

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/13/2012 11:42 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Metro Atlanta Collaborative (U282P120021)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Record and potential for success of collaboration		
1. Success of collaboration	15	15
Quality of the lead applicant		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	11
Quality of the project design		
1. Design quality	15	15
Potential for scalability		
1. Scalability	15	13
Innovation		
1. Innovation	15	11
Quality of the Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	7
Sub Total	95	80
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Collaboration Awards - 1: 84.282P

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: KIPP Metro Atlanta Collaborative (U282P120021)

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:

KIPP Metro Atlanta provided evidence of past collaboration efforts with partners such as Teach for America, Mercer University, The New Teacher Project, and Sammie E. Coan Middle School which all have contributed to improving educational outcomes and operational practices (p 1). Most notably is KIPP's partnership with Atlanta Public Schools (APS). Since 2007, KIPP and APS have been collaborating to disseminate the best practices of the high performing urban charter and urban middle schools (p 2). The proposed collaboration with B.E.S.T. Academy Middle School (BEST) will improve student academic achievement by creating a strong school culture and equipping teachers with instructional strategies and data analysis training to better enhance instruction (p 8-11).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

The applicant provides data which demonstrates successful academic achievement of all students from 2010-2012 (p 14). In all 3 years of data presented, the applicant outperforms the State and local district.

Weaknesses:

The response would have been strengthened if the applicant had provided 3 years of subgroup data or a note indicating this data was not necessary because subgroups do not exist. Without this information, it is impossible for the reader to determine if the applicant addressed part 2 of selection criteria 2.

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 applicant proposes a high-quality plan which focuses on the professional development of the teachers and leaders of the partner school (p 16-17). The professional development opportunities detailed will yield results that will improve educational outcomes in all participating schools. The response is strengthened by the inclusion of a timeline, specific project goals which include one-on-one coaching and intensive professional development, and expected outcomes for the project (p 18-22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

The applicant's project, intensive professional development of the teachers and leaders of B.E.S.T. Middle School, does have the potential to be easily replicated by other schools in the nation. The plan described is extremely detailed and includes easily adaptable strategies such as peer-to-peer mentoring. The applicant mentions information about the project will be disseminated to other school districts (e 23).

Weaknesses:

The response would have been strengthened if the applicant addressed specific methods for disseminating the project to other schools (e 23).

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 applicants proposed project indicates it is unique because charter schools in the area do not provide professional development and one-on-one coaching (e 23). The model provides an intensity that is not typical in the school setting. Professional development opportunities in this model provide for on-going trainings and substantially follow up to ensure successful implementation. Due to the applicants size of the network, they have the ability to disseminate information about the project to other schools in the nation.

Weaknesses:

The response could have been strengthened if the applicant had provided more detail around how this partnership is unique in relation to the public schools as well.

Reader's Score: 11

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 applicant identifies 4 KIPP personnel, including the Director of Leadership Development who is identified as the project director. All personnel has the relevant qualifications and training to carry out this project (P24-26). The executive director has experience as the founding principal of KIPP Ways and has overseen the growth and development of KIPP Metro Atlanta.

Weaknesses:

The response would have been strengthened if the applicant had indicated the roles the remaining 3 personnel would play in 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 applicant provides a general management plan which includes goals of the proposed project and expected outcomes (p20-21) along with a general timeline for completion (p 27).

Weaknesses:

The response would have been strengthened if the applicant had provided clearly defined responsibilities for each task of the project along with milestones for accomplishing each task.

Reader's Score: 7

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:

A response to this priority was not included.

Weaknesses:

A response to this priority was not included.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/13/2012 11:42 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2012 06:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Metro Atlanta Collaborative (U282P120021)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Record and potential for success of collaboration		
1. Success of collaboration	15	14
Quality of the lead applicant		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	10
Quality of the project design		
1. Design quality	15	14
Potential for scalability		
1. Scalability	15	15
Innovation		
1. Innovation	15	11
Quality of the Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	8
Sub Total	95	80
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Collaboration Awards - 1: 84.282P

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: KIPP Metro Atlanta Collaborative (U282P120021)

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 evidence of successful collaborations with a number of entities including Teach for America, Mercer University, Georgias New Teacher Project, a traditional middle school and the Atlanta Public Schools. Data supporting the success of a professional development cohort opportunity presented to teachers throughout the Metro Atlanta region is presented. The application demonstrates strong potential for success in the area of student achievement. The KIPP model and strategies that have a track record of producing strong achievement results in KIPP schools will be shared with their partner in the collaboration. The demographics of KIPP Metro Atlanta and its partner school are similar in that over 85 percent of students come from low-income families. KIPP schools have a track record of high achievement, high graduation and college matriculation rates. (p. 1, 5-6).

