skills for addressing literacy. Considering literacy is the most critical element that positively impacts reading, no doubt this project will have significantly positive impact on student growth. This attribute specifically targets children who are English Language Learners (pg. 33)
The use of strong inclusive practices, fidelity checks and ongoing monitoring of the students will add value to the over all outcomes of the stated goals and objectives. (pg. 32-33).
The project will utilize technology in a variety ways that are directly aligned to instruction (pg.-29-30). The webinars should be extremely beneficial tools for professional development.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

   (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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

   (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant presents a clear illustration of the goals, objectives and timelines are aligned to project personnel. In addition, the management plan provides outcomes that are directly tied to the stated needs for the project.(pg.48-49). The project is extremely cost effective (pg 38) and illustrates that strong external and internal support (pg 40).
The proposed model is strong designed around evidence practices with the intent to provide a seamless and coherent continuum o f education practices that from birth to primary grade grades . Such efforts provide strong evidence of the sustainability and scaling of this project (pages 26,30,33).

Weaknesses:

Although the project personnel appear highly qualified to address the stated goals of the project; there was a lack information regarding expertise relating to culturally responsive practices , particularly in relationship to challenging variables (family dynamics --especially the value of education, psychosocial stressors, economic conditions, culture and lifestyles) that often adversely impact of learning of many ethnic minorities learners. This concern is a critical element when addressing the high needs students in geographical location that will be include in this project.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

   (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

   (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

   (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

none noted

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide innovative strategies that would enhance the increasing the quality of early experiences.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

   (a) address students'preparedness and expectations related to college;

   (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

   (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

none noted.

Weaknesses:

There were no specific strategies or evidence based practices presented that clearly focused on students with disabilities or limited Enlish proficient students.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)**

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)**

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)
Reader #2: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Summary Statement			
Summary Statement			
1. Summary Statement		0	
	Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need for Project		35	32
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	25
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	18
	Sub Total	80	75
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
1. Competitive Preference 6		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
1. Competitive Preference 7		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
1. Competitive Preference 9		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 10			
Competitive Preference Priority 10			

1. Competitive Preference 10		1	
	Sub Total	1	
	Total	85	75

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 84.411C Panel - 1: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. **Summary Statement (Optional)**

   General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   (2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

   (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

   Strengths:

   The proposed project targets a critical need of strengthen literacy and language development among prek-1st grade at risk and ELL youths by focusing on the professional learning of their teachers (pages e21-23). It provides rich data and research to support the strategy and approach for the project (pages e23-26). It uses both an urban and rural setting to pilot its efforts which will allow for the emergence of best practices and generalizations (pages e28). The proposed project seeks to build a foundation to inform how to better prepare teachers for literacy and language development and under what conditions to a broad audience for replication and sustainability (pages e38-40).

   Weaknesses:

   Omission of students with developmental delays could skew findings and replications (e21).

Reader's Score: **32**

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

   (2) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

   Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both (a) to assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and (b) to understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Development grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

   (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

   (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths:

The proposed project has three clear goals that align directly with the outcomes it identifies to be implemented and replicated by other school districts (pages e20 and e40)... Built on lessons learned, it uses 21st century technology to provide means for teachers to become active participants in the observation and feedback cycle (pages e29) allowing for evidenced based feedback and self reflection (pages e30-31). The costs are reasonable considering the technology needs of the project and the repurposing of existing salaries. (See Budget narrative).

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

   (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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The well thought out management plan as presented has the potential to meet the project goals and outcomes (pages e47). The responsibilities and timelines acknowledge the realities of working with classroom teachers, building a collaborative working group and internalizing new strategies while maintaining the fidelity of the project (pages e48). The personnel identified are well qualified in managing a project of this size and scope (pages e47).

Weaknesses:

What s missing among the collective background of the lead personnel identified is experience with the target population (Appendix F).

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)**

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

There was not a direct link connecting proposal activities to increased Early Learning Outcomes

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)**

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students,

particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students'preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

There was not evidence providing a direct link to prposed activitiess to the unigue needs of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM