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

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Berea College (U411C110137)
Reader #1: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Summary Statement			
Summary Statement			
1. Summary Statement		0	0
	Sub Total	0	0
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need for Project		35	35
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	25
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	20
	Sub Total	80	80
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	1
	Sub Total	1	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	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 10			
Competitive Preference Priority 10			

1. Competitive Preference 10		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
	Total	85	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #45 - 84.411C Panel - 45: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Berea College (U411C110137)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. **Summary Statement (Optional)**

General:

The applicant presents an innovative program that will implement a National Math and Science Initiative Advanced Placement Teacher Training in two middle and three high schools. The program focuses on enhancing teacher performance, creating a college-going culture, and empowering parents through outreach. The project addresses Absolute Priorities 5 and 2.

Reader's Score: **0**

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 has provided strong evidence that clearly identifies the gaps and weaknesses in graduation rates, number of students taking AP courses, and number of students entering and completing two and four year institutions (See Figure p.11). The applicant has determined that its students are not adequately prepared to enter college and successfully complete a two or four year program due to the low number of students who take AP courses (pp.3 and Figure 6).
The applicant will partner with APTIP and NSMI to address the identified gaps and weaknesses in the target districts. The objective is to increase the 2% of students who received a score of 3 on AP testing as compared to state and national average of 49% and 58% respectively. The inclusion of a monetary incentive program for both teachers and students is a unique and innovative strategy.
The applicant has provided strong evidence that will increase the number of students who enroll in college, decrease the magnitude of gaps and weaknesses in the targeted areas and increase graduation rates and the number of students taking AP courses. The applicant has a history of working with disadvantaged students and has administered several federal programs.

Weaknesses:

1. No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 35

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 clearly defined goals and objectives that are aligned with the planned strategies (p.5). The applicant and its partners have developed a highly structured plan. The strategy is to offer monetary incentives to both AP teachers and students who successfully complete AP courses. The proposed project plan is logical and will serve the student population from birth to completion of a two or four year institution. The Applicant's partner Save the Children and Promise Neighborhood will play an integral role.
The Applicant's proposed project is a well-planned design that will serve 2,948 students in the target county school districts. The cost of $3,290,948 to administer the proposed project is very reasonable considering the low per student cost of $1117 and the expertise and experience the partners and applicant bring to the program (p.17). The per-student cost is a one-time cost covering multiple years. Due to the reasonable cost of the program sustainability and scalability is justified. The projected costs are as follows: $597 per 100,000; $384 per 500,000 students; and $273 per 1,000,000 students.

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:

The applicant has formulated a management plan that will achieve the goals and objectives of the project (p.14). There is strong evidence that the applicant will complete the proposed project on time and within budget. The budget is reasonable and cost efficient based upon the per student cost for multiple years. The related tasks and strategies are sustainable and there is definitely evidence of scalability beyond the grant period (p.32). The applicant's partner SAVE has the ability to seek further funding.
The management key personnel will be hired upon receipt of the grant award. The key personnel are: (1) Principal Investigator; (2) three Achievement Counselor; (3) Project Director and (4) Program Associate (pp.32-34). The duties, responsibilities, qualifications, and experiences are clearly defined by the applicant. The Principal Investigator is already on board and her resume reflects 15 years of experience in administering federal grants.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 20

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:

Not scored

Weaknesses:

Not scored

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:

The applicant provides strong evidence that its plan consisting of innovative strategies and practices that will serve students from birth to the completion of a two or four year institution. The program's strategic plan is to enable each student the opportunity to enjoy a productive and successful life free of poverty and to also develop an improvement in the Appalachian region economic conditions. The applicant and its partners developed a comprehensive plan that intends to enroll all students into AP classes as research studies concluded that AP students are college prepared and more likely to graduate from a higher institution in comparison to non- AP students. For this reason, the applicant has joined partnership with; Save the Children; APTIP; and KSTC to train the AP teachers to provide technology based programs that will motivate students to take AP classes (p.1, 2). The Applicant has clearly revealed its intent to ensure that the students of the target district are college ready by providing rigorous coursework that will enable its students to succeed in AP classes, get acceptance into college, and complete college. The applicant will provide strategies and practices to improve student's academic achievement. The applicant, along with its partners is highly capable of obtaining their mission.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 1

