

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/14/2012 02:43 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Boston Collegiate Charter School Foundation, Inc. (U282P120025)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Record and potential for success of collaboration</b>		
1. Success of collaboration	15	13
<b>Quality of the lead applicant</b>		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	11
<b>Quality of the project design</b>		
1. Design quality	15	14
<b>Potential for scalability</b>		
1. Scalability	15	13
<b>Innovation</b>		
1. Innovation	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	8
<b>Sub Total</b>	95	84
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds</b>		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	100	89

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Collaboration Awards - 3: 84.282P

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

Applicant: Boston Collegiate Charter School Foundation, Inc. (U282P120025)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Record and potential for success of collaboration

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant's past or existing collaboration has improved educational outcomes and operational practices; and  
(2) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration and dissemination plan will achieve one or more of the following demonstrable results:
  - (i) Improved operational practices and productivity among all partners in such areas as financial performance and sustainability, governing board performance and stewardship, and parent and community engagement;
  - (ii) Improved student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications);
  - (iii) Improved student attendance and retention, and improved high school graduation rates;
  - (iv) Improved rates of college matriculation and college graduation;
  - (v) Improved rates of attendance and graduation from other postsecondary (i.e., non-college) institutions or programs.

### Strengths:

BCCS has described past and current collaboration efforts which include extensive sharing of resources in print and online, presentations at conferences, and mentoring school leaders. BCCS also has been a recipient of the silver EPIC award 4/5 years and is part of the Boston Charter Compact.

In spring 2012, a collaborative partnership was established with a public high school and a low-income Catholic high school in the efforts to foster teacher collaboration around the common core. The application describes a detailed plan to increase student achievement, involving teacher-to-teacher support for ELA and math team teams on data driven interventions, to better position them to work on the common core transition by mastering the current standards first.

Attendance at Burke has increased 4% in the past two years.

There are clear goals, including those for graduation and student achievement, and potential obstacles and strategies to overcome these goals have been addressed. Dissemination will include areas of budgeting, governance, and family engagement.

### Weaknesses:

The collaborative efforts initiated in 2012 are still too early to determine results.

Student attendance was not addressed and the improved graduation rates were weak at only an 11% increase from 44% at Burke.

Reader's Score: 13

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the lead applicant

1. (1) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student achievement (as defined in the NIA) and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school.
- (2) Either--
  - (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school; or
  - (ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school and to which significant gains in student achievement (as defined in this notice) have been made with all populations of students served by the charter school.
- (3) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including, where applicable and available, performance on statewide tests, student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for students from low-income families and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school that are above the average academic achievement results for such students attending other public schools in the State.

### Strengths:

The application includes data to demonstrate that BCCS consistently exceeds the proficiency levels of the state for low-income students and also has consistently improved student achievement over the past three years.

BCCS has been a recipient of the EPIC award 4/5 years, which is awarded for demonstrating significant student gains.

### Weaknesses:

Although it is reasonable to assume that the achievement gap is being closed due to the high test results, the achievement gap is not directly addressed through data representing performance of different subgroups within the school or subgroups in comparison to the state. Additionally, only 10th grade data is provided.

Reader's Score: 11

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the project design

1. The extent to which the applicant proposes a high-quality plan to use its Collaboration Award funds to improve educational outcomes and operational practices in public schools, including public charter schools.

### Strengths:

The plan includes clear student achievement objectives.

The application clearly highlights the joint efforts and therefore intends to equally compensate and involve staff from both schools: two teachers from each school and two leads from each school.

The dissemination plan will effectively utilize technology to improve outcomes in public schools that extend beyond the partnership. The application outlines the plan to create a portal connected to the website, including videos, student work, and teacher comments, that students from across the nation could use to help address skill deficits.

**Weaknesses:**

Operational improvement efforts are not addressed in detail.

**Reader's Score:** 14

**Selection Criteria - Potential for scalability**

1. **The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration can be replicated or adapted beyond the participating partners by other public schools or LEAs, including public charter schools and charter school LEAs, and sustained over the long-term.**

**Strengths:**

The two main strategies described in the application are scalable: stipends for teachers/leaders and web-based tools. The use of the portal will allow for effective dissemination and expansion of collaborative efforts.