The application presents data on student achievement of KIPP Metro Atlanta with the partner school and two traditional middle schools that serve the same demographic. KIPP out-performs the comparison schools in all areas of achievement. (p. 6). Discipline and attendance for the partner school is presented indicating high levels of disciplinary actions and poor student attendance. KIPP presents strong data in both of these areas that they attribute to the practices that are identified in the proposed collaboration. (p. 7)

Weaknesses:

The application does not address how operational practices of past or existing collaborations have been improved.

Reader's Score: 14

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 applicant demonstrates a consistently high achievement rate over the past nine years, outperforming state and district averages. Data for the past three years was presented for eight grade students that indicate higher scores in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies than the both district and statewide scores reflect. Seventy-eight percent of KIPP students at KIPP Metro Atlanta are eligible for free and reduced price meals.

The graduation rate is 92% and is significantly higher than the local public schools where almost half of all students do not graduate. The matriculation to college rate is 83% for KIPP Metro Atlanta students with 77% of students still enrolled, which is significantly above the national average for students from low-income families (41% enroll in college and 8.3% earn a degree by their mid-twenties). The student retention rate for KIPP Metro Atlanta students is 90%.

(p. 13).

Weaknesses:

The application does not address subgroups of students and achievement results. The applicant would need to address the success in closing achievement gaps for subgroups or address gains in student achievement for all students to complete this prompt.

Reader's Score: 10

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 application demonstrates a comprehensive, high-quality plan to improve educational outcomes. Professional development workshops will be reinforced with observation and mentoring. Teachers and the principal from the partner school will be invited to participate in the weeklong KIPP School Summit and the KIPP School Leadership Programs Principal Prep Program. In addition, individualized mentoring and leadership training will be provided. Students will be mentored and supported by the organization 100 Black Men of Atlanta. KIPP Metro Atlanta and the Atlanta Public Schools Office of Innovation will disseminate information about the collaboration along with best practices throughout the state. (pgs. 15-20)

The plan is broken into two phases with specific timelines and activities. Goals and outcomes are clearly stated.

Expected outcomes are tied not only to implementation of the project but to student achievement, student and teacher attendance and discipline.

Weaknesses:

Operational practices are not addressed.

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 application presents a comprehensive plan for both scalability and sustainability including timelines and specific activities. A clear and succinct dissemination plan with four phases covering 4 years is proposed that includes replicating the project, capacity building and planning a strategic rollout of professional development for both teachers and school leaders. The plan also includes working with Atlanta Public Schools to develop training materials, identify and train future trainers thereby building long-term sustainability. (p. 22)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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 cites the lack of partnerships in Georgia where professional development and one-on-one coaching and consultation with traditional schools is occurring. In addition, as KIPP is a large network serving 125 schools in 19 states, the ability to disseminate information to a large number of schools in expanded geographical areas is greatly enhanced. (p. 23)

Weaknesses:

The application states there are few charter schools in Georgia that offer what is proposed in their collaboration. The applicant would need to provide information about those schools and their partnerships to determine how their proposed collaboration is different and/or why their proposal will be more successful than other similar efforts.

Reader's Score: 11

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 personnel who will carry out the proposed project have relevant professional training and experience. Three members from KIPP Metro Atlanta will work with the principal of the partner school. Professional experiences of these members include, but are not limited to, school management and leadership, leadership coaching, team building, professional development and curriculum. The project leader, a psychologist, founded and directed three schools in Atlanta and provides leadership coaching, group facilitation, teambuilding and professional development to school leaders. The group has strong capabilities to implement the project and to provide oversight. (pgs. 24-26)

Weaknesses:

The roles of the key personnel, other than the project lead, were not stated.

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 application provides a strong and comprehensive management plan that appears adequate to achieve the objectives of the project. Outcomes, including student achievement, the impact on teacher quality and feedback from all stakeholders, are clearly defined. Progress will be monitored consistently.

A project timeline including responsibilities and personnel assignments are included in two phases in addition to a planning/capacity building period. A partnership agreement between KIPP Metro Atlanta and the partner school is presented with specific roles and responsibilities, goals and outcomes, allocation of funds, and duration/termination of the partnership. The budget supports the plan. (pgs. 26-29)

Weaknesses:

The responsibilities of personnel are not included. Milestones are not identified.

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>.

Strengths:

This section was not addressed.