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:

   Not scored

   Weaknesses:

   Not scored

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:

   Not scored

   Weaknesses:

   Not scored

Reader's Score: **0**

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:

Not scored

Weaknesses:

Not scored

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

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

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/6/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Berea College (U411C110137)
Reader #2: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Summary Statement			
Summary Statement			
1. Summary Statement		0	0
	Sub Total	0	0
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need for Project		35	35
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	25
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	17
	Sub Total	80	77
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
1. Competitive Preference 6		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
1. Competitive Preference 7		1	1
	Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	
	Sub Total	1	
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	78

Technical Review Form

Panel #45 - 84.411C Panel - 45: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Berea College (U411C110137)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. **Summary Statement (Optional)**

General:

This proposal is strong and addresses a very needy region with powerful goals. This reviewer feels that the efforts to look at college going culture, connect with parents and increasing AP courses could provide great improvements in the region.

Reader's Score: **0**

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 application clearly demonstrates the need for the project, as the region served is designated a Promise Neighborhood and poverty rates 200% an 300% of the U.S. poverty rates. P.8

The applicant provides data and charts which show an undereducated region with significantly lower success rates and college readiness. P.9-10

The proposal use f the evidence-based NMSI and APTIP trainings shows a comprehensive approach to increasing the likelihood of college success in this project.

The approach to include community and parents in targeting a college going culture and rigorous coursework is powerful. Details about use of Achievement Counselors to address attitudes and understanding in the homes of students is important to examine. P.2

Applicant chart on p. 7 shows powerful leverage points to increase opportunity for success such as open enrollment in AP courses, Pre AP courses to ready students at the lower levels of schools, and community engagement.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 35

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 application is clear and logical to follow. The grant shows the goals, the activities, and the expected outcomes. The definitions of key actions to implementation on p. 15 provide a conceptual view of the plan.
The applicant details the costs per student and the scale up costs for the project. The costs per student are reasonable and applicant projects economies of scale as student numbers increase. P.17

Strong partnerships with identified agencies increase likelihood of success. The applicant details long-standing relationships and commitments to share their learning within a cross-agency work team.

The application addresses 5 of the most persistently lowest-achieving schools in Appalachia and proposes strategies and actions to turn them into a college-going culture. Goals align and partners have a structure and plan in place to incorporate the work to benefit numerous regions to address the competitive priority.

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 applicant is drawing on previous experience with programs this size and scope. The plan they developed clearly delineates the aspects of the project such as data collection, financial recordkeeping and personnel management.

The application gives explanatory information about the partners and their expertise to demonstrate use of highly qualified staff.

Weaknesses:

While applicant clearly talks about the activities and components of the trainings, the milestones and expected outcomes are not delineated on the chart on p. 31 to allow this reviewer to see what expectations and results they expect to see. Inclusion of these milestones would strengthen the application and are called for in the grant.

Reader's Score: 17

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

   The program shows elements to support access and understanding of college success.

   Weaknesses:

   None

Reader's Score: 1

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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: 9/6/11 12:00 AM

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Berea College (U411C110137)
Reader #3: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Summary Statement			
Summary Statement			
1. Summary Statement		0	0
	Sub Total	0	0
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need for Project		35	35
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	25
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	20
	Sub Total	80	80
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
1. Competitive Preference 6		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
1. Competitive Preference 7		1	1
	Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	
	Sub Total	1	
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	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #45 - 84.411C Panel - 45: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Berea College (U411C110137)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. **Summary Statement (Optional)**

General:

The applicant presents an innovative program that will implement a National Math Science Initiative Advanced Placement Teacher Training in two middle and three high schools. The program focuses on enhancing teacher performance, creating a college-going culture, and empowering parents through outreach. The project addresses Absolute Priorities 5 and 2.

