

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/27/2010 9:40 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396C100081)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 22: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396C100081)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

A key strength of this proposal is EPP's strong presentation of extensive and compelling national, state and local data, which highlight the dismal academic achievement and educational outcomes of foster youth. The proposal clearly illuminates the need for an intense focus on the educational progress of this unique group of students (Project Narrative, p.5).

Further, EPP provides a strong reminder that service systems that rely on vast bureaucracies operating in isolation do not effectively address the educational needs of foster youth. As the proposal indicates, caring for foster youth involves complex administrative and educational obstacles. Key to fixing any system, is first recognizing that it is broken and ineffective. EPP has effectively noted that the present traditional system of caring for foster youth is radically broken.

EPP's track-record demonstrates that it has moved well beyond the "problem recognition" phase of reform. EPP has targeted and pre-tested a multi-tiered solution to reclaim foster youth from falling through the cracks. Specifically, EPP has improved services for foster youth by concentrating on increasing inter-agency collaboration; conducting educational intake assessments; creating individualized learning plans; and providing tutoring and remediation services. Data obtained from evaluations related to these improved services reveal that the EPP approach is working and holds promise for alleviating perpetual foster youth failure (Project Narrative, p. 10, 12).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as**

demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

CYFC provided a detailed overview of their work managing over \$35 million in federal, state, and foundation funds (Project Narrative, p. 15).

The proposal also highlights the development and expansion of an agency that began with one staff member serving 25 foster youth, to one that now employs more than 250 staff members serving more than 4,000 students in some of our nation's most challenged schools.

The proposal specifically indicates that the agency has tested and implemented various programs addressing the critical needs associated with foster youth and other underperforming children. Program enrollment numbers range from 225 - 4000 students, depending on program type.

Achievement: The proposal provided explicit data pertaining to high school graduation and college acceptance rates, as well as scores on various assessments (Project Narrative, p.17).

As evidenced from the enrollment and program expansion and numbers listed above, as well as achievement gains, this nonprofit has significantly improved student achievement and retention through its record of work with LEAs and schools (Project Narrative, pp. 14-17).

Weaknesses

The proposal presents data demonstrating significant achievement for improving the outcomes of underperforming youth. The success rates for foster students' a) overall academic performance, b) high school diplomas earned, and c) acceptance into post-secondary institutions, are impressive. However, because the data is presented strictly in percentages, the number of actual students the report represents is unknown. The number of students served by the pilot project is first reported as 63 (Project Narrative, p. 13) and later reported as 183 (Project Narrative, p. 21); as to which number is correct, is difficult to determine.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring

to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

EPP anticipates significantly improving the educational outcomes of 700 of the 1,000 foster students enrolled in the MUSD and PUSD school districts. The agency has already demonstrated strong success in building partnerships which increase and strengthen the likelihood of this project achieving its proposed goals (Appendix H: Partner Organization Charts for Education Pilot Project and Children Youth and Family Collaborative).

Data substantiating cost analysis benefits, cross-sector information sharing, as well as managing a wide range of programs and services, which have already produced concrete life-changing outcomes for foster youth verify that this organization's strategy to scale-up is more than theoretical. Cost per student at start-up is estimated to be \$18,502. At full scale the cost per student drops to \$15,000.

Letters of support from every key stakeholder indicate EPP's likely chance for continued success with the proposed project. Although the agency has a specific focus on foster youth, the project structure is suitable in any region

where stakeholders are willing to partner to improve outcomes for foster youth, and already has been replicated with other at-risk youths.

The proposal indicated that the capacity to expand is enhanced through EPP's efforts to document the service model with a compendium; desk protocols; position manuals and job descriptions; implementation and program manuals; training DVD's; and Memorandum of Understanding delineating the roles and responsibilities of each partner. In addition CYFC has developed a sophisticated student-management database that maintains voluminous data on each participant for program and evaluation purposes.

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 proposal included letters of endorsement from all key stakeholders, including the senior management of the Pomona and Montebello Unified School Districts; the L.A. County Department of Children and Family Services; the L.A. County Board of Supervisors-First District; L.A. County Education Coordinating Council; the Annenberg Foundation; and Casey Family Programs (Appendix D: Letters of Support).

The potential for incorporating planned project activities, benefits, and the ongoing work of the EPP is clearly spelled out throughout the application (Project Narrative) as well as through the attached Proprietary Information packet (Appendix G: Individual Learning Plan, and Program Operating Manual).

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

A key strength of the management plan is the educational background and real world experience (e.g., program development, community organizing, as well as legal, fundraising, and government grant experience) the project director and staff bring to overseeing the proposed initiative (Appendix C: Resume for Lydia Cincore Templeton and staff).

Equally important, this proposal brings a laser-like focus to improving and sustaining the educational trajectory of 700 hundred foster youth. Absent access to the proposed program, these students are likely to fall through more than the "educational" cracks of life. Based on the agency's previous successes and ability to target a caseload of 400 students per year, achieving the identified project goals and milestones is highly probable. As EPP's work expands, the proposed management plan will continue to build on organizational relationships and structures already in place, thus enhancing further opportunity for replication.

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Preference not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 proposal explicitly addresses college readiness issues through the tutoring, pre-emancipation planning, as well as "Level Up" college

enrollment promotion services that focus on weekly sessions sharing college knowledge, guidance for applications and financial aid. This program serves 452 students per year (Project Narrative, p. 15).

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Numerous programs support the unique learning needs of students with disabilities and LEP students; but perhaps the most powerful support extends from the cross-sector data sharing, which is made available to all care and educational providers through the proposal design (Appendix G: Proprietary Information).

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools.

To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Preference not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/27/2010 9:40 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 8:51 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396C100081)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 22: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396C100081)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

There is extensive data to support the need for this project through the data analyses conducted by ECC. P 5, 6

This applicant provides solid support from the ECC study in 2006 to indicate

the uniqueness of the approach. P 6

Students are included in decision-making. In the opinion of this reader, student engagement is likely to increase student achievement. P 9

The outcomes presented are measurable, citing specific numbers of students and schools to be served and specific hours of activities. P 10 - 12

Goals are clearly written. p 10-12

Weaknesses

It would have strengthened this proposal if the applicant had stated the outcomes for Goal # 2 to indicate that a higher percentage would be statistically significant. P 11

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The current program demonstrates success and is a strong indicator of a successful project. P 10

This applicant provides evidence of projects serving over 4,100 students per year. This supports the applicant's ability to implement a project of this size and scope.

The value-added analysis adds an additional dimension of support for the success of this project. This found that students meeting the threshold for high dosage had math and ELA scores that exceeded their predicted gains.p 17

Weaknesses

There is a slight discrepancy regarding the number of students served by the pilot project on pages 13 and 21. On page 13 it states that 63 youth participated in the pilot. On page 21 it states that the pilot project is serving 183 students.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

There is a clear explanation of how the role of the lead agency would change as this project is implemented and scaled up. P 22, 23

The applicant has developed extensive resources, such as a compendium, dsek protocols, position manuals and job descriptions, and implementation and planning manuals, for new partners to be able to implement this project with fidelity. P 22

The applicant stated the number of students to be served for each year of the project. p 21

The applicant estimated the cost of scaling up the project to 100,000 and 500,000. As the volume of students increased, the program would be more cost-effective. p 22

Weaknesses

It would have strengthened this proposal to have addressed the complexities of developing partnerships among multiple agencies and provided more detail on how this would be accomplished.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

This applicant provided a history of stakeholder support and past sustainability of the program. P 23

Monetary commitments are clearly outlined. This further demonstrates support that would contribute to sustainability. P 24

Since this applicant has already completed a pilot project for this proposal, the potential and planning for the incorporation of the project is enhanced. p 24

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 provides clearly defined tasks, timelines, and milestones.

The staff is exceptionally well qualified due to their educational qualifications and experience with the target population.p 26

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

(0 or 1 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

Applicant did not address this competitive preference.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 specific program component, Level Up, provides weekly sessions that address this competitive preference through sessions sharing college knowledge, guidance for applications and financial aid for high school

students. P 3

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The data from the pilot program provided by this applicant indicates that the program has benefitted LEP students showing that as their program time increased, achievement improved. P 3

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or

improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Applicant did not address this competitive preference.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 8:51 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 9:18 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396C100081)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 22: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396C100081)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The need for this project is very well established at the beginning of the narrative section. For example, data provided on pages 5-6 regarding youth in the foster care system (e.g., dropout percentages, percentages performing below grade level) demonstrate the neediness of this population. The

analysis also shows convincingly the importance of the various educational and social agencies working collaboratively in addressing these challenges, and it also outlines a set of educational interventions that could make a significant difference for this population.

The proposal presents a comprehensive articulation of goals and objectives on pages 10-12, together with a set of associated outcomes, that are responsive to the needs established on the previous pages.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The submitting organization is clearly experienced in implementing projects of this scope and complexity, and the various collaborating organizations and agencies reflect a diverse, well-respected and community-based set of

resources. A variety of previous grants and projects are briefly described on page 15.

The section on results (pages 13-14) presents data from some earlier efforts, in which the successes of graduates are documented. This section is supplemented by data on student academic achievement which is presented on pages 16-17. Overall, the results of their work to date, working with a very challenging and needy population, have been very favorable with regard to student achievement and graduation rates.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate

information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The number of students to be involved is stated on page 21, and the cost analysis of the scaling-up is provided on the following page.

The consortium of organizations and agencies mentioned earlier in the proposal, with letters included in the Appendix, has extensive contacts in the community and can disseminate information about the project widely and effectively, as well as assist in the project's replication.

Weaknesses

As noted, the project would be expensive to scale up. While a persuasive explanation is given of trade-offs for not investing in a program like this, the proposal still fails to indicate where additional revenue might be found to support a significant scaling up of this effort.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Given the experience and reputations of the partner organizations involved in this project, there is a very good likelihood that this project could be sustained beyond the period of Federal funding. As noted on page 23, this organization has never had to discontinue a program due to lack of funding. Letters of support in the Appendix are provided from a wide variety of key stakeholders, reinforcing their interest in, and support for this effort.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 Management Plan presented on pages 24-25 contains tasks, timelines and milestones. It is comprehensive and thoughtful. Having both an Executive Team and an Operations Team will help insure that all aspects of the project are overseen competently and comprehensively.

The staff involved are experienced and well qualified in appropriate areas.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 proposal addresses a number of issues related to college preparedness, expectations and readiness. As noted in the introductory section, the applicant is especially concerned with college attending and graduation rates, as well as a college access program.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must

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

Strengths

The proposal addresses the unique learning needs of students in the foster care system. The applicant provides data that show that many of the students served are classified in the special education system and that a large percentage are English Language Learners. As indicated in the introductory section, the program has been able to show success with these challenging populations (e.g., 100% have passed the California High school exit exam.)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 9:18 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 12:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396D100081)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396D100081)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 demonstrated that there were research-based findings that support the proposed study, e.g., Casey Family Programs and the Harvard Family Research Project's evaluation, etc. (p.12-13). In addition, the pilot study showed promising results although the sample size was small (p.13).

Weaknesses

The hypothesis or program theory needs to be elaborated to support the proposed project. The applicant did not demonstrate very clearly why the project would likely have positive impact if funded.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The matched comparison group design is appropriate for the proposed project (p.18). There was an informative evaluation plan (p.19), and the answers to the proposed research questions will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, etc. (p.20)

Weaknesses

Although the proposal had budgeted for the external evaluation, some key information about the evaluator (Harder+Company) was not provided, e.g., information of the principal evaluator.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 12:58 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396D100081)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	19
TOTAL	25	19

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Advancement Through Opportunity and Knowledge -- Children Youth and Family Collaborative, - Children Youth and Family Collaborative, (U396D100081)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

A brief description of an evaluation for an integrated service model, a report on the use of tutors in charter high schools, and a publication featuring collection and sharing of student information is given as research-based findings (pgs. 12-13). The pilot with 63 students offered positive results with partners working together to improve student achievement. The applicant describes how the project will impact youth in terms of positive outcomes in achievement and more hopeful attitudes about themselves (pg. 14).

Weaknesses

The research evidence did not strongly connect to or support the proposed project as a whole. Also, it would have been valuable if they had looked at how a similar approach was used with ELLs or at-risk students in general. Little information is provided about the design and implementation of the pilot, which was given as evidence for a project previously attempted.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following

factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The project will employ a full-time data coordinator and an external evaluator (pg. 17). The evaluation will use a quasi-experimental design with matched groups. Semi-annual assessments of student performance and quarterly feedback on program implementation will be provided. The key questions that they expect the evaluation to answer are reasonable to the project and are in measurable terms. Sufficient resources for the evaluation are shown: the evaluator has experience with community-based organizations and programs serving foster youth and a full-time Data Coordinator will work with project partners and assist the evaluator in collecting data (pgs. 17, 20-21).

Weaknesses

It was not shown how the following aspects would be evaluated: Goal 1 in terms of project implementation, and Goal 2 in terms of GPA, attendance, passing sections of Math and Language Arts, receiving diplomas, and enrolling in postsecondary schools. The process for revising the training program (Goal 3) was not detailed. How the implementation data and performance feedback would be utilized was not discussed.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:12 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/18/2010 11:19 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 42: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The CollegeYes program directly addresses the i3 grant Absolute Priority 3. The program is designed to meet the needs of high-risk students in the Los Angeles area. The program has a focus on English Language Learners. 92% of the students receive free or reduced lunch. Its design is intended to prepare these students for college or post-graduate career

paths. The goals of the project are clearly set and measurable.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The supervising board of the project, The Alliance, have conducted several projects with greater size and scope than the CollegeYES proposal. Previously they have partnered with the Mayor of Los Angeles in the construction of a Math and Science Charter High School. The Alliance group has a demonstrated track record of improving student achievement for high-risk students - all of their schools have outperformed traditional schools with similar demographics.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The grant writers have a demonstrated track record of developing and expanding programs successfully in the LA area. Given appropriate funding, the program could be replicated in districts across the country. The proposal clearly estimates to costs to expand the program all the way to 500,000 students.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 Alliance group has an extensive history of successful fundraising activities in the past. Key stakeholders such as the Ahmanson Foundation and the Gates Foundation, as well as others, have pledged continued support for the project. 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 area clearly defined.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan has been thoroughly developed, with specific budgetary needs and goals identified for each phase of the project. The project director has extensive experience in helping low-performing public schools, and her support staff have the skill sets needed to support her in this role.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 STEM courses and Advisory periods designed into the program provide students with the practical knowledge needed regarding college expectations, affordability, and financial assistance available.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Approximately 25% of students in the Alliance schools are ESL students. The CollegeYES principles address the unique learning needs of these students.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2010 11:19 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/27/2010 2:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 42: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant has paired two central goals for meeting this priority on college and career readiness by integrating innovative uses of technology and project-based learning with STEM courses and college counseling experiences. With a Latino population of 86%, and high poverty rates in these Los Angeles schools, the applicant is clearly serving an unmet need by providing these opportunities for students. The use of students as technology leaders is especially innovative, cost effective, and promising in terms of

increasing student engagement and motivation.

Weaknesses

The application narrative is not very specific on how the professional development plan will address STEM content and project-based learning, especially as it pertains to the annual STEM student projects.

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The non-profit charter school operator established the first high school in 2004 and has impressively scaled up to a total of 17 middle and high schools in just 6 years, with 3 more planned during the grant period. The 99% graduation rate and 73% college attendance rates are also very impressive given the depressing fact that only 30% of students are proficient on the CST in middle school years. The implementation partner, Kijana Voices, has over a decade of experience and proven track record in meaningful professional development and increasing student achievement.

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

<p>The strategies for scaling up and dissemination involving conferences, publications, and community outreach are all excellent. Foundation partners are impressive and will enable targets to be reached in the grant period provided there are no glitches in opening three new schools. The plan for integration into courses is a bonus for continued development of the project as it becomes increasingly institutionalized.</p>

Weaknesses

The applicant's estimates for costs to scale up to big targets seem low given the high dependence on delicate technology such as laptops and tablets with mobile functionality that have costly upgrades and repairs. Details in how those estimates were calculated are missing.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant has demonstrated success in diversified fundraising, and has a track record of scaling up the school model quickly and effectively. Creating course integration from the outset is also a strategy that will likely enable ongoing support for the project, and resources that will be built into future school budgets.

Weaknesses

The continued training of student technology leaders and new teachers beyond the grant period is not specifically addressed and could pose an onerous cost and time burden. The institutionalization described through policy, procedures, programs and budgets lacks specifics and details on how this will be accomplished, particularly regarding summer training for teachers.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

All partners have experience working on technology integration and project-based learning in high-needs urban schools with clear parameters and defined responsibilities that also involve teachers, parents, and students. Timelines provide details and are broken down by quarter. There is potential for additional funding from the private sector as the project moves forward so goals should be accomplished without budgeting difficulties. All personnel are highly qualified and committed to the goals and desired outcomes of the project based on prior experiences and successes.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

N/A: The proposal did not apply for this competitive preference category.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 project is specifically designed to improve student achievement for college readiness and success, as well as prepare students for college entrance procedures. There is explicit instruction in understanding financial aspects of college. Peers and adults are used in leadership roles to assist with support and dissemination of project's goals.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

The proposed project is designed for a high percentage of limited English proficient students and an overall Latino population of 86%. The programs proposed are specifically designed to increase college and career readiness and maintain high graduation rates for these populations.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

N/A: The proposal did not apply for this competitive preference category.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/27/2010 2:57 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 7:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 42: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposed project is targeting a high need student population. The 17 schools in the Alliance Network are 86% Hispanic, 13% African American, 23% ELL, 6% Special Education students and 92% of students participate in the Free/Reduced Meal Program.

With the addition of 3 schools in 2011, the project will serve 10,000 students.

The goals of the program are clearly stated and measurable. They are challenging but reasonable for the proposed project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The Alliance has demonstrated the ability to implement a project of the size and scope of the one proposed. Examples of past project successes include the Construction of a Math/Science High School on the CSULA Campus, the opening of 13 new charter schools over a 4 year period and the Center for Math and Science Instruction Partnership with Loyola Marymount University.

The Alliance has provided evidence that they have increased student achievement in the past by almost all subgroups increased performance on

the CST for 2008-2009. All Alliance schools outperformed nearby traditional schools on the CST.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The number of students targeted is appropriate and attainable for the proposed project.

Alliance and Kijana Voices have demonstrated the capacity for replicating programs and scaling them to a larger group through opening additional successful charter schools and the STL program.

The applicant has provided reasonable costs to scale the project to 500,000 students.

The plan for dissemination is detailed and includes avenues such as conferences, professional networks, professional associations and publications.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant has demonstrated support of ongoing work. Foundation supports include Ahmanson Foundation, Gates Foundation, and Baxtor Family Foundation.

The project design lends itself to incorporation into the Alliance School Network.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Key personnel have been identified and project responsibilities are clearly identified. Key personnel have the experience and expertise to implement the proposed project.

A detailed timeline with attainable milestones for the project is provided.

The budget detail is appropriate for the project and clearly presented.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 College Yes program targets all of the objectives for Competitive Preference Priority 6 including college expectations, college affordability, financial aid and the college application process.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

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

Strengths

The proposed project targets Special Education students as well as English Language Learners.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 7:14 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100321)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	8
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 05: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100321)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 identified a number of program variables that program developers hypothesize affect the expected outcomes. The authors also describe studies of the outcomes of Tech-Yes programs, the findings of which support the proposed project. The results of the described meta-analyses, in particular, provide good evidence and support for the proposed intervention. The description of the previous implementation of the STL component of the intervention is a strength of the proposal.

Weaknesses

A stronger explanation of the similarities between TechYES and CollegeYES would have strengthened the proposal.

The applicant does not provide information about the expected magnitude of the effect of CollegeYES on the expected outcomes. Page 15 identifies outcomes of a previous implementation of the STL component but the way in which the results are reported does not provide a good indication of the magnitude of the change. Details about the potential impact of the project on student outcomes would have been helpful.

Reader's Score: 8

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The evaluation methods are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project. The CBAM and Guskey models offer appropriate frameworks for data collection and analysis. The evaluation plan calls for the collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data from a variety of stakeholders. The strength of this plan is that it will likely provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings. Also, the evaluation plan allows for the sharing of evaluation data to allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. These elements of the plan will allow for a comprehensive review of the project and support program implementation and formative review.

The identified resources should be sufficient to carry out the project evaluation.

Weaknesses

The weakness in the evaluation plan is the lack of details about how student outcome data will be collected and analyzed as well as an overall description of methods of data analysis and how the various data sources will be integrated to tell a complete story of implementation and outcomes.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:43 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 1:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100321)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	23
TOTAL	25	23

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 05: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100321)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

B. Factor #1

The proposed project uses research-based findings to develop the hypotheses (p. 2). The 'causal chain' of events of the intervention is nicely articulated showing how they eventually impact the key indicators. This includes referencing the Carpenter study (p. 8) and a justification of the project hypothesis and its research underpinnings (p. 12). Finally, the description of the meta-analyses conducted previously on project-based learning (p. 14) helps lend confidence to the hypothesis proposed.

B. Factor #2

The intervention proposed is based on 'rigorous California State standards' (p. 8). They are also aligning with the 'ISTE Technology and the 21st Century Skills Standards' which complement California's standards. There is a lengthy discussion of the previous implementation of the STL project (P. 14-15).

B. Factor #3

The proposal discusses quite well how the research as well as previous implementation of the intervention would suggest a positive impact of the intervention on the student achievement (p. 14-16) as well as 'college readiness, student efficacy and confidence, and learning skills.' (p. 16). The gains made in math, language arts and reading scores in similar projects in Texas (p. 15) offer promise for this intervention to result in similar student

achievement impacts in Los Angeles schools.

Weaknesses

B. Factor #1

There is a lack of clarity regarding the interrelationship between 'College YES' and the 'Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools.' It is unclear whether these are the same groups or different entities. It would have been more helpful if the investigators offered more explanation regarding these two organizations.

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

D. Factor #1

The proposal offers a thorough discussion of the process and outcome evaluation plans. The research questions are well-outlined and matched with the project objectives (p. 19). The evaluation plan is strengthened by the inclusion of comparison schools and the collection of self-report and observational data.

D. Factor #2

The tools being used in data collection have been previously validated (Five Levels of Professional Development Form, CBAM) (p. 20). Included in the evaluation plan is the need to share results with implementers to 'refine

program components' (p. 22)

D. Factor #3

The proposal offers a thorough discussion of the feedback loop for data collection and analysis (p. 18) as well as the extent that key informants will play a role in any changes needed/required for the evaluation design. Plans for replication (p. 23) and future dissemination of results from the evaluation (p. 24) are included in the proposal.

D. Factor #4

The evaluation personnel indicated in the proposal appear to be experienced to handle the evaluation tasks included in the design. The percentage of the budget devoted to the evaluation (884K or 17.7%) seems adequate to complete the tasks at hand.

Weaknesses

D. Factor #1

Greater detail is needed to demonstrate to the reader how exactly the analyses of the data will take place for both the process and outcome evaluation components.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 1:17 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/28/2010 2:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 03: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant proposed an approach to addressing the unmet needs of high need students. The project will identify methods for identifying effective teachers. Substantial references to the data supporting the connection between student achievement and teacher effectiveness was compelling. The design is proposed to not only evaluate teachers but to improve instruction. (p.2-5) This reader was convinced this represents an exceptional approach to

the priority.

The project description is very detailed and responsive to the need of improving teacher evaluation systems. (p.5-14)

The applicant provided a clear set of goals and strategies with measurable outcomes. (p.5-7)

The applicant provided a well-designed proposal that this reader believes can be successfully implemented. (p.8-14)

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant provided evidence of past performance of implementing projects of the size and scope of this project. (p.19-22) This reader concurs that the capacity exists to bring this project to completion successfully. The following represents some examples of past success.