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear how BCCS would expand their internal capacity of teacher/leader time to provide additional support to other schools.

**Reader's Score:** 13

**Selection Criteria - Innovation**

1. **The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that its proposed collaboration, as well as its dissemination plan, are either (i) substantially different from other efforts in its area of focus; or (ii) substantially more effective than similar efforts in its area of focus.**

**Strengths:**

The application highlights why the plan differs and is more effective than other efforts through three key points: (1) support will be driven through BCCS staff of teachers/leaders, (2) BCCS already has an online presence which will equip them to launch the portal effectively and reach many more schools, and (3) the project is built upon an existing partnership.

The project design presents a unique model for school turnaround.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 15

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

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

- (i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator; and
- (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

**Strengths:**

There are two project personnel from each school all of which demonstrate adequate training and experience. The team is comprised of a diverse group of individuals.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The management plan provides a comprehensive table outlining areas of work, responsible parties, and dates. The areas of work cover both partnership and dissemination. The management plan seems reasonable to achieve within the proposed timeline and budget.

**Weaknesses:**

While there is mention of progress monitoring, timing/touch points and mid-year strategy step-back in the table, it is unclear what the data points are to assess progress and which measures will be used. There also is no mention of external evaluation.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds**

1. Turning Around Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

**Note:** In order to receive preference under this competitive preference priority, the applicant must specify that it is responding to this competitive preference priority.

To meet this priority, projects must be designed to address one or more of the following priority areas:

- (a) Improving student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, or NIA) notice) in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).
- (b) Increasing graduation rates (as defined in the NIA) and college enrollment rates for students in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).
- (c) Providing services to students enrolled in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

**Note:** For purposes of this priority, the Department considers schools that are identified as Tier I or Tier II schools under the School Improvement Grants Program (see 75 FR 66363) as part of a State's approved FY 2009 or FY 2010 applications to be persistently lowest-achieving schools. A list of these Tier I and Tier II schools can be found on the Department's Web site at <http://www2.ed>.

[gov/programs/sif/index.html](http://gov/programs/sif/index.html).

**Strengths:**

Jeremiah Burke High School is designated a Tier 1 school by USDOE. The application demonstrates that the project is designed to address all three of the following priority areas.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/14/2012 02:43 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2012 09:33 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Boston Collegiate Charter School Foundation, Inc. (U282P120025)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Record and potential for success of collaboration</b>		
1. Success of collaboration	15	13
<b>Quality of the lead applicant</b>		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	13
<b>Quality of the project design</b>		
1. Design quality	15	10
<b>Potential for scalability</b>		
1. Scalability	15	12
<b>Innovation</b>		
1. Innovation	15	10
<b>Quality of the Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	9
<b>Sub Total</b>	95	75
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds</b>		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	100	80

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Collaboration Awards - 3: 84.282P

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

Applicant: Boston Collegiate Charter School Foundation, Inc. (U282P120025)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Record and potential for success of collaboration

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant's past or existing collaboration has improved educational outcomes and operational practices; and
- (2) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration and dissemination plan will achieve one or more of the following demonstrable results:
  - (i) Improved operational practices and productivity among all partners in such areas as financial performance and sustainability, governing board performance and stewardship, and parent and community engagement;
  - (ii) Improved student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications);
  - (iii) Improved student attendance and retention, and improved high school graduation rates;
  - (iv) Improved rates of college matriculation and college graduation;
  - (v) Improved rates of attendance and graduation from other postsecondary (i.e., non-college) institutions or programs.

### Strengths:

The application provides an extensive overview of a number of ways that BCCS has collaborated and disseminated best practices over the past few years. The application provides several specific examples of how BCCS has disseminated their best practices by publishing and filming their teachers and core principals (page 19). The application also includes several examples of BCCS participating in conferences.

### Weaknesses:

The application provides several instances of collaboration, the application does not provide any specific examples of collaboration between districts, non-chartered public schools or charter schools.

While the application states that the applicants feel inappropriate crediting themselves for successes in other schools, the application could have stated some of the likely operational or academic outcomes that have occurred as a result of the collaborations.