Reader's Score: **0**

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 's plan to aggressively recruit students from disadvantaged groups to include African Americans, Hispanics, and low income White students who historically do not enroll in STEM AP classes represent an exceptional approach by the Applicant (p.10 Priority 5). The inclusion of extensive professional development for Science and Math AP teachers in the proposed program named "STEM" addresses Priority Two indicative of an exceptional approach (pp.2, 4).

The Applicant has provided strong evidence that clearly identifies the gaps and weaknesses in graduation rates, number of students taking AP courses, and number of students entering and completing two and four year institutions (See Figure p.11). The Applicant has determined its students are not adequately prepared to enter college and successfully complete a two or four year program due to the low number of students who take AP courses (pp.3 and Figure 6). The Applicant will partner with APTIP and NSMI to address the identified gaps and weaknesses in the target districts. The objective is to increase the 2% of students who receive a score of 3 on AP testing as compared to state and national average of 49% and 58% respectively. The inclusion of a monetary incentive program for both teachers and students is a unique and innovative strategy. The Applicant has provided strong evidence that it will increase the number of students who enroll in college, decrease the magnitude of gaps and weaknesses in the targeted areas, increase graduation rates and the number of students taking AP courses. The applicant has a history of working with disadvantaged students and has

administered several federal programs.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 35

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 clearly defined goals and objectives that are aligned with the planned strategies (p.5). The Applicant and its partners via collaboration have developed a highly structured plan. The plan's strategy is to offer monetary incentives to both AP teachers and students who successfully complete AP courses. The proposed project plan is logical and will serve the student population from birth to completion of a two or four year institution. The Applicant's partner Save the Children and Promise Neighborhood will play an integral role.
The Applicant's proposed project is a well-planned design that will serve 2,948 students in the target county school districts. The cost of $3,290,948 to administer the proposed project is very reasonable considering the low per student cost of $1117 and the expertise and experience the partners and applicant bring to the program (p.17). The per-student cost is a one-time cost covering multiple years. Due to the reasonable cost of the program it has sustainability and scalability. The projected costs are as follows: $597 per 100,000; $384 per 500,000 students; and $273 per 1,000,000 students.

Weaknesses:

None 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:

The applicant has formulated a management plan that will achieve the goals and objectives of the project (p.14). There is strong evidence that the Applicant will complete the proposed project on time and within budget. The budget is reasonable and cost efficient based upon the per student cost for multiple years. The related tasks and strategies are sustainable and there is definite scalabilty of the project beyond the Development Grant (p.32). The Applicant's Partner SAVE has the ability to seek further funding.
The management key personnel will be hired upon receipt of the grant award. The key personnel are: (1) Principal Investigator; (2) three Achievement Counselor; (3) Project Director and (4) Program Associate (pp.32-34). The duties, responsibilities, qualifications, and experience are clearly defined by the Applicant. The Principal Investigator is already on board and her resume reflects 15 years of experience in administering federal grants.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 20

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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:

The applicants provide strong evidence that its plan consist of innovative strategies and practices that will serve students from birth to the completion of a two or four year institution. The program's strategic plan is to enable each student to enjoy a productive and successful life free of poverty and improve the Appalachian region economic conditions. The applicant and its partners have developed a comprehensive plan that seeks to enroll all students into AP classes based on research studies concluding that AP students are college prepared and are more likely to graduate from a higher institution than non- AP students. Because of this approach, the Applicant has joined partnership with Save the Children, APTIP, and KSTC to train AP teachers and provide technology and programs that will motivate students to take AP classes (p.1, 2). The Applicant has clearly revealed its intent to ensure that the students of the target district are college ready by providing rigorous coursework that will enable its students to succeed in AP classes and enter and complete college. The Applicant will provide strategies and practices to improve student's academic achievement. The applicant, along with its partners is highly capable of obtaining their mission.

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 1

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:

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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: 9/11/11 12:00 AM