The applicant has partnered with the Toledo Board of Education since 1981 to implement a successful program of teacher professional development and evaluation. (p.20)

The Fresh Start Program was an example cited for improving student achievement. (P.21) The data provided by the applicant convinced this reader of the applicant's ability to improve student achievement.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant was responsive to all criterion in this section. The number of students proposed to be impacted is approximately 81,199. The project will be staffed by AFT teacher quality experts, NYSUT and RIFTHP staff who are familiar with the districts to be included in the project. (p.29) A strong indication of the applicant's capacity to be taken to scale is validated by the collective bargaining agreements in member districts. (p. 29-32) Because the participating districts represent a good cross-section of the American public education system it is proposed by the applicant that this will aid in generalizing how to implement in districts with a variety of students. (p.31) The applicant proposed an average cost per student per year of \$18.50. The costs for 100,000, 250,000 and 500,000 are provided as required. (p.31-32) The applicant proposed a variety of existing dissemination systems it uses to support further development or replication. (p.32) This reader found the applicant to be responsive to all the criterion in this section with sound strategies.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant provided evidence that relationships already exist with major stakeholders and resources are available to operate the project beyond the grant period. (p.32-33) This project is viewed as a top priority for the union and this organization. (p.32) This reader saw this as a substantial demonstration of support from stakeholders. The applicant states that improving teacher evaluation systems to support improved student achievement is a top priority. The president of the

organization has publicly announced commitment to the goals of this project. Lessons learned from the project will be incorporated into the work of the organization. (p.33-34)
This reader was favorably impressed with the commitment of the applicant to the ongoing success of this project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 provided a logical sequence for the development of this project. All the required details for this section were included. There are clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for project tasks. (p.34-37) This reader was impressed with the clarity of the plan and the ease of being able to identify the evidence of response to the criterion. Additionally, the applicant specifically addressed standards for LEP and SWDs. (p.34-36)

A project director and project team are identified by the applicant. The relevant training and experience of the key personnel was provided. (p.37-41) This reader is confident the team, as identified, has the experience to manage a project of the size and scope of the one proposed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

This priority was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

This priority was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The applicant addressed this competitive priority in several places in the application. (p.1,37). This reader is confident the applicant intends to use this project to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

This priority was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 2:25 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 8:49 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 03: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

There is a growing need in the field of education for the development of effective performance-based teacher evaluation systems, which this project addresses. According to page 5, these evaluations will be based on professional teaching standards and will encompass multiple areas of

teaching practice. According to page 9, the design of the project includes Danielson's Framework for Teaching and criteria for high quality professional development. As stated on page 10, experts from the Danielson Group will deliver stakeholder education training and observation skills and coach training which are critical elements for effective performance-based teacher evaluations.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

According to page 20, AFT has developed and implemented performance-based evaluation in Toledo and that work will be valuable in developing the "next-generation model of teacher evaluation" outlined in the proposal. According to page 21, the applicant has experience managing grants and large scale programs and has demonstrated progress toward

closing the achievement gap in Chicago Public Schools.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

As stated on page 29, over 81,000 students will be impacted over the course of four years. On page 30 it is noted that AFT's relationship with collective bargaining units in local LEAs will help to bring the project to scale. The average cost per student is moderate, as explained on pages 31 and 32. As

stated on page 31, "the experience of working with a wide range of districts from this project will make it easier to replicate the model in districts of many different sizes and locations." According to page 32, webinars, seminars, and reports will be made available to the broader education community to share lessons learned from the project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 ability to sustain the program is helped greatly by AFT's stakeholder support in 3,000 LEAs nationwide, as explained on page 32. Also on page 32 it is stated that AFT has 360 employees and a \$172 million budget. On page 33 it is noted that the president of AFT has publicly announced the union's commitment to research and development of teacher evaluation systems. Also on page 33, AFT expects partners and affiliates of participating districts will be eager to continue development and scale-up upon completion of the grant.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed

project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan is of high quality. The 8 major tasks listed for Year One on pages 35 and 36 and the 6 major tasks listed for Year Two on page 36 are reasonable for staying on time and on budget. The "Innovative Milestones" on page 37 are focus on progress toward the goals. The Danielson Group and American Institutes of Research are well respected and highly skilled. According to page 34, the Danielson Group has done more than 20 years of work on performance-based teacher evaluations and AIR is highly skilled at evaluating professional development programs. According to pages 38-41, the key personnel are well qualified for their individual tasks.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

According to page 1, the evaluation system will be multifaceted, including components to measure effective instruction for students with disabilities and LEP students. Furthermore, page 1 explains that working groups will be formed to focus on LEP students and students with disabilities to develop standards and performance rubrics.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 8:49 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:22 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 03: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant has developed an excellent and innovative proposal. The proposal seeks to develop and incorporate the use of professional teaching standards for general education teachers of LEP students and SWDs to judge teacher effectiveness and assist teachers in improving their practice. Including professional teaching standards for LEP students and SWDs in an overall teacher evaluation system will identify effective practices for working with diverse students in general education settings and assist teachers in successfully educating students with varied learning and linguistic needs.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit

strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposed E3TL Consortium will work in 10 districts in New York and Rhode Island to support the implementation of rigorous and comprehensive performance-based teacher evaluation systems that include standards for effectiveness in instructing limited English proficient (LEP) students and students with disabilities in mainstream classrooms. The project is innovative and an exceptional approach that has not been adopted.

Through the project the applicant is expecting that positive changes will occur in teacher attitudes regarding the purposes and potential uses of teacher evaluation; and there will be increased accuracy in identifying effective teaching practices and teachers; an increase in the percentage of teachers meeting the standards over time; and increase in student achievement and closing of achievement gaps.

The ultimate goal is to develop a set of standards with performance rubrics for assessing teacher practices in the instruction of LEP students and SWDs in inclusionary settings.

The theory of action undergirding this project is that implementing performance-based teacher evaluation systems will strengthen teaching and increase student learning. Such systems are based on professional teaching standards that identify effective practices that lead to desired student outcomes.

The applicant's proposal clearly defines the premise that when implemented with fidelity, the project could provide valuable information on a teacher's strengths and weaknesses, thus allowing for targeted professional development to develop and improve teachers.

Additionally, through the project the applicant is aiming to create and refine training and materials to certify evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance and to interpret teacher evaluation data to help teachers develop and improve.
(p.2-15)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The proposed program is a partnership between AFTEF and 10 districts. AFTEF is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) foundation that conducts, sponsors and disseminates research in education and related fields with the main objective of improving and restructuring the education system. One of the strengths of is that the AFTEF has an outstanding history of implementing high-quality projects similar in size and scope to the proposed project.

For example, the AFT has worked since 1981 with the Toledo Board of Education and the Toledo Federation of Teachers to implement a highly successful program of teacher professional development and evaluation. The Toledo Plan includes components for new and veteran teachers. Trained teacher-evaluators, along with management, conduct evaluations based on performance standards set by the Toledo Public Schools, with help from the AFT.

Created in 1981, the AFT Educational Research and Dissemination (ER&D) Program is a research-based professional development program designed to help local unions build the capacity to deliver high-quality professional development services in collaboration with their school districts. ER&D delivers scientifically based research in a focused, sustained framework that promotes the application of research-validated concepts and strategies.

Another strength of the applicant's experience is AFTEF's work has led to improved teacher professional development, evaluation, and practice, as well as increased student achievement, attainment and retention.

The AFTEF has worked with the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and the Chicago Teacher's Union (CTU) on the Fresh Start Program demonstrates the AFTEF's longitudinal success in implementing projects focused on at-risk student populations that has resulted in positive teacher and student outcomes.

The project was a major grant project which provides some measure of evidence of AFTEF experience in implementing projects of the size and scope of the E3TL as well as its capacity to forge a strong LEA-level collaborations.

The applicant provides data and narrative that clearly indicates their nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.
(p.19-22)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant proposes that the project will impact approximately 81,199 students over four years.

The project will be fully staffed by AFT teacher quality experts, NYSUT and RIFTHP staff who know the districts well and are experts in their field, and district- and school-level educators in 10 local education agencies. In addition, the project will benefit from the guidance of AFT Teacher Evaluation Advisory Panel who members include some of the top experts in the field. All of which have long-term established relationships with schools, districts, educators, policymakers, researchers and experts across the country and the world.

The E3TL project and its external evaluator will document the process of developing the system and identify successes and pitfalls. This information will help other districts across the country implement performance based teacher evaluation systems.

The E3TL Consortium project design includes the piloting of a web-based application to support evaluator capacity. On-site training to certify evaluators can be timely and costly. This project seeks to test other methods that will still ensure accuracy but will be feasible and cost-effective as well. Data from this project will inform the use (including the validity and

reliability) of online, web-based applications to certify teacher evaluators.

With an estimated cost of approximately \$1.5 million per year for implementation of the E3TL project within the participating districts, the average cost per student per year is \$18.50. It is estimated that it would cost \$1.85 million per year to reach 100,000 students, \$4.625 million to impact 250,000 students and \$9.25 million to reach 500,000 students.

To share the lessons learned with the broader education community, AFTEF, along with NYSUT and RIFTHP plan to present webinars, seminars and reports. The AFT will continue to use its existing Teacher Evaluation Community web portal to disseminate information on the project. Ongoing updates and evaluation of E3TL will be posted, as well as blogs by various project stakeholders. (p. 29-32)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 AFTEF has the resources and stakeholder support to operate and sustain the E3TL Consortium beyond the length of the Development grant based it's previous experiences, expertise and stakeholder support. The AFT has

approximately 360 employees and annual budget of roughly \$172 million and has a healthy financial history that extends back to its founding in 1916.

The AFT represents nearly 3,000 local education agencies nationwide, 43 state educational agencies and more than 1.4 million members. The AFT has well-developed and institutional structures and close working relationships with LEAs, many of which serve large populations of the most at-risk students in the country.

Over the past few years, AFT has invested approximately \$775,000 to support an innovative teacher evaluation framework, both from its own funds and from major foundation donors including the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation.

The applicant has provided letters of support from the 10 participating E3TL districts in the Appendix.

The applicant has the resources and connections to recruit other district partners that are not currently part of the E3TL Consortium participate in a development and scale-up following completion of this project. Priority will be given to districts who meet the following criteria: the capacity to participate in the work of the project, a district/union formal agreement to participate, and a district wide student population where at least 40 percent are eligible to receive free and reduced price lunches (FRPL) and at least 15 percent are ELLs. The applicant presented a well documented narrative that evidenced alternative plans to collaborate with additionally districts if needed to further develop the project. (p. 32-34)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 developed a 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. The applicant has listed all major tasks to be accomplished by year.

For example: There are eight major tasks to be accomplished in Year One:

1. The training materials for stakeholders and evaluators must be developed;
2. The pilot schools must be selected;
3. Initial training of a stakeholders group must be completed;
4. Evaluators must be trained and certified;
5. The teacher evaluation must be implemented in pilot schools;
6. Protocols for data collection must be developed;
7. Materials must be refined as a result of pilot;and
8. A committee must be formed to develop standards for assessing teacher effectiveness in dealing with LEP students and SWDs in mainstream classes.

The applicant has commitments in place from several organizations who will have significant roles in accomplishing all the tasks involved in the project. For example, The Danielson Group will assist the union/district partnerships in developing materials and training and the American Institutes of Research will evaluate the project.

The Danielson Group has a track record of more than 20 years of work on performance-based teacher evaluations, particularly in regard to assessing instructional practice. AIR has a long history of working with state and local districts.

The E3TL Consortium has developed a comprehensive project management plan that details partner responsibilities and milestones for accomplishing the project objectives on time and within budget. The applicant listed the key personnel and the roles of each. All have very impressive expertise and experience in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

All resumes of the key personnel have been include in the proposal. The key personnel will oversee the work of the state and district development committees and a project coordinator assigned to each district to assure that the development of materials, training and the implementation of the system occurs in a timely manner and to address issues of implementation as they arise in the field. (p. 34)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

The applicant does not address.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant does not address.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The applicant is proposing to meet Competitive Priority #7 by developing and incorporating the use of professional teaching standards for general education teachers of LEP students and SWDs to judge teacher effectiveness and assist teachers in improving their practice. The program is innovative and designed to improve student outcomes and close achievement gaps.(p.1)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant does not address.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:22 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396D100376)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	11
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
TOTAL	25	18

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396D100376)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

There is a clear, reasonable hypothesis about the effects of a performance-based teacher evaluation system. Given the prominence of alternative teacher evaluation systems in the modern education policy dialogue, this represents a worthwhile hypothesis that merits testing.

The authors provide excellent support for the potential utility of performance-based teacher evaluation systems, with a focus on the ability of performance-based evaluation systems to help teachers improve their practice, the relationship between performance-based evaluations and student achievement gains, and the importance of fidelity of implementation in affecting the impacts of the performance-based evaluation system. All components of their proposed intervention are adequately discussed in this review.

Weaknesses

There is little evidence about the magnitude of effects on teachers or students (or, at least, the magnitudes are not much discussed). The one piece of evidence is the narrowing of achievement gaps in MCPS (p. e19), but it is difficult to attribute this change to the performance-based evaluation system

with just the evidence provided. Based on this section, it is not clear what the expected magnitudes of the effects of the performance-based evaluation system would be, either for the effects on teachers or the effects on value-added.

The performance-based evaluation system proposed by the applicant is similar to programs in other urban districts that have already been implemented. If anything, it is not entirely clear why new approaches to performance-based evaluation are needed.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

There is a comprehensive set of research questions guiding the evaluation, focusing on the full spectrum of implementation and intermediate and more distal outcomes (including student outcomes).

The research plan is very focused on fidelity of implementation, which will be useful in explaining program effects (or lack thereof). The plan for investigating implementation fidelity includes multiple methods and sources of data (interviews, surveys, observations) which will allow for triangulation of data and a richer understanding of fidelity of implementation of the performance-based evaluation program.

It is good that AIR will be evaluating the pilot year of the intervention, and that the evidence from the pilot year will be used to inform potential

revisions to the program for subsequent years.

There will be a wide array of data gathered on teachers' instruction, teacher and leader beliefs, and student outcomes, which will be helpful in evaluating the processes by which performance-based evaluation lead to effects. The extensive array of sources of evidence from the proposed research will allow a better understanding of the perspectives of multiple stakeholders.

Weaknesses

It appears as though the intervention will be implemented completely in all districts after the initial pilot year. This means there will be no direct comparison group for evaluating the impact of the study, a threat to the internal validity of the research. A stronger approach from the standpoint of internal validity would be to split the sample of schools in half (randomly or by matching) and assign schools to receive the intervention or not.

Reader's Score: 11

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 8:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396D100376)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	8
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	9
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	17
TOTAL	25	17

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396D100376)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

On pp. e15-17 the proposers provide citations from peer-reviewed journals that indicate Performance Based Teacher Evaluation correlates with improved teaching and improved student performance. They also provide citations indicating the fidelity of implementation correlates with positive outcomes as well as systematic review training and systematic communication related to the Evaluation.

The proposers provide two examples of school district and union officials working together to develop a performance evaluation system (pp.e. 17-18). The first is very similar to the proposed intervention because it involves AFT working with a school system to develop a teacher evaluation system using adaptations of Charlotte Danielson's Framework: A Continuous Improvement Model For Teacher Development and Evaluation. The second project is similar as well.

Weaknesses

While the results of previous similar projects have indicated relationships between teacher performance evaluation systems, the proposers provide very little information about the size and magnitude of effects in previous

research. The only indication is that in one example the achievement gap was reduced for third-grade white and African American Students from 35 to 19 points and for Hispanics 43 to 17 points (p. e19). This seems like very specific data for a narrow range of students.

Reader's Score: 8

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The proposers have laid out 7 research questions on pp e23 and e24.

The proposers intend to create and refine evaluation instruments and protocols by treating the first year of implementation as a pilot and also providing baseline data.

The proposers describe the types of information that will be measured and those are relevant to the components of the evaluation system.

On pp. e 25 and e26 the proposers describe evaluation instruments that include Observations of training, teacher focus groups, telephone surveys and online surveys at reasonable intervals. These data can provide adequate information for judging fidelity of implementation and subsequent development and replication.

There are sufficient resources for conducting an evaluation on p. e2 of the budget narrative. The total amount contracted for AIR will be \$737,516.

Weaknesses

The evaluation does not include a focus on LEP and SWD students although this is a major feature of the grant.

On p. e 23 the proposers say that AIR will conduct an implementation evaluation. However, the research questions also include changing teacher practice and student achievement which are summative in nature. Their use of terminology is inaccurate.

Insufficient attention has been paid to establishing comparison groups It is important in projects such as this that in the end we have the highest quality information possible. The addition of comparison groups would allow the proposers to make stronger statements about the causal relationship between the intervention and changes in teacher behavior and changes in student achievement.

Reader's Score: 9

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 8:24 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/28/2010 7:05 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396C100243)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	7
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 21: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396C100243)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>The AppleTree Institute and its partners propose to further develop the Every Child Ready (ECR) Program, a data-driven, evidence-based, RTI model for preschools that integrates special education children into the general education classroom. The proposal presents four overall goals: (1) all participating children arrive at kindergarten with the language, early literacy, early math, and social/emotional skills necessary for success; (2) all participating classrooms implement the ECR model with fidelity; (3)</p>

children who participate in ECR demonstrate higher achievement than non-participating peers; and (4) ECS becomes a documented system of tools and practices (p. 1). The proposal presents the ECR model, its components (e.g., full-day program, teachers with bachelor degrees, universal screening, differentiated instruction) (pp. 4-5), and its five non-negotiable elements (pp. 7-8). The proposal describes the assessments that are used to identify children who score in the lowest quartile and who also display slower growth rates than their peers (pp. 8-9). Activities to Goals 1 and 4 (e.g., assessments coupled with professional development and classroom-based coaching for Goal 1) are depicted (pp. 9-11), and those associated with Goals 2 and 3 are described in the evaluation section (pp. 18-20).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The proposal describes AppleTree as a 14-year old, nonprofit organization focused on increasing access to high quality preschool and prekindergarten. As an entity that supports charter schools, AppleTree Institute has experience raising funds for facilities and has provided technical assistance to other charter schools in the DC area (pp. 14-15). The organization shifted its mission 10 years ago to focus on improving the outcomes of the youngest learners, and began opening early learning charter schools in 2005. AppleTree has experience working with the named partners (e.g., Georgetown University evaluation team, DC Preparatory Academy) on similar initiatives.

The proposal describes evidence from a pilot project that involved 52 low income, mostly African American children over a two-year period. These children achieved increases in vocabulary growth: although they entered the pilot with reading assessments between the 20th and 28th national percentile, they exited scoring above the national norm (p. 4).

Weaknesses

It appears that AppleTree Institute has incrementally increased the number of its early learning charter schools over the past 5 years, going from 1, to 3, to 5 (pp. 15-16). Its ability to rapidly scale up and continue to achieve positive outcomes for its students is still untested.

Reader's Score: 20

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed

project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The proposal states that the three charter schools that will participate will enroll 800 students, a modest number given the project budget, and the per-pupil per-year cost is estimated as \$1,375. This translates into per pupil per year costs of \$425 for 100,000 student (total of \$42.5M), \$337 for 250,000 (\$84.3M), and \$262 for 500,000 (\$131.2M). In terms of dissemination, the AppleTree Institute will work with the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) to disseminate the tools and outcomes, which will make the resources available to the District's preschool teachers. Other dissemination channels, such as multimedia professional development and online portals, will be developed by a local business consultant (p. 24).

Weaknesses

Since the project would be initially limited to a select group of three committed charter preschool partners (p. 6), it is unclear whether non-charter schools or those that do not have the resources to commit to the model would be able to adopt the approach or experience the outcomes associated with this initiative.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 proposal includes an MOU from the key partners (DC Prep Academy, Early Childhood Academy), which describe the obligations, responsibilities, and expectations for participation. Also included are letters of support from the DC State Superintendent of Education, private foundations, and other community organizations. The proposal notes that early childhood education is a core concern in Washington, DC, which means that efforts to build on the project's success can continue forward. The tools and practices that the initiative documents will allow for other organizations to build on the outcomes. The proposal describes a commitment to provide matching funds, if the initiative is funded.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan describes a three-phase implementation: planning (year 1), implementation (years 2 and 3), and follow up (years 4 and 5). The proposal describes in general terms the presence of an advisory board. A management plan describes benchmarks, indicators, and responsible parties for the major project activities in years 1-3 (pp. 28-28). Resumes are provided for each member of the management and evaluation team.

Weaknesses

There appear to be important gaps in the experience of the management team that, taken together, call into question whether the project can be

successfully implemented. The project director (Mr. McCarthy) holds only a bachelors degree and does not appear to have experience managing federal grants of a similar magnitude. Although the project manager (Ms. Lesiak) has experience within the US Department of Education coordinating the grant process, she also does not appear to have experience managing externally-funded initiatives of the scope and complexity in the current proposal. The lack of experience is important since these two key staff members would be responsible for making significant decisions about the partnership, resource allocation, negotiating and renegotiating decisions, and mid-course corrections.

Reader's Score: 7

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

The proposed project clearly targets the needs of preschool students and meets the criteria of the priority.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success

(0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The proposed project intends to focus on the needs of children who are identified as in need of special education services.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 7:05 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 9:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396C100243)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____

Technical Review Form

Development 21: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396C100243)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>One of the strengths of the proposal is it is a data driven evidence-based Response-to-Intervention model targeted at Pre-school aged students. The Early Child Ready program has the support of community partners and a core group of stakeholders. Apple Tree did a 52-student pilot program for two a year period. The data showed that students who participated in the Apple Tree program out performed their peers in vocabulary development. Vocabulary development in primary grades is used as a strong predictor of</p>

reading comprehension skills. The Every Child Ready Program has a Progress Monitoring System that gathers data on key academic areas like: Social/Emotional Development, Language, Phonological Awareness/Print Concepts, Alphabet Knowledge and Mathematics, teachers and coaches use the information to craft tier 1 or tier 2 plans using targeted evidenced-based activities.

Weaknesses

No weakness found

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

As noted in the application, the applicant has 14 years of grant experience (Community Development Block Grant), and has community partners, Environmental Protections Agency and DC Department of Housing and Community Development. With these community partners, Apple Tree was able to provide technical assistance to several local charter schools totaling

1800 students.

Weaknesses

The applicant makes mention to the DCPEL to demonstrate its efforts to improve student outcomes, but the applicant does not provided any data to support student achievement outcomes, and the applicant doesn?t address high-quality teachers and principals.

Reader's Score: 20

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

In SY11 through SY13, the Every Child Read Program will reach close to

800 students. With a 14year history of private and public agency partnerships and support from the State Superintendent of Education to track achievement, disseminate tools and outcomes and provide technical assistance Apple Tree has the capacity to bring the project to scale.

Weaknesses

No weakness noted

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Every Child Ready is a early learning professional development program that seeks to target instructional improvements in PreK. PNC Bank and the Morris & Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation have agreed to provide 20% matching funds, because Apple Tree is a consulting agency, teachers union support is not appropriate, however, Apple Tree does have support from several federal government agency and the State Superintendent's Office.

Weaknesses

No weakness found

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Applicant provided timeline and milestones broken down by benchmarks and indicators. The applicant has a strong Advisory Board that will oversee the implementation of the grant. A particular strength of the application is the development of professional development modules and ECR coaches. Instructional coaches that focus on early learn literacy development is a critical piece to the success of this program.

Weaknesses

No weakness noted

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Applicant provided a quality response

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Applicant provided a quality response

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 9:57 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 7:26 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396C100243)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 21: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396C100243)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

This early childhood data-use innovation project uses a multi-year longitudinal design to address the persistent challenges of inadequate early childhood education among minority and poor students. Every Child Ready (ECR) is a promising data intensive RTI model that has shown promise in addressing early academic skills when implemented in public DC pre-schools. The ECR model is anchored firmly in five research-based practices associated with robust studies of early learning (pp. 4-5). The ECR

implementation model operates with five core, non-negotiable practices, which aid in fidelity and consistency of implementation across settings.

The project design is grounded in four clearly stated and comprehensive goals focused on the further development and refinement of the ECR innovation. (pp. 8-9). Additionally, preschool educators working at ECR sites commitment to 230 hours annually (nearly 40 days) to workshops, coaching, and administrator-led professional learning communities.

Currently, ECR uses a web-based data analysis and student progress monitoring system, but raising the level and extent of use of this tool in school and classroom level practice is identified as a key priority.

Weaknesses

The DC provides approximately \$12,000 per child annually for public preschool education programs, which may limit the ECR replication in other states or communities.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

AppleTree (501c3) has a successful 14-year history as an incubator for secondary and now preschool charter or specialty schools. Close and comprehensive working relationships have been developed with a number of public, governmental, higher education, and private sector organizations to advance the quality of public schools in DC. Since 2000, the organization has been developing and operating preschools as partnership entities with clean audits for the past 14 years. A recently published independent ECR evaluation study reflects large and significant effect sizes on early language (.24) and math skills (.80) for children with and without disabilities at ages 3 and 4 (p. 13)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

800 preschool students will be served over two years at an average cost of \$1,375, which appears quite reasonable given the significant return on investment for early childhood interventions.

The staff is exceptionally well qualified in the areas of early childhood education innovations, professional development, and school leadership. An impressive set of consultants have committed to designing and implementing a robust ECR evaluation study.

Several local foundation partners have committed to providing the matching funds to advance the project.

Weaknesses

The expertise, qualifications, and role of Hartman Business Consulting organization in providing technology support and professional development for schools needs to be clarified, including the assurance of FERPA compliance associated with releasing pre-school student and family data to subcontractors.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Each of the three participating pre-schools provided comprehensive MOUs. (see appendix)

The partner organization letters confirm an impressive commitment to the 20% match. (p.25)

Ultimately, the project will substantially enhance the capacity of the ECR network to advance early learning on a wider scale and more cost-effectively.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Details regarding responsibilities, timelines, and benchmarks for accomplishing project tasks are provided for years 1-4.

The Apple Tree key personnel and the staff and consultants from the partner organizations are well qualified to lead the planning and implementation of pre-school innovations like ECR. They offer a wealth of experience in urban pre-school, community development, and research settings.

Equally important, these individuals worked together previously and successfully on several projects focused urban pre-school learning and development.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

The proposed ECR innovation implementation and evaluation design addresses fully and effectively each of three assurances listed above.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The applicant's plan for addressing CP 7 is excellent.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority is not addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 7:26 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:34 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396D100243)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	17
TOTAL	25	17

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396D100243)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

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

Strengths

1 STRENGTH OF RESEARCH-BASED FINDINGS OR REASONABLE HYPOTHESES

STRENGTHS

1. On pages 12 and 13 the applicant cites several studies that explain commonly known conditions that positively and negatively impact learning for entering kindergarten students.