Reader's Score: 13

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the lead applicant

1. (1) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student achievement (as defined in the NIA) and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school.
- (2) Either--
  - (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school; or
  - (ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)

**(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school and to which significant gains in student achievement (as defined in this notice) have been made with all populations of students served by the charter school.**

**(3) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including, where applicable and available, performance on statewide tests, student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for students from low-income families and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school that are above the average academic achievement results for such students attending other public schools in the State.**

**Strengths:**

The application includes detailed information regarding the extremely high student achievement of BCCS over the past three years. The application provides information regarding student achievement by subgroup and comparison groups to state averages. While BCCS consistently outperformed the state, the more impressive achievement is that BCCS consistently outperformed the state on the percentage of students who scored in the Advanced category on state tests. In Math, BCCS had almost 100% of their students score in the advance category while the state average was under 30%.

**Weaknesses:**

While the application includes information regarding the success of BCCS's high schools students (page 24), it does not provide comprehensive data regarding BCCS's middle school performance. The application only includes information regarding 5th grade performance.

Applicant does not specifically address the closing of achievement gaps for subgroups of students, nor does the applicant provide information comparing the achievement of students from low income families to the achievement of all students.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the project design**

- 1. The extent to which the applicant proposes a high-quality plan to use its Collaboration Award funds to improve educational outcomes and operational practices in public schools, including public charter schools.**

**Strengths:**

The project design does include specific academic targets for the partner school to meet by the end of the grant period. The project design builds on existing strong relationships between the two schools to leverage existing resources to improve student outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not provide sufficient detail regarding the proposed webportal nor demonstrate that BCCS has the capacity to launch such an initiative. In addition, there is insufficient data regarding the proposed 1% solutions or how the project will attract users and other partners.

The application does not provide sufficient research to justify the proposed project design. The application also does not provide a specific evaluation plan for any of the proposed components.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Potential for scalability**

- 1. The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration can be replicated or adapted beyond the participating partners by other public schools or LEAs, including public charter schools and charter**

**school LEAs, and sustained over the long-term.**

**Strengths:**

The application proposes to leverage the technology portion of their project to reach additional partners by sharing best practices. BCCS has provided sufficient information regarding the ability of their best practices to be disseminated via technology.

Additionally, with the significant number of high-quality charter schools in the North East corridor, this partnership arrangement can be duplicated in other states between a high performing school and a low performing school. The only limitation would be the willingness of both schools to be innovative.

**Weaknesses:**

The scalability of this project relies on teacher's human capital at BCCS and the willingness of these teachers to provide extensive technical assistance and development to other potential partner schools. This element of the project is not widely scalable outside of a handful of potential partners that have yet to be identified.

While the technology piece of the proposed project has the potential of being widely disseminated, the application does not include any information or documentation that BCCS has the technological expertise to host such a massive webportal. Additionally, since BCCS has no prior experience developing this type of site, there is no guarantee that the webportal would be structured in such a way that would make the material and content relevant for the long term.

**Reader's Score: 12**

**Selection Criteria - Innovation**

- 1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that its proposed collaboration, as well as its dissemination plan, are either (i) substantially different from other efforts in its area of focus; or (ii) substantially more effective than similar efforts in its area of focus.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to utilize technology in an innovative way to disseminate best practices to a national audience. Additionally, the proposed use of existing high-quality teachers to training the teachers of Burke High School is novel concept and could be replicated in other schools.

**Weaknesses:**

The application provides insufficient information regarding how the proposed project is innovative or how the project would be more effective than similar efforts. The application does not provide results or projected results that would lead the reviewer to believe that this particular webportal would be more effective than the numerous other web-based professional development and curriculum tools widely available.

The application argues that the innovative features of the program rest with the capacity of the proposed personnel and the existing partnership between Boston Collegiate and Burke, but the application does not provide any details on how this partnership is substantially different from other similar partnerships.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
  - (i) **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator; and**
  - (ii) **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

The application provides sufficient detail to document that the project director is extremely qualified to manage this project. The application highlights a number of her accomplishments including winning a Race to the Top grant.

The application provides information regarding the experience of the three project personnel responsible for the professional development efforts of this project. Each project staff member is clearly well qualified to work in the suggested capacity of professional development or leadership of the turnaround school (page 28).