Weaknesses:

This section was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2012 06:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2012 04:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Metro Atlanta Collaborative (U282P120021)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Record and potential for success of collaboration		
1. Success of collaboration	15	15
Quality of the lead applicant		
1. Lead applicant quality	15	12
Quality of the project design		
1. Design quality	15	15
Potential for scalability		
1. Scalability	15	15
Innovation		
1. Innovation	15	9
Quality of the Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	10	8
Sub Total	95	82
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Persistently Lowest-Achieving School Turnarounds		
1. Turn Around Schools	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	100	82

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Collaboration Awards - 1: 84.282P

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: KIPP Metro Atlanta Collaborative (U282P120021)

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 applicant has chronicled a collaborative history of over eight years. The collaboration includes Teach for America, Mercer University, the New Teacher Project, and Sammie Coan Middle School (p.1-2). KIPP has hosted symposiums, administrative trainings and internships to enhance the skills of partner schools in Atlanta. KIPP Metro Atlanta has presented three years of trend data that demonstrates success not only on the Georgia Criterion Reference Competence Test, but also in respect to attendance and graduation rates (p.14).

Weaknesses:

None noted

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:

The applicant has a history of success within and outside the State. The three year trend data depicted on pps. 13-14 shows results that exceed the State average and the city averages across all disciplines. The applicant reveals successful high school graduation rates (92%) that exceed the State average according to the Georgia Report Cards and provides impressive results for students matriculating to college.

Weaknesses:

In the narrative, the applicant identifies demographic information that addresses lower social economic students and high minority enrollment students. The reader can infer that the presented data applies to those two historically underrepresented groups. What is not evident, however, is the number of special education students and/or English language learners whose achievement data should be included in the narrative to create a comprehensive picture of the quality of the lead applicant.

Reader's Score: 12

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 strength of this criterion is met in the two prong approach to enhancing the skills of the front line teachers and the principal as the educational leader. The leadership design includes a three day orientation, a five week summer institute, three weekend retreats, and a two week residency (p. 17). The design for the teachers includes monthly professional development focused on improved quality of instruction, student engagement and building a school culture. There are also opportunities to observe KIPP teachers and to be observed by a master KIPP teacher (p.16). The collaboration extends to KIPP Metro as they will have the opportunity to benefit from BEST's partnership with 100 Black Men of Atlanta.

Weaknesses:

None noted

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 are two strengths that support the scalability potential of this design. First, the applicant has identified specific outcomes (p.21) that can be used as a guide toward replication. Second, the applicant has embedded in the design a replication protocol (p.22) that includes joint planning and capacity building. The replication model is presented as a two

phase roll out.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

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 structure of the professional development support for both the educational leadership team and the teachers is multi-model in approach based on the data presented in the section on program design (p.17). Principals have the opportunity to spend time in residence as well as benefit from individual coaching. Teachers have the opportunity to observe and be observed as they develop a unique classroom culture of excellence.

Weaknesses:

The applicant missed an opportunity to herald the innovations that have been fine-tuned over a decade. Rather than stating that "few programs such as the KIPP model exist in the country", the applicant should have used this section to address KIPP's Five Pillars and Doug Lemov's techniques portrayed in Teach Like a Champion that have proven to have a major impact in turning schools around. Those two aspects are a substantial difference from other collaborative models.

Reader's Score: 9

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 personnel directly involved in this project represent a team of individuals that are diverse demographically, professionally and academically. Drawing from prior partnership arrays, project personal have experience as former Teach for America Staff (p.25) and as alternative route teacher candidates, while some have knowledge of strategic planning and community psychology. The varied personnel experience allows for a range of situational responses perhaps not encountered in a traditional educational venue.

Weaknesses:

Three personnel identified in the project did not have clearly defined roles. It is critical to the smooth operation of the proposal that all personnel have specifically defined tasks enumerated in the management plan.

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 applicant presented a table that outlines Phase I and Phase II professional development activities (p.27-28). The table responds to the criterion requirement of milestones for accomplishing the design task as it sequences planning and participation by both the teachers and the administration over two years. In addition, included in the narrative on p.26, the applicant references assessment of the school culture as being measured through end of the year parent satisfaction surveys. This aspect of the plan addresses the adequacy of meeting the objectives in relation to the school culture. Included in the appendices is the Teacher Performance Review that will be used as part of the professional development growth model to improve delivery of instruction. Using that model with mid-year and end of the year performance ratings will insure that teachers are meeting the goals for mastery teaching.

Weaknesses:

In a generally well-structured proposal, this criterion lacks a level of cohesiveness needed to formulate a solid plan. The table does not list each person's responsibilities for training. The table also does not identify milestones. The framework for Excellent Teaching (p.50) does contain mid-year and end of year indicators, but the reader found a lack of organization to the plan that may impact its quality. The applicant should consider arranging all of the data from the table, appendices, and narrative into a template that is more cogently available to participants and external reviewers who may be looking to replicate the collaboration.

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>.

Strengths:

None noted

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2012 04:24 PM