2 PROPOSED PROJECT ATTEMPTED PREVIOUSLY WITH PROMISING RESULTS

STRENGTHS

1. On page 13 the applicant lists a study of the Every Child Ready model with significant and large effect sizes regarding language and math skills and did show increases in children with disabilities.

3 PROJECT LIKELY TO HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT AS MEASURED BY THE EFFECT, ON IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, CLOSING GAPS, DROPOUT RATES, GRADUATION RATES, COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS, COLLEGE GRADUATION.

STRENGTHS

1. On page 14 the applicant lists prior positive results from a previous study

as the potential for improving student achievement in kindergarten.

Weaknesses

1 STRENGTH OF RESEARCH-BASED FINDINGS OR REASONABLE HYPOTHESES

WEAKNESSES

1. On page 12 the applicant notes that there certain parent attributes affect the starting point for children entering kindergarten. The applicant then makes an assumption not based on any studies that the children become poor readers.
2. There are no studies cited regarding studies conducted for the Early Child Ready program that will be implemented. This is a substantial short coming and limits the ability to evaluate the impact this model will have.
3. On page 13 the applicant notes numerous studies that document the impact preschool has on children entering kindergarten. However, these studies do not address the effectiveness of the model proposed or any similar programs.

2 PROPOSED PROJECT ATTEMPTED PREVIOUSLY WITH PROMISING RESULTS

WEAKNESSES

1. There were no weaknesses noted.

3 PROJECT LIKELY TO HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT AS MEASURED BY THE EFFECT, ON IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, CLOSING GAPS, DROPOUT RATES, GRADUATION RATES, COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS, COLLEGE GRADUATION.

WEAKNESSES

1. There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

1 METHODS OF EVALUATION ARE APPROPRIATE TO THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

STRENGTHS

1. On page 16 the applicant will utilize a randomized control trial and will utilize the students not selected in the lottery as the control group. This is a good technique to obtain valuable comparison data.

2. On page 16 the applicant notes that the control group will be given literacy related materials. This is a reasonable attempt to provide an appropriate comparison group.

2 METHODS OF EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION DATA AND PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK, AND PERIODIC ASSESSMENT

STRENGTHS

1. On pages 18, 19, and 20 the applicant lists a very comprehensive and thorough listing of nationally normed measurement techniques (Peabody Picture Vocabulary, etc.). The tests are sequenced to provide periodic assessment which is an important strength for high quality and timely feedback.

3 THE EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE KEY ELEMENTS AND APPROACH FOR REPLICATION OR TESTING

STRENGTHS

1. On page 21 the applicant notes that the evaluation will collect data and construct a profile and summary scores for classroom and

4 THE PROJECT INCLUDES SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR THE EVALUATION EFFECTIVELY

STRENGTHS

1. On page 22 the applicant indicates it has allocated personnel and resources

for the evaluation.

Weaknesses

1 METHODS OF EVALUATION ARE APPROPRIATE TO THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE PROJECT WEAKNESSES

1. On page 18 the applicant notes that the control group will probably not enroll their children in a pre-school program. This format raises serious questions regarding a specific model given that logically any reasonable preschool program will show immediate results of having children entering kindergarten more ready in literature, reading, counting, etc. compared to children who had no preschool experience. Thus, there really is no randomization of a control group. This brings into serious question the design appropriateness.

2 METHODS OF EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION DATA AND PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK, AND PERIODIC ASSESSMENT WEAKNESSES

1. There were no weaknesses noted.

3 THE EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE KEY ELEMENTS AND APPROACH FOR REPLICATION OR TESTING WEAKNESSES

1. On page 21 the applicant notes that treatment and comparison group will be analyzed utilizing ANOVAS and MANOVAS. This analysis will be of questionable usefulness given the comparison group did not attend any preschool. The results are more a statement on the value of preschool rather than the specific preschool model being proposed. It will have very limited research or statistical value. It will only prove the obvious.

4 THE PROJECT INCLUDES SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR THE EVALUATION EFFECTIVELY WEAKNESSES

1. In the Budget Narrative the applicant lists the evaluator as being compensated \$1.8 million over the length of the program. This amounts to 36% of the request to the funding agency. This seems way out of proportion to conduct an evaluation of several small preschool programs and greatly reduces funding that could have been better used to add more schools to the program.



Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:34 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 10:32 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396D100243)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	17
TOTAL	25	17

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: AppleTree Institute for Education Innova -- , - , (U396D100243)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

Strengths: The applicants cite several studies that support the effectiveness of quality pre-k education and its long term benefits (pgs 12-13).

The program was piloted in the proposed setting and independent evaluation results found significant effect sizes on relevant outcomes (pg 13). These promising results suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

The independent evaluation found effect sizes ranging from 0.24 to 0.80 in language and math skills for 3 and 4 year olds, and for children with and without disabilities (pg 13).

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: Although there is evidence of the approach overall, the applicants did not cite research supporting their specific program design or components of their program (pgs 12-13). On page 13 the applicant makes a statement that children who start kindergarten farther behind others become poor readers and struggle with literacy and learning "throughout their often-abbreviated academic career." There is no literature cited to support this prediction.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

Strengths: The project proposes to use RCT and the setting will support such a model. This evaluation method is appropriate to the size and scope of this proposed project. The evaluators have a solid plan for recruitment and retention of the control group (incentives) (pg 16).

The evaluation plan includes several implementation measures to monitor fidelity and implementation process (Table D1; pgs 19-20). The plan includes mechanisms to share information with program staff and a set schedule for data collection. They will make data easily accessible by teachers and project teams (pg 21). They will also document the extent to which the proposed activities occur (pg. 22).

The table on pages 18 through 21 indicates that the evaluation has been designed to assess outcomes, and to document and measure the extent to which each of the program components is implemented.

The evaluation team has stellar credentials and an impressive amount of experience with both basic research and evaluations. In addition to being methodologically strong, they are also content experts which will strengthen their ability to interpret findings and make programmatic recommendations (appendix C CVs). A sufficient amount has been budgeted for the evaluation (p. 3 Budget Narrative).

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: Some of the children in the control group will attend preschool and some will not. It is possible that a sizeable portion will not attend any preschool, therefore, it is questionable as to whether changes detected suggest this program is effective, or whether attending preschool at all is what contributed to differences. The design would be stronger if the control group were attending some more traditional preschool program in order to determine whether this particular program is more effective than what is currently available (e.g., Head Start).

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted**Last Updated:** 07/21/2010 10:32 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2010 5:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	22
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 27: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The proposal gave evidence of a strong track record of data-driven school improvements and sustainability. The project was research-based, clearly written, and well thought out. The application did not identify any competitive priorities and it would have seemed appropriate to have asked for CP5 and CP7.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The project provides for interventions that will benefit 6800 students in 12 low-performing schools. It was helpful to have the table in the appendix that reported individual building demographics.

The proposal was very well organized and well written. The goals (p. 49-52) were clear and tied to program evaluation components.

There was a strong tie between project goals and activities and solid research.

Using 6 schools as a control group is impressive.

The identification of specific school level assessments (DIBELS) and other evaluation tools - the need to create one using prior district successes was also a good idea. The applicant then does not have to wait until this project is in its 4th year to develop something that it needed from the start of the project.

The recognition that in order to continually improve and to be able to share with others evaluating your process is crucial and impressive.

Weaknesses

In the appendix you have the demographics and test data for 4 of your 6 control group schools. It is not clear how the applicant will get the 6 control schools to cooperate for 5 years. There appears to be no incentive for those schools to "put up" with the intrusions of an external evaluation process.

Data were not given for academic needs.

Reader's Score: 22

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

In its 4.5 years of operation the applicant has provided evidence that using the research for teaching and learning works. This proposal comprehensively demonstrated that this nonprofit organization has the ability to improve student achievement.

Weaknesses

It was not clear about what levels of expertise the partners bring to the table.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

This project is cost effective. The allocation of \$64 per student for five years of service (\$13 per student per year) is impressive.

The project holds nothing as proprietary. It actively pursues collaboration with others also committed to school improvement. This is impressive and adds the scalability of the project design in dimensions beyond budget issues. It is with this openness and willingness to share what works that US schools will make the necessary progress to retain its place in the world.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 proposal identified sustainability costs post grant as \$1500 per school. It was noted that Title I dollars could be allocated to this purpose. BSRI also reported that they would work with district superintendents to secure local funding. In the event that there are no places for the local district/school to find funding, BSRI has a cash reserve for the purpose of supporting sustainability. This is not only beyond their responsibility but indicated to

this reader a true heart for their mission.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 Executive Director's experiences in managing large scale initiatives and projects are excellent.

The resumes indicated clear abilities to perform required functions of the project.

There was strong evidence of capacity to perform the project at the highest possible standards.

Weaknesses

One question relates to the budget category: "OTHER"

Over 5 years \$1,043,841 is allocated to this category. The brief explanation identifies such expenditures as: miscellaneous office expenses, costs of expanded evaluation planned for this project, and the purchase of their professional development program.

The budget has a \$807,000 allocation for the program evaluation component. It is unclear why other dollars would be needed for an expanded evaluation.

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 5:53 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 27: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The Bay State Reading Institute is cooperating with several districts to develop a "literacy-based" and "data-based" program that could be expanded statewide. It is partnering with 12 high-need low-performing elementary schools. The project would identify the skills and resource requirements for scaling up a rather well designed program.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The statement of needs is well documented and focused on developing model program based on experiences in 12 elementary schools. Strategies deployed appear to be drawn from both a body of research and from direct experience. Support from the state is recognized as an advantage in moving this project further. Basically, a well written section.

Weaknesses

Details of the conditions that exist in the schools that are being targeted are not adequately described. Some addition details that would demonstrated a more in-depth analysis of the problems and conditions as they currently exist could have been included. The respective roles of the principals and others should have been described at the outset. The appendix picks up on some of the details that describe the program design.

Reader's Score: 20

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant demonstrates evidence of having considerable and direct

experience in working with school districts in the state over the past five years. The DSTP approach seems to have evidence that it has contributed to the improvement of young children that are identified as being "at risk" or failing out of school. Three years of data is impressive.

Weaknesses

Possibly, additional details of the involvement of partners would have helped.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant demonstrates that it has considerable political and professional experience and to work with project partners to continue and expand the project beyond the experimental school sites.

Weaknesses

The proposal lacks some relevant details that would have added strength to the applicant's capacity to document research-evidence and further develop the project. Information regarding cost implications including those associated with whole school reform are not given adequate attention. Citing prospective funds from Title 1 and other sources could have been identified.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 experience of the staff and credibility of the project director in being able to marshal support for this project throughout the state are recognized strengths for carrying on this project to other districts. Funding sources located to move forward.

Weaknesses

Although the overall capacity of this applicant to carry on this innovative project beyond i3 funding is generally acknowledged, more documentation would have contributed to the strength of the applicant to sustain the project's development. Having support from the state assembly is noted, but not necessarily a contributing factor for addressing these criteria.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan is comprehensive and the staff seem very well qualified to manage this project. The director has considerable contacts with officials in the state that could add to its capacity to orchestrate the various components of this project. Drawing on former and successful principals to serve as trainers and coaches is another strength worth citing here.

Weaknesses

It is unclear how much time the proposed director will devote to manage this project.

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:20 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/25/2010 11:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	21
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	7
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 27: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

DSTP will be partnering with BSRI, who has 18 current partner schools to assist approximately 6800 students in the area of literacy.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>There is a need for DSTP with several low income, non-white, ELL schools. The belief is that out of 6800 students, literacy will be increased by 20%.</p>

Addressing early reading difficulty has been related to achievement later on, which DSTP plans to address. DSTP will be partnering with BSRI, who has 18 current partner schools to utilize several of its program components which are detailed and research based. Data to support the achievement already established at one of these other cohorts included in section B.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Although the BSRI has been only in MA schools since 2005, there has been substantial growth in those years for expertise. It is impressive that they are able to increase 120% for partner schools in a year without fidelity loss. Good strategies and steps are in place for measurement of success, which correlates to the percentages of increases in achievement on page 12.

Weaknesses

The margin of reading is lower than the rest of the application merits. There is concern for the level of significance on page 14.

Reader's Score: 21

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

DSTP will serve 6800 students, already assisting 18 schools. Expertise is established with other schools showing that this project can continually be replicated successfully. Management has continued success in implementing these types of interventions and is seeking state-wide scaling. Costs per students are indicated.

Weaknesses

Dissemination is not addressed outside the lines of Departments of Education in MA.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 MA legislature has supported BSRI with allocation funding and BSRI receives support from various superintendants in MA. Schools know upfront the funds needed to stay with BSR, utilizing other resources that are detailed for the costs. BSRI coaches will be used to guide future professional development. A cash reserve is going to be maintained by BSRI to continue with DSTP, in the event other sources cannot be found.

Weaknesses

There is not much in the view of further purpose or activity to stay ongoing with this partnership after the grant. It is stated on page 20 that upon entering a partnership with BSRI later, schools will be responsible for covering costs using Title1 funding which may be hindered at a future time.

Reader's Score: 7

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

There is great qualifications and management for this project team, including an Associate Commissioner to assist with policies who has previously served as a House of Representative. Gardner has been associated with many large scaled projects. There are details of management roles and responsibilities. A timeline is addressed in another section and gives good merit to the plan being outlined.

Weaknesses

More detail needs to be set on the Turnaround coaches, at the heart of the program on page 22.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 11:50 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396D100623)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	24
TOTAL	25	24

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 05: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396D100623)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.
- (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 summarizes research findings that connect each component of the proposed intervention with improved student outcomes or successful school turnaround efforts. In addition to identifying the research-based instructional practices or school structures of the model, the applicant also describes characteristics of high-fidelity implementation, which are embedded within the proposed intervention model (page 8). A strength of this application is the description of a model that connects instructional elements with training, changes in the infrastructure, stakeholder involvement, evaluation, and attention to policy and funding.

The descriptions of previous implementation efforts and outcomes of those efforts offer promising results that support additional implementation and further study. The reported effect sizes (page 10) suggest that the proposed intervention will have a positive impact on student achievement as measured by DIBELS of an appreciable magnitude.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project. The evaluation plan will examine both the effectiveness of implementation as well as the observed outcomes. The experimental design of the controlled study is a strength in that a well-designed experimental study can theoretically predict future outcomes in similar settings. This type of study could provide stronger support for the efficacy of this project than could an evaluation with a less rigorous design.

The evaluation plan describes a method that will collect high-quality implementation data and performance feedback. Data from classroom observations, interviews, and surveys will provide information that can inform improved implementation.

The applicant describes an evaluation that will collect information about the key elements and approach of the intended intervention. Connecting implementation information with the outcome evaluation will provide information to facilitate further development, replication, or testing of the model.

The evaluation plan includes sufficient resources - funding and capacity of identified evaluation firm - to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Weaknesses

The proposal describes an experimental design but does not identify the ways in which comparison schools will be chosen, how quantitative and

qualitative data will be analyzed, or the instruments that will be used to analyze the data.

The intervention model suggests that evaluation results will be used to inform implementation (pages 8 and 9), but the proposal does not explicitly identify the time lines for sharing evaluation information with stakeholders and the process by which those data will inform implementation modifications and improvements.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:43 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/22/2010 6:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396D100623)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	24
TOTAL	25	24

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 05: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396D100623)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

B. Factor #1

There is a methodical explanation of the research behind each of the hypotheses (p. 7-8) and good references listed for every one suggesting support for these hypotheses. This covers each of the four elements of the planned intervention. They stress the importance of the integration of the four parts of the DSTP model (p.8).

B. Factor #2

The proposal discusses how the DSTP model has been previously implemented in '18 schools over the last 4.5 years' (p. 9). They show the high implementation fidelity and the gains made all suggesting promising results with the current proposed intervention with large statistically significant results from ANOVA (p. 10).

B. Factor #3

The investigators clear step-by-step discussion of the process behind the project including the research-basis behind each step results in a clear understanding and confidence that the intervention as proposed should yield a positive impact on student achievement.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

D. Factor #1

The evaluation design includes a well-specified plan for both implementation and impact studies (p. 14). They make clear the importance of demonstrating the quality of the implemented intervention in that 'the quality of the implementation is as challenging as it is important' (p. 8). The plan includes the collection of data through surveys, documents (meeting minutes), observations, and school data (achievement scores) (p. 16-17). They also plan to 'triangulate the data to complete an index that qualitatively rates each school on both implementation fidelity and intensity' (p. 16).

D. Factor #2

The proposal discusses the use of valid and reliable tools (DIBELS, MCAS) for confidence in the assessment data to be collected (p. 12). There is also a strong training component for data collection team to ensure consistency and quality of data to be analyzed (p. 15).

D. Factor #3

The investigators make clear their intent to identify key parts of the program in order to assist in replication of the program in the future (p. 14). The data collection places a great deal of importance on the study of the implementation process for fidelity to the current project and future

replication (p. 16). The use of a mixed methods data collection strategy will result in triangulation of the data for greater confidence in the results generated (p. 16-17; 23).

D. Factor #4

The budget suggests that over 15% (\$807K/\$5000K) of the budget will be reserved for the evaluation component.

Weaknesses

D. Factor #2

The timelines for sharing information with key project participants are not delineated. There needs to be a timely sharing of this information in order for the results to be helpful to responding to any needed changes in the implementation of the intervention.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 6:41 PM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 06/30/2010 1:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____

Technical Review Form

Development 36: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

This proposal was thoughtfully organized and addressed all aspects of the Selection Criteria. It would serve as a model proposal to assist others who attempt this process.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

This proposal is to develop and enhance A4L, an academic program that integrates standards-focused, text-based content and arts strategies to improve students achievement in literacy, learning, and life skills. The goal is to implement A4L learning in grades 3-5 across the applicants district. As part of this implementation, comprehensive evaluations - both formative and summative - will monitor the implementation of the program and rigorously evaluate its impact on student achievement.

This i3 grant will allow BSD to faster leverage their existing systems, stakeholder support, and other available state and federal resources to significantly and rapidly improve all of our students reading and writing achievement, particularly their high-needs students.

A4L has been piloted in 92 schools in 28 districts across the country; a majority of participants were students in grades 3-5 (14,123 students). In previous evaluations significant student gains in key literacy skills, including ELLI students and those who perform below grade level. This program is closely aligned with the high priorities of BSD. The distinctive features of the program are listed on p.4 of the narrative. Through implementation of the A4L Lessons the applicants expect to achieve the following goals: 1)close achievement gaps in learning; 2)increase the percent of elementary students meeting or exceeding benchmarks for college and career readiness in literacy; and 3)increase 4th grade students writing performance.

The district goal is to ensure that all students show continuous progress toward their personal learning goals and that they are prepared for post-secondary education and career success. Our staff engages in purposeful, research-based, and ongoing professional development. With a fast growing percent of English language learners (9-15%)and a doubling percentage of underserved students increasing from 24-43%, while the applicant is proud of the progress students have made, 1 in 4 students failed to meet the standards in reading/literacy and the majority of these students are economically disadvantaged, ELLs and students with disabilities.

Weaknesses

none

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the

size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

BSD has extensive experience securing and successfully managed grant of the size and complexity of this i3 grant. In the 2009-10 year BSD managed almost 27 million in grants from federal, state, local and private sources in which fiscal reporting was completed on time for all grants.

BSD has made strong progress between 2003-04 and 2008-09 by increasing the percent of students meeting or exceeding state standards in reading by 7%; in math by 4% in in writing in grade 7 by 12%. Most importantly BSD has been successful in closing the gap between Black and White students (by almost 10%) and between White and Hispanic students (over 16%).

Weaknesses

none noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

A total of 12,850 students in grades 3-5 will be served by this grant period. The requested i3 grant and matching funds will serve 4,500 students annually for four years, with an additional 4,500 supported by the district in the final year as they move toward sustaining the program.

The per student cost per student will be \$107. for the initial year; subsequent years will be \$78. For 250,000 students at \$24,744,00 initially; subsequent years \$18,035,000.

Weaknesses

none

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

In year 5 of the proposed project, BSD will support the cost to implement A4L in the 17 treatment schools using Title IIA and general fund allocation. This includes support for the Teacher on Special Assignment, release time for teachers to collaborate, related materials and accompanying Residencies.

With the gradual replacement of Federal grant support with funds from other sources, the district will be able to assume all costs associated with implementing A4L in each of the 33 elementary schools.

The sustainability of the project will have support from strong consensus BSD has established among school and community stakeholders around the districts overarching theory of action.
(more information on pp.18-19)

Weaknesses

none noted

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 Management Plan will organize around three broad tasks: 1) Design and Development, 2) Implementation, 3) Evaluation.

Timelines for each task and associated activities along with target benchmarks/outcomes and responsible parties are presented in Appendix

H.9.

Ensuring the amount, quality, and timelines of implementation of the program requires the confidence of teachers and principals that they will be supported with expertise that is sensitive to their experiences.

The team invests in multiple means for timely data, support, and feedback from the field - meetings of the study groups, formal observations, informal connections, scheduled and asynchronous voluntary electronic connections and regular e-mail exchanges to support practice and prompt feedback.

BSD will serve as the fiscal agent and lead organization, including overseeing the execution and monitoring of contracts.
(more details on pp.21-25.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success

(0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

In meeting the district goal to narrow the achievement gaps for ELL students in reading and writing results drawn from piloting A4I schools and districts that serve large numbers of ELL students will be particularly helpful. From the clarity of the proposal and the way research support was drawn on at each turn to qualify and enlarge the scope of understanding for each decision has added to the clarity and transparency of the decision-making of how best to meet the needs of the special needs students and ELL students.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 1:25 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2010 6:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	2
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 36: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant is focused on developing, implementing, and evaluating a program that integrates student focused, text-based content and art strategies to improve students' achievement in literacy, learning, and life skills for 12,850 students in grades 3-5.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Outcomes are clearly stated on page 65 and include spending more time reading, efficient use of time, building on strengths, building community, using specialists and PLC's, and meeting specific standards. The needs of all learners are included in goal 11 by ensuring equal access to all students. Integrating disciplines is a strong component of the program. Measurable and specific outcomes are clearly addressed in the narrative on page 67. The program is aligned to the state standards as evidenced in appendix H, which is a priority for the applicant.

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant shows evidence on page 11 that they have managed grants of this size and scope, managing over \$27M in grants. The applicant provides

statistics on page 1 of the narrative that they have improved student achievement in reading, especially for LEP and minority students. Additionally data tables in appendix H and information on page 12 support this.

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant identifies that they have qualified personnel, who have worked

together successfully on similar projects, to develop the program beyond the grant. The staff is committed to expand the program. Scale up costs are outlined on page 16 of the narrative for up to 500,000.

Weaknesses

The applicant has not demonstrated the capacity to work with the 12,850 students in the proposal with evidence in the narrative. Feasibility of replication is not addressed in the narrative. Mechanisms for Dessimination are also not included in the narrative.

Reader's Score: 2

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 shows that the stakeholder will support the project beyond the grant. All costs will be assumed by BSD. On page 1, BSD states that they will implement lessons in all elementary schools at the end of the project.

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Responsibilities, timelines, and milestones clearly stated in Appendix H and aligned to outcomes. Responsible parties are identified for each objective. This extensive chart gives a clear indication that the project will be completed on time and within budget. Roles and responsibilities are clearly and specifically outlined and defined in the narrative on pages 21-24. Training and experience of key personnel is evident and supported in the attached CV's/

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The applicant addresses meeting the needs of LD and LEP students throughout the proposal and specifically in goal 11.

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2010 6:58 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2010 2:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 36: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Innovative approach focused on using the arts to boost literacy. The program is a "groundbreaking supplemental literacy program that blends the creativity and discipline of the arts with learning science to raise student

achievement in reading and writing, and to develop learning and life skills" (pp. 3-4). The project is a "unique design interweaving the arts, reading, and writing" (p. 6). Data from pilot projects indicate gains in key literacy skills, including LEP students and those who perform below grade level. These features are aligned with the key needs of the target district. The project is aligned with Oregon academic standards. Application specifies 11 distinctive features of the project (p. 4). The project is focused on units of instruction aligned with work by trained teaching artists who collaborate with classroom teachers. The project provides students with opportunities to excel through activities that draw on a variety of skill sets and learning styles (p. 5). The project includes both formative and summative assessments.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Applicant has experience managing grants from federal, state, local, and private sources. Applicant has raised student achievement, helped to close achievement gaps, and improved graduation rates (p. 12).

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Key project staff have worked successfully on similar Arts for Learning projects (p. 16).

Weaknesses

Limited discussion efforts to disseminate project information broadly and support replication.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant will incorporate the program into the district strategic plan to ensure sustained commitment (p. 17). The applicant has secured stakeholder consensus on "inherent values and educational priorities" of the project community (p. 18). Applicant reports strong community commitment to ensuring that all children receive instruction in the arts as well as in core subject areas. Applicant reports that once established, program maintenance will be manageable and involved "nominal cost" (p. 19). Applicant will seek public and private sources of support to sustain program.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Personnel have experience managing large, multi-faceted federal projects. Key staff have subject matter and management experience. For example, the Project Coordinator has 15 years of experience working with arts organizations and other team member are experts in learning sciences. The management plan emphasizes effective communication and coordination among program partners, including monthly meetings, feedback, and quarterly reports. Applicant plans at least monthly internal reviews of work progress and budget status. Applicant promotes a "shared responsibility for quality within all of our teams" (p. 22).