**Weaknesses:**

While the application includes detailed information regarding the four individuals mentioned above, the application does not provide sufficient information regarding the proposed project manager or web content developer. The application explicitly states that funds will be used to contract with individuals to fill both of those roles, but the application does not provide a job description or additional information about how these roles will be incorporated into the project.

**Reader's Score: 8**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposed management plan breaks the key activities and milestones into the three separate goal areas of the project including: partnership; dissemination partnership tools; and dissemination 100 1% solutions. The management plan clearly includes responsible personnel for the each activity included in the management plan and includes milestones for the full two years.

The management plan includes interim benchmarking and includes time for the applicant to modify instructional methods and their dissemination efforts based on the success or failures of the first year of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant has not identified a web vendor nor a video vendor but the project management plan has a very limited timeline on when the vendors will be selected and start working. It is not clear if this timeline is realistic.

The application's project management activity list for the dissemination project is extremely limited and does not include sufficient details to ensure that this portion of the project stays on track throughout the entire two project period.

**Reader's Score: 9**

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds

#### 1. Turning Around Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

**Note:** In order to receive preference under this competitive preference priority, the applicant must specify that it is responding to this competitive preference priority.

To meet this priority, projects must be designed to address one or more of the following priority areas:

(a) Improving student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, or NIA) notice) in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).

(b) Increasing graduation rates (as defined in the NIA) and college enrollment rates for students in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).

(c) Providing services to students enrolled in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

**Note:** For purposes of this priority, the Department considers schools that are identified as Tier I or Tier II schools under the School Improvement Grants Program (see 75 FR 66363) as part of a State's approved FY 2009 or FY 2010 applications to be persistently lowest-achieving schools. A list of these Tier I and Tier II schools can be found on the Department's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>.

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to partner with a tier I school and to increase student achievement and graduation rates at the partner school.

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/17/2012 09:33 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2012 05:15 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Boston Collegiate Charter School Foundation, Inc. (U282P120025)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Record and potential for success of collaboration</b>		
1. Success of collaboration	15	15
<b>Quality of the lead applicant</b>		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	15
<b>Quality of the project design</b>		
1. Design quality	15	15
<b>Potential for scalability</b>		
1. Scalability	15	13
<b>Innovation</b>		
1. Innovation	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	10	10
<b>Sub Total</b>	95	93
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds</b>		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	100	98

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Collaboration Awards - 3: 84.282P

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

Applicant: Boston Collegiate Charter School Foundation, Inc. (U282P120025)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Record and potential for success of collaboration

1. (1) The extent to which the applicant's past or existing collaboration has improved educational outcomes and operational practices; and  
(2) The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration and dissemination plan will achieve one or more of the following demonstrable results:
  - (i) Improved operational practices and productivity among all partners in such areas as financial performance and sustainability, governing board performance and stewardship, and parent and community engagement;
  - (ii) Improved student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications);
  - (iii) Improved student attendance and retention, and improved high school graduation rates;
  - (iv) Improved rates of college matriculation and college graduation;
  - (v) Improved rates of attendance and graduation from other postsecondary (i.e., non-college) institutions or programs.

### Strengths:

BCCS has an extensive established pedigree of excellence both in the community and resources made available to schools. They has served as hosts on numerous occasions and have been an active member of the Boston Charter Compact an active group based on collaborative efforts to improve education outcomes of various low-achieving demographic subgroups, p. 4.

BCCS existing collaboration with Burke HS was found to address the educational outcomes as well as operational practices of that school, p. 5, by working to align their curriculum and assessment to the Common Core State Standards and on performance task creation by making their list of best practices available to the public, p.5.

### Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the lead applicant

1. (1) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student achievement (as defined in the NIA) and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school.  
(2) Either--
  - (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school; or
  - (ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter school and to which significant gains in student achievement (as

defined in this notice) have been made with all populations of students served by the charter school.

(3) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including, where applicable and available, performance on statewide tests, student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for students from low-income families and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter school that are above the average academic achievement results for such students attending other public schools in the State.

**Strengths:**

BCCS has, in Spring 2012 started the "One Dorchester", a formal collaboration between BCCS, Burke HS, and Cristo Rey HS, to implement educational procedures directed toward increasing student achievement and Common Core readiness. In addition, there was an ample amount of quantifiable data included in the proposal from Burke HS available pp. 7-8. This data revealed the planned improvements by including a three-year progression of attendance rate indicators over 85% for 2008-2009 to over 88% in 2010-2011, that was commendable. A comprehensive list of student MCAS data was provided from low income families, p. 24.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the project design**

1. The extent to which the applicant proposes a high-quality plan to use its Collaboration Award funds to improve educational outcomes and operational practices in public schools, including public charter schools.

**Strengths:**

BCCS has designed a comprehensive project design that includes an elaborate, well thought out data-driven intervention plan for its partner schools, p. 9, that includes the ability to provide stipends for teacher leaders, equipment including computers carts for students and cameras, contractual costs including web design and video production contracts, and necessary supplies, that are all cost effective.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**Selection Criteria - Potential for scalability**

1. The extent to which the applicant's proposed collaboration can be replicated or adapted beyond the participating partners by other public schools or LEAs, including public charter schools and charter school LEAs, and sustained over the long-term.

**Strengths:**

There was a plan in place to replicate BCCSs best practices, the creation of an web-based intervention program, and Continuing to leverage the opportunities gained from networking and collaboration efforts will add considerably to keep the replication process refreshed.

**Weaknesses:**

Because there is an online component, there is a probable concern for computers as a deterrent to the low-performing schools in low-income areas which are the schools that need this replication process.

**Reader's Score:** 13

**Selection Criteria - Innovation**

1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that its proposed collaboration, as well as its dissemination plan, are either (i) substantially different from other efforts in its area of focus; or (ii) substantially more effective than similar efforts in its area of focus.

**Strengths:**

There were many approaches discussed that can be considered innovation, such as the creation of an online data-driven intervention program, sharing personalized assessment process unique to BCCS, and providing one-on-one customized implementation strategies for teachers from partnership schools to also receive stipends during this process.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score:** 15

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

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:
  - (i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator; and
  - (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

**Strengths:**

The four main project personnel are not all from the same school, and are all highly qualified. In addition, a chart, p. 30, included in the proposal, described the list of activities association with the management and implementation of these collaborative effort that identified responsibilities and activities assigned to a particular project manager.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found

**Reader's Score:** 10

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

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

**Strengths:**

The management plan appeared to have addressed all listed criteria according to the Secretary of Education. The objectives, goals, prescribed strategies to alleviate potential obstacles, and funding allocations list, all correlate with the Partnership for data-driven intervention on the path to college, management and implementation plan on p. 30. These all demonstrate the sound quality of the plan. In addition, there were eight project design strengths listed, p. 25, as well as a clearly defined list of activities and responsibilities designated to specific personnel, timelines, and milestones to successfully perform project goals.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds**

**1. Turning Around Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools**

**Note:** In order to receive preference under this competitive preference priority, the applicant must specify that it is responding to this competitive preference priority.

To meet this priority, projects must be designed to address one or more of the following priority areas:

- (a) Improving student achievement (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications, or NIA) notice) in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).
- (b) Increasing graduation rates (as defined in te NIA) and college enrollment rates for students in persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA).
- (c) Providing services to students enrolled in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

**Note:** For purposes of this priority, the Department considers schools that are identified as Tier I or Tier II schools under the School Improvement Grants Program (see 75 FR 66363) as part of a State's approved FY 2009 or FY 2010 applications to be persistently lowest-achieving schools. A list of these Tier I and Tier II schools can be found on the Department's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>.

**Strengths:**

Boston Collegiate has provided a detailed description of their existing collaboration partnership Task Team that will support partner schools by sharing their work, school leaders in training, school visitations, and further collaborative dissemination efforts p. 1, that is commendable. Boston Collegiate has an extensive formal collaboration initiative called, One Dorchester p.5, by initiating their partnership relationship with Jeremiah E. Burke High School and Cristo Rey Boston High School prior to this grant process.

Also, Jeremy E. Burke HS is a Tier I school as a low-achieving schools, BCCS is eligible for grant consideration.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/17/2012 05:15 PM