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2010 2:41 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396D100900)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	24
TOTAL	25	24

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396D100900)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 Arts for Learning Lessons(A4L) project intends to improve the achievement of high needs students in grades 3-5. A4L is a supplemental literacy program that blends the arts with science to improve reading and writing. This project has been piloted in 92 schools across the country. Evaluations of the pilot found significant student gains in "key literacy skills" for English Language Learners(ELL) and students performing below grade level. (p. 4) The A4L project is based on the "How People Learn" model by Bransford, Brown and Cooking. (p. 5) A number of research studies to support this project are discussed on pages 7-11. The applicant states on page 10 that the research in the past 5 years on the A4L project were not of scale or rigor of the proposed study. However, positive results were obtained in literacy gains, particularly for ELL students.(p. 10)

Weaknesses

The research studies discussed in this section provide summaries of the findings and their relevance to this project. However, few details on the studies are included.

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

WestEd will serve as the independent evaluator. The evaluation design includes quantitative and qualitative data and details for the formative and summative evaluations. (p. 13-15) Biannual classroom observations, an online teacher survey, student surveys, professional development observations and annual interviews with principals and district administrators will be part of the formative evaluation. (p. 13-14) The summative evaluation will be a three year, cluster-randomized trial in 33 elementary schools in the Beaverton School district. (p. 14) To ensure internal validity of the random assignment process, statistical analyses will assess the baseline differences of the treatment and control groups. Appendix H contains a five year project overview and the logic model. Sampling and Power Estimates of the project are also provided in detail on pages H-35-36. A detailed chart of the tasks, timelines, benchmarks/outcomes and responsible parties is also detailed in Appendix H. During Year 1 WestEd will develop the protocols for comparisons.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 1:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396D100900)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	25
TOTAL	25	25

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396D100900)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

A4L has significant support from the research literature including its basis in How People Learn, a seminal meta-analysis of education research. A4L has been piloted in 92 schools in 28 districts, with positive results. The combination of its strong literature-based and empirical-based support makes it a promising program that is likely to produce positive outcomes and warrants more rigorous study.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The experimental design of the summative evaluation matches the project goal of rigorous study of impact on students. The description of this design demonstrates understanding of designs aimed at facilitating causal inferences.

Implementation data will be collected using a comprehensive set of measures including independent measures such as observation protocols.

The implementation data collected, including fidelity of implementation will be useful in replication.

WestEd is a sound choice for external evaluation. The subcontract is large (\$900K); nearly 20% of the entire budget but this is appropriate given the size and rigor of the summative evaluation design (cluster randomized trial).

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 1:46 PM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 06/30/2010 8:54 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396C100150)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	22
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	2
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	4
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____

Technical Review Form

Development 35: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396C100150)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant clearly describes the extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to Absolute priority 3 and Competitive priorities 6 and 7. The applicant proposes to enact problem based curricula in both AP and non-AP courses, implement a series of supports for struggling students, and professional development for teachers to implement and evaluate problem based curriculum (p 5). The applicant has provided specific

outcomes to drive the project with specific emphasis on SWD's and LEP's (p. 8).

Weaknesses

The response could have been strengthened by providing a clear set of goals and objectives.

Reader's Score: 22

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant has provided information regarding past projects that are of similar size to the proposed project (p.12-13). The applicant provided substantial data that clearly shows the progress the applicant has made in closing the achievement gap for all groups of students (p 14). The applicant has also indicated that 27% of BSD teachers have National Board certification.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant's estimate of 6700 students appears to be reasonable to the project (p 19). The applicant has detailed highly appropriate mechanisms for the dissemination of information on the project. These include publications, site visits, and week long institutes for interested schools (p 21).

Weaknesses

The estimated cost of \$4,324,717, for the project of the proposed project

appears to be high in relation to the number of students to be reached (p 20).

Reader's Score: 2

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant clearly has support from stakeholders. The applicant included multiple letters of support (Appendix D). The applicant clearly details the potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work at the end of the Development grant. The applicant gives clear examples, problem based curriculum and assessment as well as Starting Strong, of activities that will continue after the grant (p. 21)

Weaknesses

The response could have been strengthened if the applicant had clearly described the extent to which it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 included a management plan with activities and years for completion (p 24-28). The qualifications of the project staff appear to be appropriate for completion of the project.

Weaknesses

The applicant provides a very vague management plan (p 24-28). The response could have been strengthened by providing more detail regarding responsibilities, timelines, project goals and objectives, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 clearly addresses strategies that are designed to enable students to be prepared and ready for college by sifting to problem based curriculum.

Weaknesses

The applicant fails to address strategies for students to understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The applicant clearly describes strategies that will specifically have a direct benefit on SWD's and LEP's.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 8:54 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 8:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396C100150)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 35: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396C100150)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Applicant points out the need by American industry to replace retiring workers with young employees who are masters of STEM subjects and concepts.

The fact that ? of the students in WA who enter 2-year colleges need remedial courses supports the need for this project.

There is a wide gap at applicant's high school between the number of graduates who at least one AP course and Hispanic, SWD or LEP students who pass at least one.

While the project involves whole school reform for all high schools in the district and for all students, there is a clear focus on improving the achievement of high-need students.

The project involves adoption of PBL strategies and creation of PBL curricula to add rigor and require academic behaviors that mirror college and career experiences.

PD and curriculum work are major components of the project. Teacher time for training and curriculum development is achieved by having participating teachers responsible for one less class per day. This should also help recruit top teachers for the project.

Expansion of the summer Starting Strong program to serve specially identified high school students should help the project meet its achievement goals.

The participation of professionals in the field as guest speakers in classrooms and as mentors for individual students is an outstanding component.

The proposal presents a wise plan for curriculum change, with a year to plan before implementation of new courses, and one course worked on per year.

The inclusion of a high quality Advisory Board is well conceived.

Teachers will be trained in using PSAT data to revise instruction as needed, and the willingness of middle school principals to administer the ReadStep assessment in grade 8 will provide more information about incoming students' academic strengths and weaknesses.

Teachers' union participation in the project design and strong support of the project will greatly aid in its chances of success.

Partnering with the University of Washington-Seattle and with local industry and community leaders will add much to the project.

Weaknesses

While the expected outcomes are on target, there is some confusion about them numerically. For example, a 20% increase in AP exam pass rates could mean that the passing rate moves 20 percentage points, e.g., from 30 to 50%, or grows by 20%, e.g., from 30 to 36%. This needs to be clarified.

Clarity is needed as to how teachers will be selected to participate in the project, i.e., selecting from volunteers or mandating across the board.

While science and math improvements are clearly targeted, courses in the engineering and technology areas are left out of the project, other than in ways that these subjects may be included through PBL activities.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The Bellevue School District has significant experience in creating and implementing grant programs. In fact, this project is a logical extension of work already accomplished or underway that has been supported by outside funding.

BSD has already made significant progress in closing achievement gaps in reading and writing. This project targets gaps that still exist in STEM subjects.

100% of the classes in BSD's "high poverty schools" are taught by highly qualified teachers, as defined by ESEA. Further, in 2009 BSD has the highest number of National Board Certified Teachers in Washington State.

BCSD has a data system in place that will support the analysis of new student achievement data that is generated by the new curricula and common assessments created during this project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The project begins at one of the district high schools and then expands to the other three the following year.

The district already has a common curriculum aligned to state standards, which will facilitate scalability to the other schools.

The evaluation model, which includes videography of classrooms and interviews of participants, lends itself to the creation of a "how to" manual for other institutions to follow.

Strong teacher union support should create enthusiasm and prevent obstacles from occurring.

Over the course of the 5-year grant period, it is estimated that 6,700 students will be involved in the instructional improvements being implemented.

The creation of a scale-up team will help to ensure that the project will be brought to scale.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Support from the University of Washington, the Bellevue Education

Association and the Bellevue Schools Foundation will clearly assist in sustainability.

The PBL curriculum and assessments that will be created throughout the project will be available for use once the grant period ends.

An important component of the project is PD in use of data to improve instruction. This acquired skill will help staff sustain and improve the developed instructional methodologies once the grant period ends.

The 0.2 FTE allotment for teachers involved in course planning and piloting peaks in Year 2 at 25 teachers and decreases in the next two years. By Year 5, teachers are no longer receiving the extra planning time, which is a significant expense that will not be required after the grant period ends.

Weaknesses

New staff may need more training than is available through "new staff orientations and refresher workshops."

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 timeline for project activities is clear and logical.

The staff members who will take responsibility for the implementation of the project are highly experienced and qualified.

The applicant has given great thought to creating a Table of Organization that will give staff members time and resources to work on the project with enough oversight to ensure excellence.

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Through the instructional, mentoring and guidance components of the project, applicant has met all requirements of this priority.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

There is a clear description of the gap between SWD's and LEP's and all other students in participation in AP courses, with specific goals and strategies to narrow the gaps.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools.

To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 8:12 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2010 10:20 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396C100150)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 35: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396C100150)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant, Bellevue School District (BSD), states that it has successfully implemented high quality standards and assessments throughout its schools, however, there are gaps in graduates' college readiness, especially in math and science. The math and science scores on the state test were 20 to 30

percentage points lower than scores in reading and writing. Also, though AP courses are readily available, pass rates on AP exams for African American and Hispanic students were 28 and 20 percentage points (respectively) lower than pass rates for white students. There are also significant AP course completion gaps for Hispanic HS seniors, LEP seniors, and HS seniors with disabilities.

The proposal has 3 elements to address those needs. First, design and enactment of problem-based curricula in both AP and non-AP courses; Second, implement a series of specific supports for struggling & underserved students, focusing on increased mathematics literacy; third, work with partners to provide professional development that will help teachers implement new curricula and evaluate their effectiveness.

The applicant includes an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project over 5 years.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the**

nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant has received a number of recent grants and engaged in partnerships with public and private educational organizations. BSD has also received recognition in national publications highlighting Sammamish High School specifically for its success in preparing students for college. Data from Washington state tests show that BSD has made significant progress in closing achievement gaps for AYP subgroups over the past 6 years. For example, the achievement gap for students with disabilities on the 10th grade reading exam has gone from 55% points in 2003-04 to only 21 in 2008-09. Achievement gaps have also narrowed for Hispanic students in reading as well as African American and Hispanic students in writing. Also, on-time graduation rates in BSD have remained high (Pages 86-90) since 2004.

Districtwide, 97% of classes are taught by NCLB (highly qualified) teachers, with 100% of classes in high poverty schools. 27% of BSD teachers have achieved National Board Certification, compared with only 5.3% of teachers statewide.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and

expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant notes that the proposed project will reach approximately 2200 students over the 5-year grant and 4500 students at BSDs other 3 comprehensive high schools. A scale-up team will begin preparing for project dissemination in years 3 to 5 of the grant. Partnerships with University of Washington and College Board will add capacity to scale the practice to other regional or national high schools and the advisory board of local educational and industrial leaders will help leverage professional connections and secure resources to assist with scaling. The project will result in a number of deliverables that will facilitate project replication. PBL curriculum frameworks will be made available to schools at zero or minimal cost.

The applicant provides the total project cost and an estimated breakdown of cost per student per yr and for 100,000, 250,000 and 500,00 students. Also, the applicant proposes to disseminate information through a variety of vehicles, including peer-reviewed journals and district publications.

Weaknesses

The applicant provide an estimation that was very high in relation to the number of students being served (see page 20).

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant provides letters of support from the Bellevue Schools Foundation, offering financial support, and the Bellevue Education Associations (union) executive board to unanimously support the project. Also, BSDs many community and industrial partners will continue to support the mentoring programs and provide real-world STEM expertise in the classroom.

The applicant intends to make the problem-based curriculum and assessment, developed during the project, available to district high schools for their continuing use. The programs will continue to operate with state and private funding and the partnership with College Board will allow for continued administration of the PSAT/NMSQT to all 9th to 11th grade students and access to score data training.

Professional development for implementing the curricula will be implemented into new staff orientation and refresher workshops at the school and district levels. The district will also follow the recommendations of the Department of Education on the ongoing effective use of assessments.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 shows a detailed budget narrative with a management plan

including responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The qualifications of the project director and other key project personnel appear to reflect the training and experience needed to manage projects of this size and scope.

Weaknesses

Though the management plan lists some required qualifications for the Project Leader, that position has not been hired yet. The success of this project is highly dependent on this position.

Though the management plan lists some required qualifications for the Project Leader, that position has not been hired yet. The success of this project is highly dependent on this position (see Page 24 and page 280).

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

None

Weaknesses

This application does not address educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 school district offers strong supports for college success. The district curricula are aligned with state and national standards. BSD ranks in the top one percent nationally for student participation in Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate courses. BSDs College Corps Program provides trained volunteers to help with college applications and access to information about scholarships and financial aid. Counselors ensure that all students fill out and submit at least one college application before graduation. Students have access to the Discover Career Planning Program to identify options for post secondary schooling and careers. The proposal includes connecting students with local professionals in STEM fields to provide real-world validation for students college and career questions.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

All beginning LEPS in the district are served at Sammamish HS, where the grant activities will begin. Also, approximately 15% of students at Sammamish HS qualify for special education services.

The proposed innovation provides increased instructional time for LEPS and SWDs with a focus on mathematics, which the applicant notes is a frequent barrier to high school and college readiness. It also provides one-to-one mentoring from local professionals for information about college access and opportunities for job shadowing and internships.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

None

Weaknesses

This application does not address the challenges of high-need students in rural schools.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 10:20 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396D100150)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	7
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	17
TOTAL	25	17

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 01: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396D100150)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

STRENGTHS:

The applicant begins with a strong research based discussion about why the school district needs to implement this new problem based learning in their schools. The applicant includes well documented research data, within the US, identifying that there is a need for more STEM graduates and professionals to enter the Sciences. The applicant discusses the evolution of their school district and the results of minority students on AP tests and graduation rates.

Current research and references documenting the use of Problem-based learning is provided. The need for a robust framework for assessment is also provided by the applicant in their narrative.

The applicant provides details about the need for additional STEM program activities, and professional development for staff who teach in a STEM area. An in-depth plan for implementation among minority students and STEM study areas are provided. Related components of Problem Based Learning (PBL) including scaffolding are discussed and research and references are provided to support them. (p 9) Use of assessments and evaluations of them are included. (p 10) One-to-one youth mentoring, another component is

discussed with corresponding references.

The applicant provides an indication of how they have previously implemented many of the individual components and their success is documented. Previous grants have been used to support some of these successful components. The applicant demonstrates how their students have been able to achieve as a result of the components.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES:

None observed.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

STRENGTHS:

The applicant discusses all of the required potential risks, where and how data will be collected and how the results will be used. The applicant

proposes measurable and observable goals and objectives for this overall project implementation.

Evaluation meetings are identified in the plan and will allow the evaluators to communicate with project staff. Project evaluation activities are included within the overall management timeline and plan.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES:

The applicant has not discussed how data will be collected and compared. There is no information about when baseline data will be collected and when follow-up data will be collected, by whom. There is no information about how the data will be analyzed to determine whether or not there will be any significant changes. The applicant has not identified any statistical analysis to be used.

The applicant uses the word random assignment and meta-analysis. However, they are not designing an experimental total random assignment, nor are they doing a meta-analysis when they are actually collecting pre and post test data and survey results. This is not a meta-analysis of previous data and studies.

The applicant includes a discussion on formative and summative evaluation. However, they do not fully define how each will be accomplished and how they will be able to make any decisions about the overall success of this project.

No matter how strong the goals and objectives were, the evaluation is lacking any specific criteria or performance measures that will be demonstrated as a result of this project.

There is no indication about who will conduct the evaluation process. How will data be collected, by whom and how will it be quantified and analyzed, all of these items are not discussed.

In the proposal narrative 10% of the budget is allocated to the evaluation costs, this should be more than adequate to successfully complete a rigorous

evaluation process. However, in the budget narrative and budget line item there are no monies identified.

Reader's Score: 7

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:44 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:03 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396D100150)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	8
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
TOTAL	25	18

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 01: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Bellevue School District -- Bellevue School District, - Bellevue School District, (U396D100150)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

One strength of the BSD proposal is that problem based learning is currently being used within the district. As a result, some staff within the district are familiar with the processes needed to develop a problem based learning approach, effective assessments, and can provide support and information for those new to the problem based approach. In addition, as a result of their efforts, BSD staff already have some data on the impact of a problem based approach on student performance.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

First, the evaluation incorporates both process (e.g., documenting the implementation of the problem based learning approach) and outcomes findings which will provide information on both what happened (i.e., process) and what was the impact (outcomes).

A second strength is that the evaluation incorporates assessment of teaching processes followed by rapid feedback that will ultimately enhance the fidelity by which staff implement the problem based learning curriculum.

Next, the evaluation clearly incorporates both quantitative (e.g., test scores) and qualitative data collection, a strength because information learned from each approach will complement the other.

Another strength is that the evaluation incorporates assessment of all program components: teacher professional development, implementation of the program, and student outcomes which will provide useful information about the relative successes and challenges encountered at each point of program implementation.

Last, a strength of the proposed evaluation is determining the impact of the problem based approach on student academic and career plans. This is useful and warranted because it examines the impact of the proposed curriculum beyond the classroom.

Weaknesses

One weakness is that a single group pretest/posttest design has been chosen to evaluate the problem based learning approach and this design is relatively weak in determining the impact of a program relative to other, alternative approaches. In other words, the design may show that the problem based approach had an impact on students, but it will not demonstrate if the problem based approach has more impact than other teaching approaches.

Another weakness is that the group plans to use course grades (see p. 17), in part, to examine the impact of the problem based approach on student performance. Use of course grades is problematic because of variations from teacher-to-teacher and school-to-school in the development of course assignments and the assessment of student work on those assignments. Those variations introduce error into the analysis of the impact of the program and impede conclusions made. Instead, a standardized, uniform instrument would be more useful to determine the impact of the problem based learning approach on student learning.

Reader's Score: 8

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:03 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2010 5:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

TOTAL 80

75

Technical Review Form

Development 27: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

This project is innovative and will move partners into a 21st century instructional model and design. It offers a practical solution to meeting Response to Intervention differentiated instructional needs and honors the diversity found within this country. The RFP was well organized, clearly stated goals and objectives, and represented a strong need.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible

applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposal identified extensive needs for the continued development of the pilot model. To facilitate transitioning into high school, the proposal provided evidence for how 9th grade would benefit. There were strong clearly written goals, well thought out implementation plans, and a solid program evaluation plan.

Weaknesses

None identified.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The credentials of the NYC schools were impressive. The leadership seems focused on moving the district into the 21st century. To have wisely engaged each of the stakeholders in understanding your vision long before you submitted this proposal poised your partnerships to write strong supporting

letters. Their personal experience with the system and their sharing added a powerful dimension to your proposal.

Time magazine's Top 50 recognition certainly added credibility to this project being innovative.

On page 19 the leadership reported the following student achievement gains: 3-8th grade Language Arts and Math gains on the NY State Regents' exams were 44.6%, 2009 graduation rate, as compared to 30% in 2005.

Evidence of the ability to scale up a project was found in the implementation of ARIS.

Weaknesses

None identified.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The proposal will involve 3,000 students (250 per school). The 6th-8th grade math scores were impressive. Evidence was provided supporting a past history of bringing technology to scale. The credentials of those responsible were impressive. The district has experience with scaling up on a national level through its partnerships with several other large urban districts.

The replication plan for this project includes a number of tool-kit procedures, student orientation handbooks, school selection criteria, and technical platform requirements.

There was an honest assessment of per student costs at \$3337.

The identified dissemination plan includes a realistic and concrete list of venues within which to share results.

On page 3 the teachers have stated that they want this project and the student achievement benefits that would result from its implementation.

Weaknesses

None identified.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 proposal identified an impressive list of partnerships that indicate

admiration and support for the framework of School of One.

There was clear evidence of strong district commitment to not only maintain but to build this system. The fact that the letters of support were written by partners that had visited the pilot months prior to the application was significant. The district had been solidifying and sharing their vision of 21st century instruction with many partners and potential partners.

Weaknesses

There was no evidence of professional development for the teachers. This is a concern related to the sustainability of the project, if the teachers are not well trained.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 personnel costs included one full time director.
The proposal also included job descriptions for the new personnel to be hired. This indicated a thoroughness of planning and forethought. There was evidence of the connection between all positions and their responsibilities.

Weaknesses

None identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

(0 or 1 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

This project did not apply for this Competitive Preference.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

**2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success
(0 or 1 Point)**

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

There were no clear connections between the proposal and this preference.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

This proposal addressed this Preference.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The project does not serve rural schools. The fact that it could in the future do so is not a factor for this proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 5:53 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	3
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1
TOTAL	80	76

Technical Review Form

Development 27: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The New York City School of One Project is offering to develop a personalized instructional model for helping middle school students to master critical knowledge and skills that are considered vital for continuing on to high school and college. The project is based on the experience and success of a pilot program that involved 80 school in the City. The project is technology-based and includes ongoing and comprehensive assessments that will be used to direct supplemental education and support services.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The is well designed innovative project that appears to complement and support the City's priority of improving the teaching and learning of math at the middle school level. The program makes use of a management information system that will provide ongoing data on the performance and achievement of students, and particularly for students with the greatest needs. The assessment system provides a key component for monitoring progress and for making adjustments. It will contribute to identifying the unique needs of ELL student and students with learning disabilities. The exclusive focus on math and its unique approach in providing professional development to facilitate the integrity of the proposed model program seem to be definite strengths.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

Experience is more than adequate. The commitment from the NYPS to make use of the student performance reports will be a definite advantage in the further development and implementation of this program. The ARIS system has been developed and used city-wide for the past several years. Moving forward on this project seems appropriate and the experienced staff should be able to carry this off.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.**

- (2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.**

- (3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.**

- (4) 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.**

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The focus on further developing this program and expanding in within the City of New York contributes to the potential for bringing this program to scale. Additional adoptions should contribute to reductions in overhead costs.

Weaknesses

Anticipated plans and details are somewhat vague. The array of partners, while supporting current efforts, may add to the challenges of duplicating the project in other and multiple sites. Carrying on an effective professional development component seems particularly challenging. Details about the current PD component are not adequately presented its cited that "an experienced person" will serve as the PD director, but its nor clear who that person will be and what experience and talents will be expected.

Reader's Score: 3

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

With community-based organizations and support from City officials, this project has a good chance to be sustained and replicated within the system. The structure that is being developed will be a good foundation on which to build. Having direct access to such a wide range of project partners in both the public and private sectors should continue to support and help sustain its development.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan is detailed and adequate for the tasks that need to be successfully accomplished. Sufficient details are provided about the schedules, activities and respective role of key staff and contributing partners. The staff is well-qualified and experienced in working with the City's school system and its teachers.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

This competitive priority was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Success of this project would contribute to improvements in reducing school dropouts and increasing graduation rates.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

The program is directed to low-income and minority children in NYC and it would address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including a significant number of ELL students and those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

If this project is successful, there is a strong indication that it will address the unique challenges of high-need students in rural schools.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:20 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 0:11 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	7
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	3
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2
TOTAL	80	67

Technical Review Form

Development 27: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

A specialized tool is being addressed for complete development to assist with more individualized differentiated instruction in the classroom of a rural community.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible

applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

So1 is an innovative tool that will be infused in middle school framework to effectively increase achievement in mathematics and for future college success. It would be an excellent tool for IEPs for students with disabilities or needing ELL support. LEP and rural areas are addressed in this proposal. The student's daily excerpt helped to visualize the use of the tool better. Two pilot phases have occurred.

Weaknesses

Data for So1 is limited currently and not user friendly. Access for this program will be limited to schools that meet the specific criteria for technology.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Effective strategies are in line with the increased achievement of the pilot programs. Google is lending support for this innovative proposal with financial funding. Support for this unique technology is impressive in the letters provided, including from Microsoft, Wireless generation, Teaching Matters, McGraw Hill, PBS to name a few. Expertise is evident for this applicant in the area of large scale projects. Data supports improvement in achievement gaps of in math, reading, graduation and college preparedness page 19.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate

information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

3000 students will be served from this project. Appendix indicates specific allocations of funds for personnel and funding per student. Cost of expanding the schools is minimal after initial startup. Technology and Educational partners will help to continues support, only if this grant is successful. However, replication is dependent on a variety of options that are not detailed. Dissemination will be hosted via web and press, but most importantly the stakeholders are involved.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

A multitude of substantial grant funding has been provided from the stakeholders (as mentioned on other sections). Support from school principals is documented. The fact that Time magazine states this is the most innovative tool that has come about" was astonishing and worthy of the innovativeness of this tool. This tool may have merit to evolve teaching once again!

Weaknesses

NYCDOE will only invest if this program deems to be successful. Community support will also be important in future investment of this program. Teacher support will be crucial for this to continue. Strategies are in place to expand this project in three phases that are clear and concise.

Reader's Score: 7

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 two key management personnel are discussed; responsibilities are listed in detail. Expertise for both key parties are appropriate for this large scale grant. It was mentioned in another section about consultants for So1 being utilized for their own purposes.

Weaknesses

Project timeline is not detailed enough. Other personnel including Director of Content, Director of PD, and others are not listed for expertise purposes.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Criteria met.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Criteria met.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Criteria met.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 0:11 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 4:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396D100941)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	23
TOTAL	25	23

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396D100941)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

A good literature review demonstrated there were reasonable hypothesis and research-based findings that supported the proposed project, e.g., Fuchs & Fuchs (1986) and Barrow et al. (2007). Furthermore, the pilot study showed promising positive impact (e.g., 28 percentage point increase, p. 15).

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. The reviewer's scores reflect his/her professional assessment of the application with respect to these criteria.

Weaknesses

Although the applicant demonstrated that the proposed project likely would have a positive impact, they did not justify why an anticipated effect size would be between 0.25 and 0.5 standard deviations (p.17).

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The clustering randomized block design with matched pair was appropriate for the evaluation (p.22-23). Given the small sample size (8 schools), this design can avoid unhappy randomization, i.e., make two groups more equivalent than without matching. The statistical power is one issue, but the applicant provided some solutions, e.g., using pretest as covariate (p.24).

In addition, the applicant proposed good plans to provide implementation data and analyze the factors mediated the program impact (p.25).

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. The reviewer's scores reflect his/her professional assessment of the application with respect to these criteria.

Weaknesses

Their power analysis was too optimistic, i.e., $MDES=0.25$ with power = 0.9 (p.24). With 8 schools, power = 0.9, alpha = 0.05, 2-tailed test, $MDES=0.25$, the ICC need to be smaller than 0.05, and the level 2 R-squared needs to be 0.9 (see Optimal Design Software or Bloom's MDES formula). These assumptions in school settings were unusual. The power analysis in developmental grant is not so important, but it should be reasonably presented if the applicant decided to present it.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 4:16 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 4:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396D100941)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	11
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
TOTAL	25	18

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396D100941)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 describes three different areas of research to support the project. The program was piloted on a small scale in 2009 (pgs. 14-16). Two groups evaluated their pilot study: one focused on the model and the second looked at student outcomes. Positive results as well as shortcomings were shared. Based on presented results of the pilot program, the applicant indicates that further study is warranted (pg. 17).

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. The reviewer's scores reflect his/her professional assessment of the application with respect to these criteria.

Weaknesses

The first area of research, use of paper formative assessments, does not specifically relate to the project's format (pg. 12). In the second area regarding differentiated instruction (pg. 13), the term "differentiated" can refer to meeting the needs of students with different learning styles, adjusting the size and scope of individual assignments, and so on, yet how the term

was used in the research was not defined. This project does not lend itself to these multiple aspects of differentiation because its focus is on differentiating content. Also, the discussion focuses on teachers yet not technology, which is the intent of this project. The pilot study featured student participation in summer and after-school (pg. 17), and so the attitude and motivation of these students, compared to the population in the pilot, may be dissimilar and affect results.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The evaluation will employ a cluster randomized control trial with eight schools. An explanation is provided for how random assignment and matched pairs will occur (pgs. 22-23). In addition to looking at benchmark and statewide assessments, the evaluation will examine student attitudes and behaviors and teacher beliefs. They will investigate whether the program effects vary across students and teachers. The budget portion allocated to the evaluation represents 7-8% of the total budget which seems sufficient to conduct the evaluation.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. The reviewer's scores reflect his/her professional assessment of the application with respect to these criteria.

Weaknesses

It was not clearly shown how learning about student and teacher attitudes would help to improve or revise the program. The evaluation design does not include learning about the structure and implementation of the development activities, the process for space redesign, or site support and managing the technology platform. It was not clear if the purpose of the evaluation was to show the project improved student performance, or that the technology platform was ready for other schools to purchase.

Reader's Score: 11

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 4:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396C101038)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 11: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396C101038)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant's plan proposes to train highly effective teachers to work in under-performing schools to improve student achievement. The applicant's plan is exceptional because it has a residency component. The plan meets requirements of priority 1.

The applicant's proposed plan has clearly defined goals, objectives, and

outcomes that are measurable. The applicant's plan to recruit, prepare, train and sustain excellent teachers for BPS is highly structured (pp. 8-10).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant pioneered the residency plan to meet the needs of its district (BPS). The plan now serves as a national model. The applicant's program has grown from training 16 resident teachers to 235 (p. 24).

The applicant has provided data referencing the achievement that has been made since the implementation of the turnaround program. The applicant provides data to show that the average student percentile for BTR teachers is slightly higher than non-BTR graduates. (BTR 48.96% compared to non-BTR 48.3% p. 26). The applicant has provided data that illustrates

significant gains in English and Math (p. 29).

The applicant's plan has increased the rate of retention of its BTR graduates. After completing their three year commitment, 85% of BTR graduates remain in the BPS. Previously, BPS retention rates were reported at 53% (p. 27).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant will reach 2,335 teachers in the first year of the grant period in three turn around schools (p. 35). The plan will add three schools per year reaching approximately 1,500 students per year. BTR estimates that a total of 8,935 students will be reached by the end of the grant period. BTR will place 235 teachers into its school at a rate of 65 graduates per year.

The applicant's plan provides evidence that it has financial resources, strategies, and personnel to reach the proposed number of students during the grant period. The applicant has established its success at training and recruiting graduates to work in turn around schools. BTR has private and public stake-holders that support the program. BPS will contribute 20% of operating costs (p. 39). There is additional evidence of support that can be found on pp. 38-39.

The applicant's program can and has been replicated. BTR's plan is a national model and the Department of Education has already distributed \$150,000,000 to replicate the program.

The applicant has estimated that the total cost of the five-year program will be \$4,855,618. The applicant lists the cost of serving 100,000 students as \$54,300,000; 250,000 students as \$271,500,00; and 500,000 students as \$543,000,000.

The applicant's plan will disseminate information about programs by distributing all information about the program and its results at no cost. Dissemination methods will include presentations at conferences, published results in the Harvard Center for Education and Research and the Journal of Teacher Education.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant has resources to sustain the project beyond the grant period that have been contributed by stakeholders, BPE private funds, and multi-year funding from a variety of foundations (pp. 38-39). BPS has gained highly effective teachers that have been placed in their low performing schools and the retention of those teachers has cut their cost of training teachers who leave the system. Therefore BPS will remain a partner and help to sustain the program.

The applicant has provided evidence that has the potential for planning to recruit and train highly effective teachers through its unique approach to placing its graduates in turn around schools.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 a management plan in place. The applicant's key personnel are capable of managing the project to include budget oversight, establishing and meeting deadlines, and specified tasks during the grant period and beyond.

The project director and key personnel are in place and have relevant training and experience. The duties and responsibilities of the management team and staff are clearly defined and align with the overall program goals.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The plan addresses the unique needs of students with disabilities and has seen growth in the performance of ELL students and students with learning disabilities.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the

unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority not addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:15 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/28/2010 12:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396C101038)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

TOTAL 80

74

Technical Review Form

Development 11: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396C101038)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

This grant initiative is viewed as exceptional.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The Boston Teacher Residency program recruits, prepares and supports

teachers in the highest need areas for the Boston Public Schools. The outcomes of this proposal are intended to prepare and place a total of 130 teachers for Boston's designated turnaround schools; at present there are twelve. Other areas of focus within the program address retention, student academic growth, and proficient teacher evaluations.

Weaknesses

No overall weakness was noted in this category of the project.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Since its creation in 2003, BTR has prepared and supported more than 230 graduates, with a sizable number addressing ELL and students with disabilities. A partnership with the Academy of Urban School Leaders (AUSL) will render technical assistance and support toward the program. The U.S. Education Department has recently distributed a large sum of monies in the form of Teacher Quality Partnership grants that are

intended to replicate the residency model.

Weaknesses

No overall weakness was noted in this category of the project.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

BTR is partnering with principals with an excellent record of increasing student achievement; the first three have been identified. BTR is planning to sub-contract its school based assessment work to Achievement Network. In addition, BTR will contract with the Harvard Center for Education Policy

Research to conduct a value-added study to examine the effects on student achievement of its graduates.

Weaknesses

No overall weakness was noted in this category of the project.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

BPS is a joint initiative of the Boston Public Schools and the Boston Plan for Excellence (BPE). BPE has helped secure over \$74M in funding for the BPS. Though BPS' funding serves as a core of BTR's support, the Ford Foundation and Carnegie Foundation, in conjunction with BPE, have contributed significant funds to a school based inquiry project. There also exist other funding sources that currently support BTR.

Weaknesses

No overall weakness was noted in this category of the project.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 structure of the BTR management plan appears to meet the needs of successfully implementing this program.

Weaknesses

The key staff identified in the Boston Teacher Residency program does not include a professional with applied principal experience within a public school setting. As leadership is one of the major three components that determine school success, the BTR staff does not reflect an individual with this background.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The profiles within turnaround schools reflect a significant enrollment of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency. Therefore, the program would 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 for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Weaknesses

No overall weakness was noted in this category of the project.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 12:48 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 5:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396C101038)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 11: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396C101038)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>This application, on page 6, uniquely builds from previous years of this work by the applicant partnership. It presents an exceptional and innovative approach to tackling the challenge of failed schools by matching leaders in</p>

"fresh start" schools with the new leaders in "turn around" school to support successful turn-around strategies. The project plan is grounded in a theory of change that has been demonstrated as successful both in the Boston area and in a handful of districts across the country. It combines experienced leadership and data collection, analysis, and support with a constant focus on student learning (p. 8 and forward). The plan includes an innovative, standardized system for measuring teacher effectiveness (p. 11) which includes value-added assessment and classroom observations. Measures are specific and defined. Another strength is that the project proposal lays out a plan to prepare future teachers individually for the specific school in which they will be placed and, simultaneously, it will work with partners to implement whole school improvements (p. 13). The plan stipulates teaching through inquiry and the use of continuous formative assessment as well as regular analysis of assessment data to guide continuing instructional intervention (p. 14).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the**

nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The experience on which this project is built is well-established and distinguished. BTR has a strong background of success in Boston Public Schools (P. 3 and pp. 15-19). A "Turnaround Coordinator" will be responsible for overseeing the tricky work using formative assessment to guide continual instructional adaptation to student needs(P. 14). The guiding TOC, together with the value-added assessment model, is grounded in emerging evidence about the research-based features of strong assessment systems (p. 16). BTR demonstrates that it has convened a diverse group of participants who will be in a good position to develop teachers' skills in serving students in the high needs academic fields of math, science,ESL, and special education. This proposal specifically identifies the school leaders who will direct the programs on the ground (p. 21), and proposes a set of successful non-profit partners that are staffed with a deep bench of experienced urban school leaders who have a strong track record of success (pp. 22-30). The BTR team is especially experienced and successful. The proposal presents concrete evidence of the partners' accomplishments, and their solid reputation for using analytic approaches successfully in very challenging school contexts. Letters of support attest to the widespread commitment to this project and interest in supporting its scaling up throughout Massachusetts.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

A well-planned strategy for scaling the project is built on BTR's experience and track record of success. The scale-up plan (pp. 35-37) will be coordinated by the the multiple partner which comprise this project team. Each of these partners is a strong, well-funded organization (BPS; BPE, UTRU, & AUSL), which has successfully scaled projects of this nature in the past. Letters of support from the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education provide evidence of statewide institutional support that increases the likelihood of success of the scale-up. Cost estimates for large-scale scale ups are presented (p. 37). Dissemination is thoroughly addressed (p. 38).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 lead organization for this project is embedded within two organizations that have established histories and track records of successfully initiating school innovation and change with a focus on teacher development. The parent organization (BPE) has already demonstrated its capacity for sustainability and growth over a 25 year period. The organizations are well-funded and continue to attract new investors in their work (p. 39). The project's teacher residence and training strategies, combined with its embedded evaluation, and its organizational power, promise that the project will be sustained and will likely expand and grow during the grant period and beyond.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

A detailed and comprehensive management plan envisions a multi-faceted organizational structure which is directed by leaders with a wealth of experience on the ground and working in partnerships (p. 42-50) to turn failing schools around. Timelines and milestones are explicit and carefully designed; experienced staff members were identified and are already working with the lead organization. The staff roles are uniquely specific for the work that lies ahead, including field directors, and directors to oversee induction, curriculum development, ESL, and special education programs. The proposed staff members also have strong backgrounds working in schools in crisis and have successfully demonstrated their capacity to redirect the educational programs of failing urban schools.

Weaknesses

Now weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Preference not indicated.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Preference not indicated.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

What makes this application especially strong for this competitive preference is that an experienced field director is identified to manage the focus on ESL and special education in the implementation of the project. The application lays out a plan that is designed explicitly to address this priority area.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the

unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Preference not specified in this area.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 5:04 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/25/2010 2:28 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396D101038)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	24
TOTAL	25	24

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396D101038)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 research cited on the BTR model is well-respected in the field. Linda Darling-Hammond, Sanders, Calkins, Duke, and others are cited for their work on the importance of teacher education. Each component of the model is identified, described and connected to research in the field or a theoretical position. After seven years of recruiting, training and retaining teachers, the district would now like to target the success of the general model to the specific task of preparing teachers to support chronically low performing, or turnaround schools. For this task, the model will draw on the work of professional learning communities in the area of formative assessment.

The research on formative assessment is generally accepted. Learning to review data and use it to guide instruction is recognized as an essential element of teacher effectiveness. To support the use of the data, BTR will add a data collection and reporting system to ensure quick turnaround and easy access to test results.

To test their success in this effort, the district will pull on the work of Sanders. Recently, the program commissioned CEPR to conduct a value-added study on the quality teacher value in low performing schools. The targeting of the BTR model to more specific types of schools will help to identify and prioritize the skill set needed to support a vital educational

problem.

Weaknesses

None Noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

The evaluation design is well-organized and partitioned to focus appropriate research methods on specific educational objectives. Three overarching research questions are articulated and expanded with sub-questions. Then, the evaluation for that question is explained. The research questions, in general, address the impact of teacher quality on student achievement in low performing schools. The school district will share student level data on teachers and students to enable the most robust statistical value-add analysis. BTR teachers will be compared to non-BTR teachers to support causal interpretations of the findings. Teams of trained researchers will go into sets of classrooms to examine the nature of teacher effectiveness using a case study methodology. Their observations will be standardized by recording their findings on validated behavior checklists such as the CLASS. The observations will be conducted on four different occasions over the school year, which is generous given the time required to conduct the observations.

Another research focus will examine the support network of the teachers-in-

training and the factors the hinder and propel teacher empowerment. This research will be qualitative in nature and include observations of teachers in and outside of the classroom. Multiple methods of data collection will be applied to allow for a triangulation of the findings. The resources for the evaluation are sufficient with budgets applied that are proportional to evaluators' time and/or expertise required.

Weaknesses

The multiple evaluation efforts need to be well-coordinated to facilitate communication. Here doesnt appear to be anyone assigned to the task.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/25/2010 2:28 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396D101038)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	22
TOTAL	25	22

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools Foundation -- , - ,
(U396D101038)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

STRENGTHS: The proposal addresses Absolute Priority 1 and the hypothesis as stated on page 3 responds to the absolute priority. The proposed project is based on seven years of experience with teacher residency and expands the current residency to turnaround schools to change the school environments so that increased student achievement can be realized in those schools. Research results for the seven years that the project has been implemented demonstrate effectiveness in teacher recruitment, preparation, development and retention that warrant further systematic study to determine generalizability to various school settings and student populations. The project will further extend the validation of the value added study of teacher effectiveness that it piloted during the previous implementation phase. The magnitude of the impact of the proposed project discussed on page 21 appears to warrant further research to confirm the previous results of the model in retaining qualified teachers through reducing turnover. There is a thorough discussion of effect size and impact on student achievement based on teacher years of experience which supports the retention component of the proposed project (p.21-22). The project will also draw on insights from other projects that have had success with turnaround models and will enlist their mentorship to guide the current project (p.23) and employ the lessons learned in building effective turnaround capacity for schools. A discussion of the variation in models

offers opportunities to replicate the model while still being flexible to school and local contexts (p.25).

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

STRENGTHS: The evaluation is guided by three key research questions that align with the overarching hypothesis of the project (p.32). The evaluation includes three distinct components that address each of the key research questions. The value-added study will be used to determine student achievement and will use a standardized assessment to both predict current performance and actual performance of the students. This is a strong methodology to employ for determining program impacts. The table on page 33-34 clearly presents the evaluation questions and the timing of data collection and reporting which are timed to allow for project implementation feedback to inform decision making. The second evaluation question will be addressed through observations and the collection of qualitative data to capture the key components of the project. Instrumentation is discussed and observer training is mentioned to ensure inter-rater reliability of the data collection (p.35). Qualitative data will be used to address the third evaluation question and this approach appears to be reasonable based on the

nature of the evaluation question. Data collection instruments and time points are presented on page 36 and seem to be appropriate for capturing data on key elements of the approach that can be used to document project fidelity and the variation in the model contexts that can inform outcomes as well as replication. The evaluation team consists of academics from Harvard Center for Educational Policy Research which has worked with the project implementers for the past two years to create an outcomes database. The project budgeted sufficient financial resources to carry out the evaluation based on the expertise of the evaluation team, the scope of work and the complexity of the evaluation components? data collection and analysis.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: Although the data analyses for the outcomes component of the evaluation are clearly discussed in the proposal, the data analysis for evaluation questions 2 and 3 are not clearly presented. The addition of discussion of data analysis to address these questions would improve the proposal. It is not clear who will coordinate all of the evaluation activities as it appears there will be three distinct components with three different evaluation teams conducting the evaluation research. Although the job descriptions include a Director of Teacher Effectiveness which will oversee the evaluation, this information should also be included in the narrative of the proposal in the evaluation section. There is also another position in the job descriptions for a Research Associate, but it is not clear if he/she will work with the evaluation team. Further discussion of the specific responsibilities of the internal and external research staff and the working relationships to coordinate the overall evaluation would improve the proposal.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/25/2010 6:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396C100694)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 64: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396C100694)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

1. A very food demographic population for critical need,k-3; critical period for intervention with far-reaching effects. Project of "community literacy" represents an exceptional approach.
2. MPS on-going assessment,framework,descriptors all components of program intervention and all present in the project design.Applicant cites current statistics for population to be served. e4 Applicant provided comprehensive demographic and achievement data with clearly defined

goals and objectives (as performance metrics) for each sphere: school, family, community.

Weaknesses

(2) Measurable outcomes and performance measures not explicit. The applicant needs to provide CLEARLY defined goals/objectives (as performance metrics) for each sphere: school, family, and community.

Reader's Score: 20

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

- (1) Boys and Girls Clubs have a long history in the community with the potential for the presentation of longitudinal data.
- (2) Presence of 21st Century Learning Centers within school network has created opportunities for significant student achievement. The program is accessible for high-poverty and high-needs students. Significant achievements of the applicant are substantiated with relevant data (ii)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

1.Capacity is stated regarding the number of students for the proposed project.(e18)

(2) Capacity with reference to highly qualified personnel is evident.The project incorporates the use of Americorps members as well as the full incorporation of B&GCGM staff. This suggests the likelihood of leveraging the substantial fiscal resources of B&GCBM as a means of providing further development of the project.

(3)The feasibility of the project is suggested through the creation of a

Curriculum replication and training plan. This plan involves the use of in-school lesson plans, and literacy tool kits.

(4)The applicant presents direct and indirect cost for scale up Costs for scale up of the project to reach 100,000;250,000; and 500,000 students.

Weaknesses

(5) Dissemination is not broad and is primarily inclusive of those within the Boys and Girls network. The inclusion of resources to reach a broader and more diverse audience would have been helpful: Facebook, Twitter, more accessibility of information to parents, families.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

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

Strengths

1. Key organizations have demonstrated support for project. (SPARK)
2. Collaboration includes proposed fiscal support which justifies a likely sustainable model. Letters of support are impressive: Governor of Wisconsin.

Weaknesses

No weakness found

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

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

Strengths

1. A very specific management plan is presented which include activities, timelines, an action plan, key personnel and clearly defined responsibilities.
2. Qualified personnel (see resumes) are integrated into the project design all personnel referenced have extensive experience in managing projects of the scope and size of the proposed Project.

Weaknesses

No weakness found

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

1. Specific concepts for population to be served are addressed. Very strong linkage presented of school, community, and family all of critical importance to the population served and to the project design. The project design

presents a program of early literacy which is research-based. Further, the project presents a means of articulation with programs for early learning, pre-kindergarten and the primary grades. The program as described, presents the potentiality for improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 6:57 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 1:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396C100694)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	18
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 64: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396C100694)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The goal of the Milwaukee Community Literacy Project is to demonstrate an impact on improving student reading (K to 3) for high-needs students by expanding community literacy.

The overall goal - students will be reading on grade level by the time they enter 4th grade.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The program is a joint venture between the Boys and Girls Club and the Milwaukee Public School District; 81% of the students in the school district qualify for free or reduced lunch.

The goals are clear with strategies supporting them to include a "wrap-around" approach including schools, family, and community.

Weaknesses

Points were lost in this section as all goals were not measurable. For example, "Performance Measure 1: Teacher ratings of participating students will exhibit higher reading levels than the students in the control group." This would be strengthened by the following modification, "Teacher ratings of participating students will exhibit higher reading levels by at least 20% than the students in the control group." (see p. 4)

Reader's Score: 18

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

This proposal is built on a limited scale project called Spheres of Proud Achievement in Reading for Kids (SPARK) that has shown promising results in eight schools to date.

The SPARK program uses the PALS curriculum = Phonological Awareness and Literacy Screening.

Significant student achievement has been demonstrated in reading.

The applicants have experience in similar programs, such as the 21st Century Community Learning Centers; budgets of \$3M in federal funds, \$1M in additional funds.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

(1) A strength of this proposal is the number of students to be reached. For example the MCLP will reach 350 students each year at seven schools. The ultimate number of students to be served is 1,000 from 20 locations.

(2) The applicant's capacity for further development is based on the experience noted in the application regarding a similar endeavor. For example, The Boys and Girls Clubs launched a program in 2005 with the goal of increasing reading scores for students in grades K to 2. This pilot program was successful and the Clubs launched a full program at three additional sites.

(3) A plan is in place for replication should the results be positive. A particular strength is that formal training, as well as technical support, will be provided to organizations who wish to replicate the program.

(4) Annual budget for the project related expenses is only \$1,873 per student; projections for 100K, 250K, and 500K is included, along with corresponding costs that are appropriate.

Weaknesses

(5) Dissemination of information strategies is limited and includes primarily a network of other Boys and Girls Clubs of America. This area would be strengthened if it included information regarding the mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to BROADLY disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication in a variety of settings and for organizations other than the Boys and Girls Clubs.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Key community organizations have come together to assist in the success of SPARK through a large-scale collaboration. The collaboration is another action to further their vision of neighborhood school.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Many of the project staff, including the project director and site coordinators are already on staff. The program will be supported by the Boys and Girls Club; their finance department will be responsible for all financial accounting.

The qualifications and experiences of those already hired and/or involved appear to be commensurate with the needs of the program.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

(0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

The proposal for the Milwaukee Community Literacy Project is geared toward students in grades k to 3.

(a) The Boys and Girls Club of greater Milwaukee, in partnership with Milwaukee Public Schools, will implement the program. The project will help develop students' social, emotional, and cognitive readiness through support in three spheres: school, family, and community.

(b) As part of the district's corrective action, the Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction is requiring MPS to provide ongoing assessment of student progress that includes a universal screener in reading.

(c) The program will improve alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs by providing a "wrap-around" approach to address the three spheres of school, family, and community.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Applicant did not address.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Applicant did not address.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement

innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Applicant did not address.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 1:16 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:59 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396C100694)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	22
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	7
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 64: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396C100694)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant is applying CPP#5 for Early Learning Outcomes; and AP#4

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>The applicant proposes an average program that has not already been widely adopted but has shown promising results in eight schools.</p>

The applicant provides clear evidence of need through the data provided on the large achievement gaps in reading that are proposed to be addressed by applicant. (Page 3)

Weaknesses

The applicant fails to provide a set of measurable goals.

The family sphere of the project does not properly address the needs of family situations and has the undue limitations for implementation in the highest needs student populations. For example, the applicant states that families that are unwilling to participate will be replaced with a family randomly assigned and does not account for single parent or working family needs or limitations, nor for sensitive issues regarding foster care situations. (page 7)

Reader's Score: 22

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant has vast experience implementing projects of this size. Additionally, the applicant operates 30 sites and \$30 million in federal and private grants for a similar program. (Page 14)

The applicant provides meaningful data that points to significant improvements in student achievement, attainment and/or retention at local schools. For example, 84% of high school students who participate in the programs operated by the applicant compared to 67% of their peers.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant provides information that the project intends to serve 350 students each year at seven schools during the grant cycle. (Page 18)

The applicant's current management capacity allows for the expansion of the proposed project and they possess qualified personal and are currently operated in mainstream classrooms.(Page 19)

The applicant possesses feasible replication of the model for expansion and replication given availability of resources. For example, the applicant operates \$30 million in federal and private grants.

The applicant provides the proposed projects start-up and scaled up cost estimates to reach 100,000; 250,000; and 500,000 students. (Page 19)

Weaknesses

The applicant provides for a dissemination plan that is not broad. For example, the applicant's only intends to distribute information to Boys and Girls Clubs. (Page 20)

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant demonstrated that it possesses the necessary resources as well as support from stakeholders to operate beyond the length of the project. For example, the LEA utilizes the proposed learning programs in 6 local public schools and has the commitment and support for incorporation of the project activities. (Page e4 and 20)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 governance and structure of the applicant provides for the experience and qualifications to manage projects of this size.

The applicant provides a clear timeline with measurable goals and objectives.

Weaknesses

The applicant proposes to hire a coordinator to assist with implementation and data compilations, but does not clearly describe the responsibilities for data management, student achievement information and electronic data systems and how the sensitive information will be disseminated from the LEA to the applicant. (Page 22)

Reader's Score: 7

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

The applicant provides a model and strategies to improve educational outcomes for high needs students struggling with literacy development. The applicant proposes to further develop the SPARK program and integrate it into the Boys and Girls Club youth programs to improve literacy development milestones and prepare early learning programs in kindergarten through third grade.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Not addressed in the application

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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 addressed in the application

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not addressed in the application

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:59 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 2:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396D100694)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	8
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	21
TOTAL	25	21

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 02: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396D100694)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.
- (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

Tutoring model is based on previous research on two interventions--- Reading Recovery and Success for All. Other research support comes from studies on family reading. In 2008-2009 they did a study of PALS and demonstrated positive change on student achievement.

Weaknesses

They have limited evidence on their specific model. They don't require certified teachers (although their tutors receive extensive training. The one study they completed did not have a control group. This means that other threats to internal and external validity may be an issue.

Reader's Score: 8

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality

implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

Strong RCT with repeated measures crossover design. Each involved school will have 50 treatment and 50 contrast students. Analyses include fixed and random effects.

Good implementation analysis plan. Lot's of opportunity for formative feedback.

Weaknesses

Would have liked to have seen more detail regarding sample, power analysis, and analysis strategies. Most of the detail is left to App H. For example their "value added" approach doesn't review some of the bias and statistical difficulties in carrying out this model.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 2:58 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 4:31 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396D100694)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	24
TOTAL	25	24

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 02: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Milwaukee -- , - , (U396D100694)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 demonstrates that there is empirical evidence and reasonable hypotheses to support the proposed project. The applicant presents evidence that one-on-one tutoring and parent involvement, components of the proposed project, are effective in raising achievement levels of at-risk students. The applicant also presents a rationale for including a community component in the current intervention.

The applicant demonstrates successful implementation of the project as a pilot program yielding promising results. Applicant presents data from the pilot program, although limited and a pre- post- test design, which shows an increase in the percentage of children reading at grade level, comprehending grade level material, spelling correctly at grade level, and reading grade level words in isolation.

The applicant presents research findings from similar programs with effect sizes and results from the pilot program that demonstrate a positive effect.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The plan proposes both a formative and impact evaluation.

Application evidences a thoughtful consideration of variables to be included in the formative evaluation including adequacy of staff selection and training. The study design is a randomized control trial and the use of multi-level modeling procedures promises to yield answers regarding program effectiveness by controlling for other factors possibly influencing measures of achievement such as prior achievement and participation in other programs.

Applicant notes that information gathered in regard to formative evaluation will be reported and made available to guide replication efforts.

Applicant will have an experienced external evaluator lead the project evaluation.

Weaknesses

Applicant notes need for additional personnel for implementation of evaluation. It seems these may be project staff which could present a conflict.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 4:31 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/23/2010 6:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)
(U396C100135)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1
TOTAL	80	70

Technical Review Form

Development 29: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee -- ,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) - ,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) (U396C100135)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

SLOPE (Stem Learning Opportunities Providing Equity) will attempt to level the playing field as far as access to higher mathematics in high school by concentrating its efforts on pre-algebra and 8th grade algebra and the very students who tend to dismiss mathematics as something they will not ever be able to accomplish. Algebra is a gate-keeper to higher level mathematics which students need for college entry, and this project plans to improve the performance of low income and under represented minority students in Algebra, through project based learning, extended days, and summer academies, and build a college-going culture in the schools for eighth graders.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet

need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The California Education Roundtable has identified three major factors in the lack of production of STEM majors which seem to have their roots earlier than high school: poor mathematics performance in 8th grade Algebra, mathematics curricula that is not engaging, and inadequate knowledge and preparation for high school courses required for college entry.

The goals and strategies are clearly outlined. Especially helpful are the measures for each goal which are included in this section of the application. Another need which the project will address is the development of quality professional development for rural teachers at their school via the web and the development of their ability to collaborate professionally with one another via the web.

Weaknesses

The details about the college readiness activities are not readily available in the proposal.

The special activities for ELLs is not fully described, and a more coherent explanation of how this will be implemented would strengthen the application.

Reader's Score: 20

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) **The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**

(2) **The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**

(a) **In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant has successfully implemented numerous projects of at least equivalent size and scope. Applicant has also administered complex statewide projects, directed at improving student achievement. The partners, ConnectED and WestED also have impressive reputations for their involvement with improving student achievement.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached is well articulated from several perspectives.
- (2) The Roundtable represents California entities which have the capacity to create policy and leverage funds, so scaling up a successful project will be achievable.
- (3) Because the project will be in a variety of schools, (urban, suburban, and rural), the feasibility of replication is essentially being explored during the project. The cadre of trained teachers by the conclusion of the project could become a cadre of trainers.
- (4) Several scenarios were presented on the cost of the proposed project, in terms of targeted students and the potential students affected by the additionally trained teachers.
- (5) The roundtable diverse membership represents the internal ability to disseminate the successes of the project readily. The Roundtable has hosted nationwide education conferences in the past, and would again host conferences, participate in others' conferences, and publish results of the project in a variety of media.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 Roundtables and ARCHES have existing resources in place and generic MOUs with partners executed for this proposal, as evidence of their ability to operate the project beyond the grant period.
The train-the-trainers model will be readily implemented with the trained teachers at the end of the grant period.

Weaknesses

The MOUs would strengthen the application if they were more specific and had more definable commitments.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan is comprehensive, with activities and milestones and clearly defined persons responsible.
The qualifications, training, and experience of the key personnel are impressive.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Not applicable to this proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Part of the summer academies will focus on college issues. Also the summer academies and the extended day will have project based curricula which will have high relevance for the students, paving the way for student achievement in higher level mathematics in high school.

Weaknesses

However, the proposal does not specifically address item(b); if this will be attended to in the summer program more description would have been informative.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The unique professional development planned for this project will partially focus on the special needs of the ELL students.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Accessible quality professional development for rural teachers with the enhancement of being able to collaborate with teachers who are in other rural sites facing similar challenges will be beneficial initially to the teachers, and ultimately to the students. If this model is effective, and easily replicated, it could have tremendous implications for rural schools across the country.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/23/2010 6:41 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 1:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)
(U396C100135)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	18
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	7
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students	1	1

(0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1
TOTAL	80	60

Technical Review Form

Development 29: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)
(U396C100135)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant proposes a 3-tiered intervention for high needs students designed to increase the number of students earning proficient scores on the 8th grade algebra test. Interventions will be implemented in 6 school districts and will begin with 90 students completing a summer accelerated pre-algebra project-based experience with emphasis on college pathways and exposure. The participating students will then complete an academic year of enriched algebra instruction with afterschool algebra support provided for those students not making satisfactory progress.

The proposed project will serve approximately 1,620 high needs students in 5 years.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant proposes working with schools in six regions of California (Los Angeles Unified School District, Pasadena Unified School District, Antioch School District, Porterville Unified School District, Redding Joint Union School District, Waterford School District, Patterson School District and Newman Landing School District) to serve a 5-year total of 1,620 high-needs students.

The applicant proposes to develop and implement a 3-tiered intervention for high-needs students designed to increase the number of students earning proficient scores on the 8th grade algebra test, increase the number of high-needs students enrolling in college-prep courses and increase the number of participating students who choose STEM paths in high school.

The applicant clearly identifies objectives and measures for specific goals designed to guide the proposed project.

Weaknesses

The applicant provides data concerning California students' lack of college academic readiness for math learning, but the data presented is not specific to the six districts the applicant proposes to serve. Similarly, facts are provided about minority students and poverty, but much of the information is not specific to the targeted school districts identified in the proposal.

The applicant does not make a strong case as to why 8th grade algebra 1 was selected as the area of focus for intervention. The approach, while novel, seems disjointed and includes several components, including direct services to rising 8th graders and 8th grade algebra I students, professional development for teachers using web-based technologies, and instruction for teachers on the MDTP assessment system. Also mentioned as areas of focus are ELLs and schools located in rural areas.

Some of the specific details of the proposed implementation seem to be

omitted. For example, the applicant states that teachers will receive professional development in mathematics project-based learning curricula, addressing language needs of English Learners, and college readiness prior to the Summer Academy and ongoing throughout the school year. No additional information is provided concerning how this will be accomplished.

The applicant does not make a compelling argument that the proposed approach is something novel or new that has not been widely adopted. The applicant simply combines three research-proven strategies, intensive project-based curricular, quality academic instruction and afterschool tutoring and instruction.

While goals, outcomes, and objectives are identified, action steps or measures to achieve each are not always clearly presented. It is unclear how many weeks the summer academy would be conducted and how long sessions would last. It is unclear whether teachers would participate in specific professional development prior to implementing 3 STEM-themed curricular units.

Reader's Score: 20

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment,**

or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant argues that it is well-positioned to build upon its previous successes. The applicant heralds the existence of educational collaboratives across the state of California with a total of 27 regional sites of the ARCHES alliance across the state.

The applicant lists a number of previously funded and implemented projects. Many of these were funded by business or non-profit agencies, and data or outcomes for these projects are provided. ARCHES has administered several statewide projects.

The applicant collaborates with ConnectED and WestEd, the evaluation partner.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not clearly present how the ICC, ARCHES, the Round Table and other partnering agencies or organizations plan to work collaboratively to implement the proposed program.

While ARCHES requires the regional collaboratives to report annual data concerning academic achievement of all students and the status of closing achievement gaps, the applicant does not explain how the proposed project would utilize the established regional collaboratives.

While the tiered interventions focus on high-needs students, other elements of the proposed project focus on ELL students and teachers' professional development. The applicant does not clearly demonstrate how all the proposed components of the project will improve student achievement.

The applicant does not address how the proposed project will result in significant improvement in graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high quality teachers and principals.

Reader's Score: 18

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The proposal includes plans to train teachers, resulting in the potential for a "Train the trainer" model for dissemination of the approach to other schools and/or districts.

The applicant proposes serving 1,620 students in the tiered intervention as well as training of 18 teachers per year for 5 years. Additionally, the applicant proposes to train 60 additional teachers in years 4 and 5, thus increasing the potential number of students that will benefit from better-equipped or prepared teachers.

The applicant provides MOUs and letters of support as evidence of the collaboration involved on the project, from both the public and private sector, and to document that the capacity is available to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project.

The applicant presents an approximate cost per student of \$2,657. The cost-benefit ratio for all students taught algebra by those trained teachers is calculated at \$356 per student.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not clearly identify how each partner or entity will contribute to the proposed project, particularly with regard to resources and costs.

It is unclear how the applicant derived the proposed project costs per student per year.

Mechanisms for dissemination of ideas and practices seem to be limited to conferences sponsored by ARCHES, other national, state or regional conferences and journal publications. It is not clear how teachers would continue to receive professional development, training and support after the grant funding ended or how funding could be addressed on a larger scale.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant states that the regional collaboratives provide an extensive network and the Round Table provides support from key education stakeholders in the state.

The applicant proposes using a "train the trainer" model to help support the continued use of the proposed program in other middle schools.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not make a strong case that it has the financial or material resources to sustain the initiatives after the grant funding has ended. While the applicant states that each school has agreed in their MOU to work with ARCHES to sustain the project at the end of the funding cycle, no further information is provided to suggest the nature or interaction of such work together.

Reader's Score: 7

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

A wide and varied group of educators and leaders are assembled to work on the proposed project from a variety of organizations.

It is evident from the information provided that some of the key personnel have depth of knowledge and experience working with math pedagogy, ELL students.

An Advisory Panel will advise the work of the project director and key personnel two times per year.

A 5-year project management plan is presented and West ED will provide the evaluation component of the project implementation.

Weaknesses

The focus on college readiness and preparation, along with meeting the needs of ELL students, seem to be marginal in the grand presentation of the proposed project.

The management plan seems quite ambitious in that some major activities and milestones are expected in the very first quarter of funding. A delay in timelines would negatively affect implementation of the first summer academy.

Score remained the same after panel discussion even though other reviewers awarded full points.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

The applicant did not respond to this competitive preference.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Emphasis on college pathways and college exposure is incorporated in the summer accelerated pre-algebra project-based curriculum.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not address how the proposed project will help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes or how the proposed project will provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

One goal of the proposed project is to build a college-going culture in schools that serve low income and underrepresented minority students.

The three-tiered intervention is designed to focus on high needs students.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not identify innovative practices that would be implemented to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities or students with limited English proficiency.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs

that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The applicant proposes to offer web-based professional development opportunities for teachers in rural schools for 30 minutes two times a week.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 1:00 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 10:09 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --
Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -
Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)
(U396C100135)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	22
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	5
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students	1	1

(0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1
TOTAL	80	64

Technical Review Form

Development 29: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --
.,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -
.,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)
(U396C100135)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The project addresses three areas of need: 1) minority success in passing the California Mathematics course required for graduation from high school, algebra I, 2) access to academic advisement and information to prepare minority students for college, and 3) participation rate of minority students in STEM related careers.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit

strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The project addresses three areas of need: 1) minority success in passing the California Mathematics course required for graduation from high school, algebra I, 2) access to academic advisement and information to prepare minority students for college, and 3) participation rate of minority students in STEM related careers.

The model upon which the Algebra component of the project is based shows promise in enhancing targeted student performance. The year-long student support systems and focus on problem-based learning increase the probability of student success. A summer Algebra and College Exploratory Academy (p.6) exposes students to project-based mathematics instruction and college exploration activities. In the fall students who attended the summer academy are placed in Algebra I courses which employ instructional units that build upon knowledge learned in the summer academies. Extended day support systems are then provided to students who do not achieve the proficient level on an Algebra readiness exam (p.6-7).

Geographic scope of intended project is significant (encompassing multiple school districts and serving a large population of rural students from high poverty communities).

Weaknesses

Specific details related to college exploration activities beyond the summer experience are not included. It appears that school year college exploration activities are planned. However, details related to these activities are not clearly described or discussed in the proposal narrative.

The proposal narrative provides specific details related to the Algebra component of this proposal, including supporting research, student achievement data, and instructional models. However, the college-readiness and ELL components of the project are not described in similar detail.

Little information related to the professional development for teachers is included. The proposal describes regular meetings with instructional coaches via video-conferencing. Beyond that few details related to the professional development component for teachers are included. More information related to professional development model would provide a clearer understanding of this project component. Similarly, more information related to how the instructional coaches will be selected and prepared would allow for a more

informed judgment.

Reader's Score: 20

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

Project is led by the Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES), an organization that includes several universities and state level leaders in education (State Superintendent and the Executive Director of the California Post secondary Education Commission for example). Evidence of multiple successful projects focused on enhancement of minority performance in science and mathematics completed by ARCHES included (p. 10, 12-14). Among these are National Science Foundation and United States Department of Education funded projects.

The project leadership is well-defined and includes personnel with extensive experience in projects of this type and scope.

The detailed, preplanned information included with supporting documentation is evidence of the level of experience the proposed leadership group brings to this project.

Weaknesses

Information related to successful initiatives that increased recruitment, retention and/or placement of high-quality teachers in targeted schools is not provided.

Reader's Score: 22

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Although the project targets 1,620 students, the training project teachers receive will result in enhanced Algebra instruction for a much larger number of students and will benefit students beyond the life of the grant. The level of planning and detail apparent in the provided memorandums of understanding enhances the likelihood of successful implementation of the Algebra-related

components of the project.

The California Education Round table is consortium of institutions with a strong history of collaboratively working to improve education across California. Their prior experience and previously developed collaborative mechanisms increases the likelihood that the proposed program will successfully be brought to scale.

The middle schools targeted in this proposal represent a wide variety of schools and demonstrate geographic and ethnic diversity. The project also requires little equipment or start-up costs. These factors increase the probability that the project can feasibly be implemented in other sites.

Dissemination will occur across a number of venues. The California Education Round Table consists of Chief Executive Officers in California K-20 education, providing a clear means for regional dissemination. Project personnel also plan to disseminate through state and national organizations and publications and have a track record of publication and presentation across such venues.

Weaknesses

While the description of the Algebra-related components of the project demonstrates thorough discussion and planning, details related to the other components of the project are not as clear. As a result it is difficult to determine the probability that these components of the project can be brought to scale and/or replicated.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Proposal indicates that partner school districts have committed to operation

of the project beyond the length of the grant period.
The enhanced teaching abilities of the participating Algebra I teachers will be a positive sustainable aspect of the project.

Weaknesses

Memorandums of Understanding do not include a written commitment to operation of project components such as the Summer Academy or extended day support systems beyond the length of the grant period. Additionally, no clear statement of a commitment to sustaining these project components is included in narrative.

Reader's Score: 5

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

A detailed Management Plan with Activities, Responsible Personnel, a Time-line, and Milestones is provided.
High level of collaboration between several education organizations is evident in the letters of support provided. Specific project-related details and responsibilities have been negotiated and determined prior to proposal submission which is an indicator of thoughtful planning and coordination of project efforts.

Inclusion of an Advisory Board, regularly scheduled meetings of key stakeholders and examination of project-wide data to inform project activities ensure shared, data-based decision-making.
Advisory Board is composed of faculty and administrators from multiple institutions with a history of success and collaboration on projects with similar focus and scope.

Clear, measurable objectives are provided. Proposed strategies are logical

and well-connected to each objective. Further, measurable outcomes for each objective are included.

Weaknesses

None cited or found. Score remained unchanged after review panel discussion.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Exposure to the college campus through the Summer Academy.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The theories and strategies associated with intended English Learner professional development for teachers are clearly described.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Use of distance-based technologies to support Algebra teachers from rural communities.

Weaknesses

No description of a mentor training program and lack of school-based support for the implementation of instructional strategies learned during teacher professional development.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 10:09 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)
(U396D100135)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	6
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>16</i>
TOTAL	25	16

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)
(U396D100135)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10

Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.
- (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 cites several research studies to support the three project components: 1)summer accelerated project-based pre-algebra; 2)academic year enriched algebra; and 3)after school algebra support. Several studies that were cited support the effectiveness of project based summer programs for increasing skill and concept knowledge in mathematics. (p. 8) Three state/regional projects have implemented one of the components of this project with positive impact on student achievement in Algebra. (p. 10)

Weaknesses

The goals for the project are: 1)to master the California Algebra I standards; 2)increase college knowledge and pursue a college preparatory sequence of courses; and 3)participants will enter STEM program of study pathways in high school. The application cites the value of follow up coaching and support for teachers. (p. 9) However, it is not clear why this research is cited when it is neither a goal nor a major component of the project. Research on

the "responsive teaching cycle" is also referenced which again does not align with the project goals. (p. 10) The Student Improvement Through Teacher Empowerment(SITTE) study indicated that one of the measures of success was that "86% of the participating students earned a C grade or better." (p. 10) It is difficult to determine the strength of this study based on student grades or those passing the Algebra I course.

Reader's Score: 6

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

The evaluation design includes qualitative and quantitative data with both formative and summative evaluation questions. The evaluation will include not only the effects of the intervention, but also the processes used and the fidelity of implementation. (p. 14) With the number of schools involved in the project and the three different components that will be implemented, it is wise that the first year will be dedicated to examining evidence for implementation and piloting and refining of instruments. (p. 15) Summative evaluation questions are focused on the three project outcomes. Qualitative data includes teacher, student and parent surveys. Classroom observations and focus groups will be conducted with teachers part of the treatment group. The method and sampling plan is described in detail on pages 17-18. The external evaluator will be WestEd and significant funds have been identified for the evaluation.

Weaknesses

The application indicates that secondary research questions (p. 15) will examine the effect of the intervention by focusing on the differential effects for student subgroups. When referencing Table 2 in Appendix H, there is only one secondary research question listed which addresses females. The reason for the omission of additional secondary research questions is not clear. The process by which teacher observations will be conducted and instruments or protocols for these observations were not discussed in this application. The process by which feedback is provided as part of progress monitoring and implementation is not clearly described.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 1:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)
(U396D100135)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	22
<i>TOTAL</i>	25	22

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)
(U396D100135)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10

Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.**
- (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 team thoroughly documented support in the research literature for each of the key elements of the 3-tiered intervention (p. 8-9). This evidence is compelling that the approach approximates best practice in mathematics education for the desired outcomes.

The intervention has been piloted in several contexts with positive results that suggest further study would be worthwhile. Positive outcomes for participants in the proposed project are likely.

Weaknesses

Some of the research cited used grades as an outcome. This is less compelling outcome because of the likely non-normality of grade distributions - making the analysis suspect.

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The evaluation design is well-conceived with tight alignment between evaluation questions, measures, and analysis methods. Mixed Methods approaches should serve the evaluation questions well.

Power analysis was helpful in showing that detecting a meaningful effect was feasible.

Comprehensive implementation data will be collected in service of formative evaluation question #3 (p.16). Implementation data will be collected at multiple levels of the system and using independent measures such as observation protocols.

WestEd is an excellent choice for external evaluation with considerable evaluation capacity at the organizational level and at the personal level of those assigned to this study. The subcontract is large (\$700K+), nearly 15% of the entire budget but this is appropriate given the size and rigor of the summative evaluation design.

Weaknesses

Power analysis refers to use of a pre-test covariate on achievement outcomes. However, collection of pre-tests doesn't appear to be part of the plan (p. 15).

In addition use of course grades as an outcome measure is somewhat risky because these tend not to be normally distributed - this will be problematic only if inferential statistics are used in this analysis.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 1:46 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/25/2010 12:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	22
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 43: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The proposed project will implement a program to use writing as a pedagogical method in all content areas, not only ELA. The proposal has clear goals and objectives that are measurable. The proposal focuses on students' preparedness and understanding for college entrance, and focuses on students with limited English proficiency. The proposal has a well-detailed management plan, although a limited timeline of activities. The project appears to be sustainable with the resources of the district.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit

strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposal describes the use of teacher-developed activities to enhance writing as a pedagogical practice across multiple content areas (in addition to ELA). It will include a computer-based writing assessment and scoring system to allow faster feedback to students and teachers. This seems innovative and would be greatly beneficial if the results were quick turnaround and reliably scored writing tasks. The proposal also describes the appropriate forms of professional development that would help teachers make best use of these new systems, including iterative learning/application models and cognitive coaching. These are practices that have been demonstrated to help inservice teachers adopt novel instructional practices. Finally, the proposal describes explicit goals and objectives and identifies measures that are appropriate for determining if these goals are met.

Weaknesses

One of the proposed activities will be to develop online courses to improve students' writing and to increase students' and parents' understanding of the application process, expectations, and financial aid options for colleges. However, it seems probable that there are existing curricula or lesson modules that other schools or educational researchers have used. Accessing and building on prior work in this area would conserve time and resources, but still allow adaptation to the CNUSD teachers' needs and knowledge of students and parents.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The LEA has received grants of comparable size in the past and has demonstrated ability to implement them well. The LEA also has demonstrated its successes in raising student achievement (as state test scores and AYP) and attainment (graduation rates) overall including subgroups, though it has not yet been able to reduce achievement gaps.

Weaknesses

Though the LEA states it has had federal grants and funding in the past of similar scale, the total dollar amount quoted in the proposal is just \$16 million and they list multiple programs. Therefore, the mode of dollar amounts funded and scope of each project may not be as large as the current request.

Reader's Score: 22

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student

populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The proposal describes the LEA's experience in implementing programs across all district schools and ensuring fidelity of implementation, and the district commits to implement across all schools with fidelity. This is an important part of the success of the proposed project across the district. The proposal also indicates that the project will disseminate findings through careful documentation and publication for other LEAs and by having school district staff participate in regional and national conferences. The materials to be used by the project are broadly available. The project's estimate of cost per student is \$754, and when taken to scale the proposal recognizes that there are start-up costs that must be in the calculation.

Weaknesses

Though the proposal describes its intention to assure fidelity of implementation, little further information is provided.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 proposal describes the LEA's success in working with its teacher association. The LEA has also identified other ways that it can assure sustainability. These include no-cost access to the computer-based writing assessment system (CTeWriter) and the district's investment in IT staff so that it can support the grant-related computational requirements during and after funding. These elements indicate that the proposed project could be sustained by the district after the grant ends.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 proposal describes its management plan, which will include senior officials from the district office, a cohort of teachers on special assignment who have experience with technology-based instruction, and district IT staff. The management plan specifies the LEA staff involved and their particular roles in the conduct of the project. The project staff members have experience implementing grants and other federally-funded programs, and appear to be qualified in training and experience to conduct the project.

Weaknesses

There is inadequate detail in the timeline, aside from detailing the number of students who would be impacted by grant year and grade level.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

This was not described in the proposal.

Weaknesses

This was not described in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 proposal describes its intention to include content that focuses explicitly

on students' college preparedness, expectations, understanding of finances, and access to supports. It also includes an outreach through online modules to parents in both English and Spanish.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The proposing LEA has a significant proportion of students who have limited English proficiency. It has a history of helping improve performance and reduce gaps for this population. The project includes an explicit focus on these students with attention to continue closing the achievement and attainment gap. It also will provide information about college application and financing to parents in both English and Spanish, which may further help these students.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the

unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

This was not described in the proposal.

Weaknesses

This was not described in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 12:22 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/22/2010 10:36 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	75

Technical Review Form

Development 43: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Strengths:

The applicant identifies the need for student improvement and provides data to support this assertion. The district has improved achievement over the past decade but gaps still exist. Data to illustrate the need, specifically in high need student populations, and details regarding writing and language deficiencies and obstacles to college success are identified.

Using writing across the curriculum is not new but the addition of technology, teacher training, and a comprehensive design to improve achievement is not widely adopted and addresses a great need demonstrated at this school district and nationwide.

Weaknesses:

The management plan does not detail a timeline for implementation with identified project tasks and milestones.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed

project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

1) The applicant identifies the need for student improvement and provides data to support this assertion. The district has improved achievement over the past decade but gaps still exists. Data to illustrate the need, specifically in high need student populations, and details regarding writing and language deficiencies and obstacles to college success are identified. p 3-4
Using writing across the curriculum is not new but the addition of technology, teacher training, and a comprehensive design to improve achievement is not widely adopted and addresses a great need demonstrated at this school district and nationwide. p. 4

2) Goals and objectives are described in the narrative with detail regarding activities and outcomes. The proposed strategy is clearly described. The narrative is supported by a goals and objectives chart in appendix H that further details Goals, objectives, research, strategies and measurable outcomes. The goals and objectives are well-aligned with the proposed project priorities.

Weaknesses

1 and 2 No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data

demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

- 1) The applicant is a large school district with evidence of experience in successfully implementing large projects. Several examples are provided. p. 14
- 2) i) Data and explanations are provided to support the applicant's success in closing achievement gaps among various groups of students and improving achievement of high need students. p. 14,15
- ii) Increase in graduation rate by 4% over 6 years is stated.

Weaknesses

1 and 2 No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

- 1) This project will reach 8415 students in the 5 target schools. The district has demonstrated capacity to implement this size project. Several examples are provided. p. 20
- 2) Through partner technology and ongoing staff development, this project will be brought to scale and expanded by the district. Based on findings, the project may be revised or adjusted appropriately. p. 21
- 3) Replication will require staff development, technology and technical support. These resources are available and the project is adaptable to a wide variety of students and settings. p. 21 and previous sections.
- 4) Cost per student for the 5 year project is \$754. The scaled-up costs for larger populations are calculated at similar or less per student. Initial technology increases start up costs.
- 5) Dissemination is described and includes internal sharing with stakeholders, presentations at relevant events, website development, participation in conferences, and publications.

Weaknesses

1,2,3,4,and 5 No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers'

unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

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

Strengths

- 1) The applicant is prepared to dedicate resources to ongoing implementation. Teacher associations have also been involved and obstacles to continuation have been explored. IT and staff development resources will be used effectively to support continuation and expansion.
- 2) A plan for incorporating the project purposes and activities beyond the grant is described and is cost effective and appropriate. The applicant is a partner in the development of the key CTeW technology and therefore does not have to pay for license or use. p. 22

Weaknesses

- 1 and 2 No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

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

Strengths

- 1) The management plan narrative clearly describes the project activities and oversight. Responsibilities of key personnel are described and the timeframes for meetings and communication are described and include weekly and monthly meetings. A more detailed chart is provided in the appendix H and includes a timeline for professional development activity. A data collection timeline is also provided in appendix H
- 2) The project director and key personnel are described with reference to responsibilities and experience. Resumes are provided and indicate

appropriate qualifications.

Weaknesses

- 1) The management plan does not detail a timeline for implementation with identified project tasks and milestones.
- 2) No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 applicable

Weaknesses

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Project includes preparation for college level work and support for application process and financial aid.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The described project is personalized to each student and provides support and feedback to students and teachers. The applicant specifically describes uses to address special needs students and LEP students.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not applicable

Weaknesses

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/22/2010 10:36 AM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 06/24/2010 10:50 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____
TOTAL	80	73

Technical Review Form

Development 43: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Diagnostic writing assessment tool hoped to bridge gap between groups of students. Immediate feedback, motivating technology. Writing across the

curriculum emphasized, rather than simply ELA.

Important: addresses the need for improved student writing for high school graduates so as to be eligible for college writing programs.

Supports existing Step Up to Writing initiative in district.

Will standardize expectations for student writing with use of research based, 6 writing index inclusive, artificial intelligence scoring rubric.

Provides collaborative professional development experiences for teachers to improve writing assignments and instruction.

Clear goals, outcomes linked, strategies specific

Addresses college awareness prep resources for students, parents, community

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment,

or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

District has experience implementing similar scale projects.
Recent student achievement growth higher than ever before, with use of EBDM.
District experiencing increases in all state measures, across all disciplines, above average increases within state.

Only district to meet the federal AYP requirements in CA.
Grad rates up from 90 to 94%.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.**

- (2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.**

- (3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.**

- (4) 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.**

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

District has personnel, technology and leadership to bring project to scale. Project targeted at 8415 students within district, but can easily be disseminated and used across the district, since leadership and infrastructure would facilitate this.

Builds upon existing writing initiative.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

District has personnel, technology and leadership to bring project to scale. Project targeted at 8415 students within district, but can easily be disseminated and used across the district, since leadership and infrastructure would facilitate this.

Builds upon existing writing initiative.

Private partnerships.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Management team already in place with a few additions to be made. This project builds upon an existing initiative, so infrastructure in place to support it.
Includes description of IT staff support.

Weaknesses

Wkness: Lacking management timeline.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or

improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2010 10:50 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396D100467)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396D100467)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

This project will implement the Writing to Learn!(WtL!) program in 3 elementary, 1 intermediate and 1 high school. This program builds on a previous writing initiatives in the district. It will go on to establish a comprehensive, curriculum-wide program for the district. (p. 1) The five principles of WtL! are presented with supporting research on pages 9-10. These studies support a system of practice, assessment, feedback, meta-cognition, student-centered/standards-based, and reinforcement in writing will increase student achievement in English Language Arts(ELA). Quasi-experimental matched case comparison studies on the writing program were conducted over the past seven school years.(p. 11) The results were increased student proficiency on the state assessment as compared with students from another district matched on four demographic variables.(p. 12)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The evaluation design will focus on measuring improvement in student academic achievement and increased professional development opportunities and coaching support using a quasi-experimental design. (p. 17-18) For each objective the application includes operational standards and measures. Teachers will take the Identifying Needs with Data Quiz(INDQ). Teacher observations will be conducted by principals using a checklist on a quarterly basis. (p. 19) Principals will meet annually to calibrate ratings using the checklist. The funds dedicated to evaluation are substantial and appropriate for the scope of the project.

Weaknesses

District developed ELA and writing benchmark assessments will be the second measure of student performance. (p. 17) The validity and reliability of these assessments was not included. The external evaluator will meet at regular intervals with the program director, coaches, principals and teachers. The specifics regarding what is meant by "regular intervals" are not provided.(p. 20) The teacher classroom observation tool has many room environment elements that are not clearly linked to the research goals. The impact of some of these items may result in inaccuracies, particularly when scores are averaged.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 1:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396D100467)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396D100467)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 WtL approach is described as an approach based upon 5 principles from the writing literature. Sufficient empirical evidence supporting each principal provided and described on pages 9-11.

WtL has been tested using quasi-experimental designs in several contexts with compelling positive results for both achievement gains and achievement gaps. As such, positive outcomes for participants in the proposed project are likely. This intervention appears to warrant further study with designs better suited for high confidence causal inferences (e.g., RCT).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

This study will use a matched-pair quasi-experimental design. Implementation data will be collected using independent measures such as observation protocols (p. 19).

The breadth of implementation data collected should inform replication efforts. These data sources include evidence of important features such as posted assessment results, writing samples, and student engagement.

The evaluation capacity of KSD staff appears adequate to conduct an effective evaluation.

Weaknesses

Previous study of this program used a quasi-experimental design as well. Using this design once again will limit the increase confidence that the developers can have in causal inferences of impact. Access issues that lead to this choice are duly noted. Presumably, the prior study of WtL did not use statistical adjustment (ANCOVA) to account for pre-existing differences. The current design could have also benefited from this technique using some of the same matching variables.

The proposers suggest that a Cronbach's alpha of 0.80 will be required for the observations but did not suggest a contingency plan if the observers fail to come to that level of agreement.

Ten percent of the budget is allotted for evaluation which is sufficient for many designs. However, because the number of students and teachers involved in the evaluation (a proxy for data analysis burden) was not completely clear, it can't be certain that sufficient funds exist. There wasn't

clear indication that the number of students and teachers touched by the program, as described in section E, is the same number participating in the evaluation.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 1:46 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/26/2010 0:09 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396C100275)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 15: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396C100275)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Specific project goals and objectives have been outlined and include measurable outcomes. Each of the goals and objectives (p 8-9) is directly related to the priorities District 75 has outlined. In a recent similar project entitled Manhattan New Music Project, District 75 has already seen measurable success in use of the Arts to teach special needs students. The proposed project in this application takes the concepts of the New Music project and implements it on a larger district wide scale.

Weaknesses

No information is provided as to how the ten treatment schools were chosen or their grade level make-up.

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Strength:

District 75 and Manhattan New Music Project have partnered since 2002 on various projects of similar capabilities. The MMP specialize in working with special needs populations. The large number of MMP staff who have previously worked with special needs children and have worked with District 75 on other collaborative projects will ensure a smooth transition into the proposed project at not only the teacher level but at the student, parent, and administrative level, as well. This should reduce the amount of ground work normally needed to introduce a new project and greatly impact the potential for success with this project.

The district demonstrates a history of improving student achievement. In the 3 large scale collaboration projects with MNMP, the district has surpassed

their 75% improvement rate on 100% of the targeted areas demonstrating significant increases in student achievement.

Weaknesses

It is difficult to determine the size of the former projects since no dollar amounts are provided.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

With the utilization of the train-the-trainer approach to professional development, the project is more likely to be brought to scale. At the end of

the project, District 75 will have 30 teachers and NMNP will have 20 Master Teaching Artists experienced in providing EASE training to others throughout the district and beyond with little or no funding necessary. Additionally the district has stated their plan to approach New York's successful Fund for Public School for financial assistance in bringing EASE to scale.

Due to the natural individual programming that is embedded in this project in order to serve children with Individualized Learning Plans ensures that the project is easily adaptable for any type of learning environment. This flexibility will also help ensure the project is brought to scale.

Weaknesses

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant lists possible resources for funding the project beyond the development grant stage. Each school can use a portion of the Arts-allocated funds from the LEA and potential funding from The Funds of Public Schools. However, even without additional funding this project will live on in the 300 teachers at ten district schools trained in the EASE program. This solid base will help ensure the sustainability of the project.

Weaknesses

None found.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

All 4 of the key personnel identified for the project have extensive relevant experiences that will ensure the success of this project (p. 25 and Appendix C). Additionally, the management timeline (p. 26) shows a commitment of the applicant to ensure accountability for each individual task by providing very narrow timeframes in which tasks should be complete instead of broad annual timeframes. The very detailed budget narrative provides information for each year of the project. This will help ensure the proposed project is kept within the specified budget.

Weaknesses

None found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 addressed in this application.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Not addressed in this application.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must

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

Strengths

The project is aimed at providing innovative methods of teaching to special needs children.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not addressed in this application.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 0:09 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 7:38 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396C100275)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 15: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396C100275)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>The proposed project is highly unique and will benefit all special education students in the school district through an active learning approach. The plan is well constructed, has specific achievable objectives, and will provide for student development in the core academic areas through dance, music, theater, and visual arts.</p>

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant has extensive experience in the implementation of large scale projects and grants. The proposal was comprehensive and the school system has carried out several projects of this type and substantiated increases in student achievement.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

This initiative has excellent potential to directly influence all of the school district's special needs students (~40,795 over 5 years). The project has two components, one as direct in-class support, and also through professional development. The curriculum will be available online with a video demonstration guide.

Weaknesses

Limiting the professional development training to special education teachers may reduce the long term potential for teachers and students in other settings.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant will train 30 mentor teachers, maintain a website, provide the curriculum, and conduct teacher training.

Weaknesses

The use of standardized testing to measure effectiveness will limit assessment of student growth in problem solving or critical thinking.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 quality of the management plan is sound and well developed. Key support personnel and project managers have been identified, as well as detailed activities and outcomes identified.

Weaknesses

Identify how the outcomes will be used for program improvement.

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

The project would provide for the needs of students in early childhood programs and lower elementary grades.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

This project provides for the needs of secondary students who will be pursuing higher education.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The program will benefit all of the special education students in one school district.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the

unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not addressed in application.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 7:38 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 9:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396C100275)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	21
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 15: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396C100275)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>The grant seeks to assist the large population in the district with special needs by providing professional development to teachers that would also teach them how to integrate the arts into the classroom. EASE would systematically provide teachers with skills for incorporating the arts in classrooms, help teachers more effectively deal with students with special needs, and help close the achievement gap. Goals and objectives are clear and aligned with project design and evaluative measures. Classroom teachers</p>

will receive training to help them meet the arts instruction requirements currently in place. The activities outlined are beneficial in that they would effectively model for teachers, provide them ongoing support, and be further supported by mentor teacher relationships. Dissemination of findings and additional training is clearly outlined.

Weaknesses

We have chosen to include both arts teachers and classroom teachers in the EASE program. It is unclear whether all teachers are included or only specific content teachers. The term must be clarified. Whether there is an equal number of elementary and secondary schools included in the ten treatment schools chosen is unclear- more information needed regarding these schools.

Reader's Score: 21

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Large scale projects are not new for District 75, and ongoing professional

development is a large part of their mission. Their collaboration with local artists and art teachers provide the content expertise needed, and many of these are experienced with working with special needs populations. Student data proves student achievement associated with a similar project to the one proposed in this application. Solid plan of evaluation.

Weaknesses

More information regarding the funding for the previous project listed would help the reader understand whether or not they were similar in nature. More information on the effectiveness of these projects would also be helpful. For example, the number of teachers and students served are listed here, but it is unclear what is considered success.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate

information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

CASTA is a current professional development partnership that has produced positive results. Similar results may be expected through EASE. Providing online curriculum and documentation, as well as additional training provided within District 75, ensures that word of the project and its results will be disseminated appropriately. Additional funding for outside training will be pursued, and no major changes in the Department of Education infrastructure are needed to ensure training is provided. Project is potentially beneficial for a variety of settings.

Weaknesses

It is unclear whether trainings would be mandatory.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Use of district allocated funds to allow teachers to attend the training would ensure teacher participation. Additional funding expected to support the program after grant period has ended. Multiple levels of training increase likelihood of project success.

Weaknesses

A "high level of demand" is anticipated by the end of the grant program, but no projected numbers are found in this section.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Over 30 projects have been evaluated or carried out by the evaluation team.

Weaknesses

The scope of projects carried out by this team is not clear, so the reader cannot be sure if they are similar to the project proposed here.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 identified or addressed within the proposal.

Weaknesses

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Weaknesses

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Program funding would help students with special needs and special education teachers alike. In addition, funding would help raise the percentage of schools in compliance with New York City's arts instruction mandate.

Weaknesses

The focus is on teacher benefits, but perhaps more emphasis on how this would impact student achievement would be helpful.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Weaknesses

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 9:32 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 12:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396D100275)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	22
TOTAL	25	22

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396D100275)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.
- (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

This proposal demonstrated that there were research-based findings that support the proposed study and their previous and current studies showed promising results (p.9-11). This proposal also demonstrated the likely positive impact on special education students (p.11).

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The quasi-experimental design (creating equivalent comparison group by matching, p.15-16) is appropriate for this evaluation. The proposed formative evaluation plan will provide high-quality implementation data and their dissemination strategies will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, etc. (p.19). Finally, the proposed evaluation team had prior experience with similar evaluations which was viewed as a strength. (p.19-20).

Weaknesses

Because matching is one key component of the proposed evaluation design, more details about matching (e.g., the variables to be matched, and the matching mechanism, etc.) should have been included in the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 12:58 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396D100275)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	22
TOTAL	25	22

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: District 75/New York City Department of Education -- , - , (U396D100275)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

Reasonable hypothesis is seen in the description of rhythmic movement, arts learning, integrated music, and imaginative play, and how those techniques relate to the project's approach. The previously attempted study employed an assessment system, aggregated results, interim analyses, and qualitative data which is appropriate to this project. Much of the information in B3 "Improving Student Achievement or Student Growth" (page 11) actually answers the question of why more formal study is warranted (B2). However, it is still within this section and the applicant demonstrates how a larger student sample will help evaluate student growth, differences in effects, and professional development aspects.

Weaknesses

The research offered on page 9 for reasonable hypothesis is dated (from the 1970's and 1980's). It would have been more valuable to see current evaluations of programs. The applicant does not provide detailed and thorough explanation as to the extent the proposed project will have a positive impact on student achievement.

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The evaluation will employ a mixed-methods approach, including a quasi-experimental design and a qualitative component. The applicant provides a reasonable and nicely detailed explanation on the reasons for using a quasi-experimental approach. The goals of the evaluation are consistent with the goals of the project, which will, of course, determine the effectiveness of the program (pg. 15). That the teachers and principals will assist in developing indicators for some of the measures and provide feedback during pilot period is a positive sign of collaboration and openness (pg. 18). The budget includes sufficient funding to carry out the evaluation, and the evaluator is experienced in arts-based program evaluations (pg. 20).

Weaknesses

It was difficult to determine how objective or what the rubric would be for teachers to rate their students' progress with the online assessment system (pg. 18). It was not seen how the professional development and master teacher aspects would be evaluated as a process or tool. The applicant states that the evaluation will provide data, but does not fully indicate in what ways or how it will be used to improve or replicate the program.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:12 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2010 8:54 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services (U396C100520)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	5
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 35: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills, School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills, School Services (U396C100520)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant clearly describes the ways in which the STEM21 Academy will provide a rigorous, standards based 9-12 coursework that are melded with Early College High school, Career Academy, and cyber learning strategies (p 3). The applicant provides clear data that shows the high needs population the project will reach (p 5). The applicant has provided a clear set of goals, objectives, and outcomes related to the project.

Weaknesses

The response could have been strengthened if the applicant included clear performance measures tied to the goals and objectives of the project.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant has a substantial history, 38 years, working with grants, school district, and high needs populations. The applicant has the necessary past performance, CALI, to implement a project of this size (p 15-16). The applicant provides the relevant data necessary to support that it has significantly improved student achievement (Appendix H).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant provides a reasonable initial target of 960 students to be reached by the project with a reasonable end target of 67,538 students at the end of the 5 years (p 20). The applicant has the capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project through its partnership with RESCS and Education Connections Center for 21st Century Skills (p 20-21). The applicant plans to provide a mentor program, train-the-trainer, which will influence replication if positive results are obtained (p 21).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 evident growth in CCC since 2002 supports the applicants claim that sustainability and future scaling is realistic (p 22).

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 staff outlined in the management plan has the qualification to successfully implement the proposed project (p23-25).

Weaknesses

The response could have been strengthened by providing more detail regarding responsibilities, timelines, project goals and objectives, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 clearly provides outreach and strategies that address students' preparedness and expectations related to college; help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults. College faculty mentor students in all areas (p 1).

Weaknesses

No Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The applicant provides a plan to bring STEM21 to two high schools who received limited exposure due to geographic location (p 2). The applicant also proposes to educate 7th and 8th grade studnets attending middle schools connected to these rural high schools about STEM21 to increase exposure.

Weaknesses

No Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 8:54 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 8:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services (U396C100520)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	1

Technical Review Form

Development 35: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills, School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills, School Services (U396C100520)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant presents compelling evidence for the need for the project, e.g., the low percentage of students nationwide and in CT who graduate from high school prepared to complete college-level coursework in core subjects; huge achievement gaps in the state; a declining graduation rate among high-

need students in CT.

The proposal cites research reports that point out that our nation's ability to compete economically will be connected to public schools' success in teaching STEM subjects, and that such success will be dependent upon teaching them innovatively.

This project has clear goals that are aligned completely to the requirements of Absolute Priority 3.

Most of the schools that have signed on for STEM21 participation serve large percentages of high-need students.

The STEM21 courses, developed collaboratively by high school teachers, college faculty and STEM industry leaders, incorporate information and communications technology and 21st century skills. Further, they each have a contextual focus and require students to learn while solving real world problems. Also, it seems as if this project will allow for the creation of improved formative assessments.

A web-based platform (MOODLE) has already been developed and tested for delivery of STEM courses.

The middle school component of the project is a well-conceived program that will serve large numbers of students in order to get them interested in STEM careers and prepare them to succeed in STEM21 courses when in high school.

The experiential learning aspects of the project are outstanding.

The amount of collaboration among organizations in this project, what has come before and what is ahead, is impressive.

The proposal presents a carefully planned infrastructure and plan to implement the project with a high degree of success.

The participating schools have already been selected with support from the districts' superintendents.

Weaknesses

Greater evidence of prior STEM21 success, in the form of specific data on student success in high school and college, would have made this section even stronger.

The course syllabi were disappointing in that all shared very similar goal language, only stated generally that the goals were tied to CT state standards, and did not include a map of units that would be taught throughout the year.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The lead applicant, Education Connection, is a highly trusted non-profit with an excellent track record of supporting educational improvements in CT. Since 1972, it has served as a Regional Education Service Center in the western part of the state.

CT's Education Department previously selected Education Connection as the lead trainer in creation of common formative assessments, an important aspect of this project.

The applicant's Center for 21st Century Skills has been successfully collaborating with CT schools, colleges and industry leaders by managing the statewide Connecticut Career Choices program that has been funded

through a state budget line item since 2002. As the proposal states, the "project is a natural progression" of the work the applicant has already been doing in this area.

The applicant currently manages \$11 million in federal and state grant awards.

The significant number of active partners already been collaborating successfully with the applicant have a clear sense of the project's mission and a commitment to make it succeed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.**

- (2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.**

- (3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.**

- (4) 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.**

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Professional development for STEM21 teachers is planned.

The participating schools have already piloted STEM21 courses.

The RESC Alliance will support a scale up plan. All six CT RESCs, supported through a train-the-trainer approach, work with all the districts in their regions to institute STEM21 in their high schools, if the projects results are successful.

The proposal's estimation of scale-up costs for large numbers of students takes into account the funds saved by having students enter college with college credits.

Weaknesses

The applicant should have better explained the timeline for engaging 960 students in STEM 21 academies in 12 high schools. It is not clear if each school will begin serving about 80 students each with the intent to expand each year of the project, or if the average of 80 is the number of students served over the course of the project in each school.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

This project appears to be a natural progression of a continuum of work accomplished by a collaboration of organizations that were created by CT state statutes. The applicant's Center for 21st Century Skills continues to be funded through a line item in the state budget, even in our current economic

climate.

The leaders of the project are skilled at securing grant funding; there is reason to believe that this will continue as the project is operational.

There already appears to be a strong desire among schools to participate with the applicant's Center for 21st Century Skills, with a current waiting list of interested schools.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan is carefully conceived and developed. It not only identifies and describes the key positions that will be created; it also identifies the personnel who will fill the positions.

Based on the proposal's descriptions and the resumes attached, all key personnel seem to be extremely qualified to manage their components of the project. Most of the personnel have expertise in science.

Each of the Co-Principal Investigators will also have another specific responsibility for project management, e.g., primary research scientist and urban LEA liaison.

The high quality and exceptional organization of the applicant's proposal inspires confidence in its ability to manage the project, if funded.

Weaknesses

Information is lacking about whom will be responsible for each aspect of the project.

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 evidence that all components of CP6 will be addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Two rural school districts will participate in the project.

Weaknesses

Few details are provided as to how the project will be differentiated for the needs of the rural participants.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 8:12 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 10:46 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services (U396C100520)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	2

Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

TOTAL 80

75

Technical Review Form

Development 35: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills, School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills, School Services (U396C100520)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The STEM21 project is very collaborative in nature with professional input and skill resources from 6 core agencies and additional private sector input, a key unique factor in its implementation. The applicant indicates that the course work to be used in the program has already been field-tested in

diverse high school settings with the potential to support under-represented students entry into college and careers. The program has varied performance-based assessments, a key factor in supporting students be prepared for college based on the statistics provided by the applicant (23-37% of graduating seniors not being adequately prepared to pursue college-level coursework in core subjects, including mathematics and science).

According to the data provided, Connecticut has the highest achievement gap in the nation among poor and non-poor public school 8th grade students in mathematics, science, reading and writing. By having a project focusing on science and technology, the program aims to minimize these educational disparities especially among minority students. The project builds on the success of a previously implemented program (CCC) and will use an online learning system (MOODLE) with quarterly meetings between students and teachers and ongoing presentations of projects at the annual EXPO events and in online forums. There are summer and after school program enhancements, professional development for the teachers and formative/interim/summative assessments for program success.

The applicant has clearly articulated the goals of the project to include the inclusion/ preparation of under-represented students into the college-level STEM coursework, develop/ utilize assessments to inform/ improve teaching, effectively implement the STEM21 Academy model and scaling in diverse school settings and assess the impact of middle school programs on future STEM21 participation by high-need urban and rural students.

Weaknesses

The project goals, objectives and outcomes are well articulated although it would be beneficial to candidly highlight the criteria for choosing the under-represented students the income level is implied although it is not clear if that is the only criteria.

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant currently manages \$11 million in state and federal grant awards and contracts with a 38-year history of collaborations with school districts to improve student performance and teaching practice. The applicant's educational specialists have provide intervention services to administrators and teachers in 9 high minority, high poverty schools with positive results in the past two years.

The applicant also has a history with the CCC Program that provided blended learning courses in diverse settings targeting 40 schools, 1,200 students (with over 40% identified as minority). Currently, all 12 participating schools have piloted at least one of the courses that the STEM21 project wants to implement with this funding. Eleven of these schools have shown some level of student achievement through the reduction in the 4-year cumulative high school drop-out rate, an increase in the number of students pursuing higher education, and/or scoring above state averages in standardized tests.

Weaknesses

It would have been beneficial to have meaningful data highlighting the student recruitment/graduation rates and the placement of teachers in the programs. The applicant was very detailed in their explanation of the positive collaborative efforts with other programs and some of the successes they have accomplished, but that did not include the data highlighting the specific contributions by EDUCATION CONNECTION.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The project aims to involve all high schools in the targeted districts (67,538 enrollments) during the five-year project period. Initially, over 960 students and 60-80 teachers will be engaged. An extension of the program to include summer programs will increase the number of students involved to 263,238 (total). The applicant is actively involved with the statewide RESC Alliance, an alliance that has a 20-year history of collaborative development and implementation of educational/ technology-related instruction. The applicant has clearly articulated the scope of the program and indicates that the project will encompass summer programs, train-the-trainer approaches, and mentoring instructional staff. Additionally, the web-based learning platform, MOODLE, enables rapid dissemination because of easier installation, no costs attached and capacity for ongoing downloading of the program, a key component in aiding the replication process. The applicant also hopes to disseminate the project through the ongoing use of an online/innovation portal, sharing best practices (at the state, national and regional levels), and

print media. The costs per student over the five-year period will translate to \$1,552 and the amount leverages the tuition savings for obtaining 15 college credits at \$5,100 per student (based on \$340/credit hour).

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

EDUCATION CONNECTION alongside with OWC and COT are created under the state statutes. The current funding for CCC (the project that STEM21 emulates) is funded as a line item in the state budget and 20% of the matching funding requirement being provided by private sources. Collaborating agencies such as CSDE and OWC funded the science course sequence and supported the model development while in-kind services provided by high schools, college faculty and industry partners for the last 8 years. Additionally, the applicant has indicated that STEM21 will have regional sustainability through the existing partnership with CSDE's collaboration via the New England Secondary School Consortium.

Additionally, the applicant indicates that STEM21 is modeled on the successful growth of the CCC sites from six to forty-one in 2010 and the technological system in use (MOODLE) will be hosted through funding by CSDE in all the 169 CT LEAs and CSDE will assist in disseminating the program through the CT High School Redesign initiative.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 proposal has included the skills and responsibilities of the project management team with most of the team members having extensive backgrounds in science, technology, curriculum development and project management. All project leaders have a successful history of collaborating in previously implemented educational initiatives. The applicant has also attached resumes highlighting some of the lead staff who have managed grant-awarded projects and the success of such initiatives. The lead project staff includes the Project Director (Principal Investigator), four Co-Principal Investigators with varied roles, Senior Project Staff, an Independent Evaluator, an Advisory Board and official implement partners. The Advisory Board in will meet quarterly with key project staff for purposes of reviewing evaluations and research findings in order to provide recommendations for project improvement.

The applicant has also attached information on the project budget, relevant timelines and the responsible project staff charged with implementing and/or performing each of the project responsibilities.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

None

Weaknesses

This project does not target young children below the third grade.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 proposed STEM21 Academy model is a standards-based model targeting 9th to 12th grade students with math, science and technology courses delivered in an interactive blended learning manner and students are eligible to obtain up to 15 college credits that are equivalent to the CT state colleges and universities. The credits are obtained at no cost to the students

and the standardized college entrance exams are part of the assessment strategy.

According to the applicant, the students participating in STEM21 must pass the College Board Accuplacer exam (used by CT state colleges and universities to determine student readiness for credit-bearing coursework) and students will receive tutoring to enable them pass the exams. Additionally, the College an Work Readiness Assessment will also be used to assess college readiness.

The applicant also indicates that a new content module namely College Ready 21 will be developed in order to address college selection and application process for participants.

Additionally, the project will include mentoring of students on college pathways, financial aid and scholarships with additional integrated company tours, job shadowing and internships to increase the competitiveness of high-need students? college applications.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

None

Weaknesses

Although there are some minimal statistics in the proposal about low income Latino and African American students, there is no clear indication that the STEM21 project will target students with limited English proficiency and neither has the proposal addressed any specific strategies for students with disabilities.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The applicant identifies high-need middle and high school students in two rural high schools. Region 1 High School services six rural municipalities in the remote northwestern corner of CT and it has a four year cumulative school drop-out rate that is nearly twice the state average. Drury High School's drop-out rate exceeds the state average with 26% of students having family incomes below the poverty level. Students in both schools are geographically isolated from STEM-related industries and programs, and the applicant wants to engage them through after school and summer STEM21 Academy preparatory programs in partnership with a local non-profit organization (CT Pre-Engineering Program). Additionally, the applicant states that the students and their parents will receive language and literacy-appropriate program information and facilitated enrollment to the program.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 10:46 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 2:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services (U396D100520)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	25
TOTAL	25	25

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 03: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services (U396D100520)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 research cited is relevant and supports the significance of possible effects of the proposed program to be implemented. The research that the program is based upon has both internal and external validity. The Appendix H includes results of previous studies of the project, as well as, results of a pilot study.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality

implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The Evaluation Plan is thorough and includes a quasi-experimental design that addresses all foreseeable issues that may occur during the implementation of the proposed program. There is evidence that the data collected will result in usable reports to determine continued implementation of success. The timeline on page 12 gives overall plan for all years. The evaluator is independent. The budget is clear for the evaluation costs; therefore, it is clear that the scope of the project can be fulfilled. The evaluation models are well described and could be replicated.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 2:12 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/26/2010 10:14 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services (U396D100520)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	24
TOTAL	25	24

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 03: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: EDUCATION CONNECTION -- Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services - Center for 21st Century Skills,School Services (U396D100520)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 provided evidence, including evaluation executive summaries and lesson plans of previous positive outcomes of STEM 21 academy for two subject areas.

The applicant provides promising research on early college and career academies which help to supplement the work that they propose.

The applicant provides evidence for the success of STEM 21 for students who are of priority populations of interest for this grant.

The applicant provides reports of the success for an 8 year project (CCC), upon which the proposed project will build.

Weaknesses

The evaluation results that the applicant provides as evidence in support of STEM 21 does not provided empirical evidence for increases in student achievement.

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The applicant proposes a comprehensive/mixed-method evaluation which will allow for analyses of: relationships between program inputs and student outcomes, accurate implementation and implementation effectiveness. Moreover, appropriate attention is given to analyses as three lead evaluators will have responsibility for the different aspects of evaluation.

The study will include middle and high school students to become involved, thus the size and scope of the proposed project will allow for evaluation of latent growth models, which the applicant proposes to perform.

The applicant provided a logic model with a timeline of activities that will permit periodic assessments of progress and evaluation results that can be produced within the grant period timeline.

The applicant provides information about the statistical analyses that will be conducted.

The applicant provided a detailed budgetary report of resources that will go to evaluation activities.

There will be an evaluation of 4 STEM curricula.

Weaknesses

None found.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/26/2010 10:14 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/25/2010 9:54 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	7
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 39: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The project proposed by the Erickson Institute in collaboration with the Chicago Public School system identifies an enormous need for guided, supported implementation of mathematics concepts and appropriate instructional strategies for teachers of young children.

Based upon a highly successful early literacy professional development model of enhancing teacher effectiveness and learning regarding pedagogy and content knowledge, the Erickson Institute has designed a compliment in the area of mathematics filling a void for early childhood education professionals.

Additionally, the project has the backing and support of every nationally recognized professional organization not only in the early childhood arena, but also the mathematics arena. The qualifications of all partners including NAEYC, NSDC, NCTM, scholars with international recognition and honors and CPS personnel illustrate the ability of the collaborative partners to impact early childhood education and the achievement of our youngest children in a profound way.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The Erickson Institute presents an exceptional approach to meeting the priorities set out in the application of meeting the instructional needs of high needs students in the area of mathematics through improving upon a highly successful and proven model that has been used in early literacy instruction for some time. Furthermore, the application identifies a huge need within primary education for teacher support in understanding mathematics concepts as well as the instructional strategies that are appropriate for young children.

The project contains appropriate, attainable goals linked to student learning and a recognized need that is supported with evidence and data.

A learning lab approach greatly enhances teacher effectiveness as the teacher is now a supported, learner who then goes on to support their students learning in a similar fashion. Similarly, the "Whole Teacher Development" chart presented on pg 8 is a model for other LEAs to use when designing appropriate professional development that brings about systemic change and enhanced student growth.

The logic model of Intervention presented on page 4 clearly delineates the unique and multi-tiered delivery model of effective professional development.

The application includes teacher instruction in new knowledge, coaching to model and support the instructional strategy in the teachers' classroom, site groups and Professional Learning Communities to provide collegial support and learning from other on the ground practitioners and guided classroom implementation so that teachers are supported as learners rather than dictated to by someone they have no connection to. This model has been extremely effective in early literacy and the process of using what works from the reading model. Learning from the past growth opportunities from the reading model assures continuous learning for both students and teachers.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The documentation of past performance of the applicant with projects of the scope presented is unquestioned. Additionally, the evidence of Erickson Institute, an Institute of Higher Education, to significantly improve student and teacher achievement through their considerable, validated work within the Chicago Public School system is above reproach.

Lastly, the applicant has the unequivocal endorsement of every recognized national organization in mathematics and early childhood education to further illustrate their experience and qualifications.

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant clearly identifies the number of students that will be supported by the grant including start up and scale up cost estimates. There is no question that the applicant has the ability and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the strategies presented in the application. Because of the endorsements and support of national early childhood and mathematics organizations, dissemination through conferences and journal publications is clearly supported.

Weaknesses

The feasibility of replication in a variety of settings would be challenging if

the LEA were not of the size and commitment of Chicago Public Schools. This would be particularly challenging to implement in small, rural districts where fiscal resources as well as human resources are not as widespread. Additionally, LEAs experiencing severe fiscal limitations would struggle to support the project fiscally.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 clearly demonstrates how capacity is being built at the school level to sustain the training beyond the length of the grant. Additionally, creation of videotapes for training not only supports the continued dissemination of learning after the grant sunsets but also provides a potential source of revenue to continue the project.

Weaknesses

Clear evidence that all stakeholders would be able to sustain the project, particularly from a fiscal perspective, is not provided.

Insufficient information about how the grant process will be incorporated into others' work at the building, district and IHE level are not evident.

Reader's Score: 7

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan presented has clearly defined objectives, timelines and milestones. Additionally, the responsibilities are defined as well as the unquestioned qualifications of every key project person involved. Of particular note is the inclusion of the K-12 LEA into the plan noting the collaborative partnership created by the organizations involved.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

The applicant has the endorsement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children to compliment their outstanding approach to providing quality, developmentally appropriate mathematics instruction to young children.

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

The applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 9:54 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2010 0:44 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 39: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Based on problems nationwide in mathematics and the achievement gap that exist between low-income and minority students with their non-minority counterparts, the applicant is addressing this need through teacher professional development for grades Pre-K - 3. This grade range is crucially important to the future mathematical abilities of the students. Conceptual understanding, according to the applicant is the key to reducing the mathematics achievement gap, The co-facilitation in the classrooms helps

to build teachers confidence after individualized coaching session labs. The conceptual framework brings together the initiative in a pictorial snapshot. The model provides the framework for teachers to learn and relate to.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Partnering with a reputable independent accredited institution of higher learning noted for improving educational outcomes for young children and strengthening teacher practices will help prevent and reduce the achievement gap. Teachers will receive conceptual mathematical training to equip them with strategies for classroom use to improve students math skills.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The various mediums (i.e. website, conferences, newspaper, television, letters to the home of each child and journal articles) used to disseminate project information is commendable. The number of students to be served along with the cost was provided. By the end of grant period, all students will be served and a summative evaluation will be performed.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 initiative partnership has embedded sustainability --train-the-trainer, teacher roles within and across responsibilities during professional development, website, quarterly newsletters, videotapes, journal articles and the manual.

Weaknesses

New teachers and teacher attrition could be a potential problem in terms of professional development and training.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 background experience and training of the project director and other key personnel implementing the project is above reproach. Established timelines to carry out the plan were provided.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

The proposed project is targeted to serve high needs children and their PK - 3 teachers within the public school system in Chicago. Many services will be provided at school sites, and all teachers serving the PK - 3 grades levels will be included.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Preference not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Preference not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the

unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Preference not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 0:44 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/24/2010 6:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	7
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 39: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The Erikson Institute proposes to partner with Chicago Public Schools and SRI International in a project to improve mathematics achievement in grades PK-3, as measured by the Illinois State Achievement Tests that are based on the adopted statewide standards for mathematics. The project will include teacher development, teacher coaching, in school collaboration, video production and a well designed evaluation of both the process and student outcome. The project is very well designed and commendable.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.**

Strengths

Erikson Institute in partnership with Chicago Public Schools proposes to close the mathematics achievement gap of high- need minority students in grades PK- 3 through professional development aimed at teaching mathematics and the production of videos that capture the training sessions. The professional development will focus on teaching the standards of the Illinois Learning Standards for Mathematics. The videos produced at the Erikson Institute will be used for those teachers that are not part of initial group selected for inclusion in the professional development and for new teachers coming into the Chicago system. This project meets an unmet need in Chicago where achievement gaps exist and mathematics achievement overall is low. The goals of the project are clear with a specific strategy to meet them. The goals and objectives match the project priorities.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Erikson Institute and research partner SRI International have extensive experience in teacher professional development and assessment of student mathematical achievement, page e4. For the past four years Erikson Institute has successfully utilized its learning labs on campus for teacher development. A key component of the training is the use of well trained coaches that will assist teachers in the program. Erikson Institute, a graduate school that focuses on elementary education, has over a twenty year record of training that produce achievement gains, page e11 and e12. SRI International has an impeccable array of talent assigned to this project as an official partner. Research and project design along with evaluation are their major strengths.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The Logic model or management plan is clearly written with responsibilities assigned. The proposed formative evaluation will assist in keeping the program on course over the five years of the project, page e13. The number of participants in the project can be reasonably accommodated, Table 2, page e16. This project is designed for continued professional development beyond the five years of the actual grant in that the large numbers of teachers trained will be a resource for other teachers in Chicago. Creating the multi-level learning communities will assist in bringing the goals to fruition but also have a lasting impact on teaching mathematics PK-3. This project could be replicated in most districts in America that had a great desire to improve mathematics instruction and a willingness to invest in professional development aimed at improving mathematics achievement. Having a partnership with a graduate school of education would be extremely helpful. Corporate Partners and Foundations have contributed to the work at Erikson that supports the fidelity of implementation, page e18. Scale-up cost estimates have been included.

Weaknesses

This project depends on the cooperation of 16 schools and 160 teachers committed to improving mathematics instruction. It may be somewhat problematic to recruit that many willing participants even with the monetary incentives.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

This project will be sustained at four levels, the classroom, the school, the project and Erikson Institute. To the extent that schools and teachers are committed to improving the teaching of mathematics the project will be sustained. Erikson has the resources, expertise and the motivation for this project to be successfully completed. Erikson Institute will provide website and newsletter support for the project..

Weaknesses

The question of school and teacher commitment with the large numbers to be recruited (only three schools have committed when the application was submitted) may be a problem.

Reader's Score: 7

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan with timelines and responsibilities noted is well organized. Milestones will be addressed through frequent meetings of the management team. All of the project leaders are highly qualified and experienced, page e23-e25.

Weaknesses

No noted weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

This project is directly aimed improving early learning outcomes for high-need minority students. It is an effort to improve scores on the Illinois State Achievement Tests.

Weaknesses

No noted weakness.

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2010 6:43 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 2:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396D100383)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	9
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	16
TOTAL	25	16

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 03: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396D100383)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.
- (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 research cited has both internal and external validity. The research cited includes studies about the proposed project that use data to drive the decisions for planned changes to the project in the proposed study. Other studies that discuss the student successes of the proposed program are included and discussed. There are strong studies that cite high strengths of generalizability.

Weaknesses

On page 10, the proposal discusses the outcomes of PD sessions linked to student outcomes as a failure in most programs, yet this proposal suggests just that outcome. Therefore, the proposal should include how this project will be different and connect PD for teachers to student successes and growth.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and

scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The evaluation plan is thorough and includes an experimental design that addresses all foreseeable issues that may occur during the implementation of the proposed program. The experimental design is clear and could be easily replicated. There is evidence that the data collected will result in usable reports with both formative and summative data to determine continued implementation of success. The evaluator is independent. The budget is clear for the evaluation costs.

Weaknesses

There are inconsistencies on the student numbers that are quoted throughout the proposal, therefore it is unclear the sample size of the students and teachers. No timeline for the data collection and analysis is provided.

Reader's Score: 9

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 2:12 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/26/2010 10:14 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396D100383)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	8
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	9
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	17
TOTAL	25	17

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 03: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396D100383)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 provided information on results from their previous research and findings from other studies on the effectiveness of professional development, thus providing a reasonable hypothesis for the proposed study.

The applicant has previous experience with outcomes of the early mathematics project which showed changes for students up to grade K, thus an extension of the project to grade 3 would help to keep a continuum for mathematics teacher development.

The applicant has reported positive student achievements for priority students of interest for this grant application.

Weaknesses

Although the applicant provided supporting evidence for teacher variables that may be related to student performance and the significance of some studies, there was no empirical evidence, magnitudes of effect and/or amount of academic increase provided that linked teacher inputs to student success.

Reader's Score: 8

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

Student outcome measures will be tested using standardized tests that have high reliability.

Two different evaluation teams will focus on different aspects of evaluation, thus providing for equivalent attention to formative and summative analyses.

There is information on what constitutes the PD/math instruction/development that teachers will receive, thus facilitating replication in other settings.

There will be a quasi-experimental design to improve the internal validity of results.

Weaknesses

It is unclear what is the target number of students to be reached as different numbers are reported in the abstract (4,512); page one (2,400); and page five (3,600). Therefore, the size and scope of the project is unclear.

Power analysis information was provided, however no sample size estimates were calculated/provided to justify the ability to detect effect sizes.

Reader's Score: 9

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/26/2010 10:14 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/26/2010 0:09 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396C100434)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	5
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	5
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 15: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396C100434)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>The project plan is based on the findings of a small scale 2 year project that showed promising student achievement results by using an integrated English Language Development and Science approach to learning (p. 2). This approach to addressing ELD would meet the requirements of the proposal as being an exceptional approach to the priorities sought by the applicant.</p>

The plan to provide a development guidebook of strategy and curriculum for integrating ELD and science for teachers and professional developers is a strength of the proposal.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not describe the criteria for choosing the teachers for the project.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The institute was created in 1995. Since that time the applicant has conducted extensive work with a vast number of schools. This is documented in this application.

The pilot project associated with this project has shown significant gains in student achievement as presented on page 15.

Weaknesses

Most of the work performed by the applicant has been in the form of trainings to teachers at the request of the individual school districts and did not provide the opportunity to collect student outcome data. The experience of the co-applicant is not addressed.

Reader's Score: 20

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

IFI's partnership in the regional project Baysci which supports elementary school science development in more than 85 elementary school districts (p. 20) will allow the strategies developed in the project to be carried over to the Baysci project which would lead to implementation in a much wider area. In addition, IFI also conducts numerous professional development workshops throughout the 85 districts. IFI plans to incorporate materials and processes

developed within this project into those workshops.
An additional strength of this project is that it can easily be replicated since it requires no specialized curriculum to implement the materials and processes. This flexibility will go a long way in encouraging other systems to consider implementing this project in their own districts.

Weaknesses

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 does include a commitment from SVUSD and other partners directly involved in the implementation of the program (appendix D). The plan to provide a development guidebook of strategy and curriculum for integrating ELD and science both for teachers and professional developers is a plus.

Weaknesses

Although the applicant does show the support of those institutions that will be working with the project, there is no evidence of community or state level support for other entities. There is no letter of support showing that the California Department of Education is supportive of the project or even the IFI organization (Appendix D). Without the commitment of others, sustainability beyond the length of the grant is questionable.

Reader's Score: 5

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 staff selected to oversee the project have the skills and expertise to successfully implement the project with strong backgrounds in curriculum and pedagogy.

Weaknesses

The timeline (p. 25) is not well developed. It does not specify the person(s) responsible for any of the tasks listed. This can have a direct negative impact on operational accountability.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 addressed in this application.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Not addressed in this application.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

students.

Strengths

The project is aimed at providing innovative methods for teaching English Language Development for Limited English Proficient students.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not addressed in this application.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 0:09 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 7:38 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396C100434)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 15: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396C100434)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>A highly unique approach combining English Language Development and Science education. Elementary teachers are often weak in science content and skills. Science can be overlooked in the daily elementary school schedule, and often students matriculate to upper grades with a weak foundational knowledge in science. Developing teacher ability to integrate English language skills is equally important. Four of the five schools in the school district have failed to meet AYP.</p>

Weaknesses

Criteria for the selection of teachers was not provided.

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Exploratium was established with National Science Foundation funding in 1995 and the organization has extensive experience in providing staff development to area teachers.

Weaknesses

Grant experience other than with NSF was not cited. School experience with grant funding could be discussed further.

Reader's Score: 20

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Program will increase in the number of highly effective elementary teachers teaching ELD and Science, as well as create a reduction in the achievement gap in both ELD and Science. The program will serve all elementary schools in the small district.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 varied components of the program: workshops, study groups, on-line resources, and leadership development provide for a comprehensive approach that will ensure sustainability. The integration of the science process skills will promote critical thinking skills throughout the curriculum. The proposal described long term support for the project from the school district.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Program objectives are clearly delineated, and supported by extensive research. The design of the initiative is based on the findings from a successful two year pilot program. The results demonstrated a reduction of the achievement gap and yielded positive outcomes in English language

abilities. Well articulated work plan aligned to specific outcomes.

Weaknesses

Cost effectiveness should be considered for the small size of the district and the relatively low number of teachers to be served. Time line should include clearly defined responsibilities, as identified by criteria.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 addressed in proposal.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Not addressed in proposal.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Program addresses the needs of ELLs .

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not addressed in proposal.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 7:38 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 10:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396C100434)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	21
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 15: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396C100434)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Providing tools for teachers to more effectively teach their students (in this case ELL students) is a valid need. The work plan for the project is feasible and timely. Interviews, focus groups, surveys, quantitative achievement data, and observations provide a wide variety of evaluation instruments to make the results of this grant research more reliable.

Weaknesses

Research is not a negative developmental component, but some of the questions the applicant seeks to answer through research should be evident already to support a proposal such as this one. The applicant should clarify how teachers will be chosen to participate in professional development in the first year and in cohorts for years 2-5.

Reader's Score: 21

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The mission and everyday activities of the Exploratorium support the goals and objectives of this grant. The Exploratorium has the tools and staff to provide the professional development needed to fulfill the work plan of this proposed project. In addition, the Exploratorium has experience creating and implementing school curriculum for elementary science students and teachers. The work of the Exploratorium has led to increased student achievement.

Weaknesses

The application does not address the experience of the school district applying alongside the Exploratorium for this grant.

Reader's Score: 20

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

BaySci has agreed to provide the materials and professional development opportunities to teachers on a national scale upon completion of this project. The project can be replicated in a more general sense to provide strategies that teachers in all districts could benefit from. Project results will be disseminated through virtual workshops, publications and presentations to share data and strategies.

Weaknesses

No significant weakness.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 school district and Exploratorium have participated in a pilot study that yielded promising results. The production of a guidebook for teachers and study groups for each grade level will increase the likelihood of participation by teachers and implementations of the strategies taught during professional development workshops. The program has a strong buy-in from teachers and administration in the district, and a position will be created to continue implementation and support for the program after the grant period has ended.

Weaknesses

Nothing is mentioned about how teachers from schools other than El Verano feel about this program.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Strong background in curriculum, nationally funded projects, oversight of projects, and science content knowledge. Strong management team overall. New funds will be sought to cover remaining needed funds once grant period is completed.

Weaknesses

No responsibility allotted for specific team members for each individual task in the timeline. Budget is too high for the number of teachers being served.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 identified or addressed within the proposal.

Weaknesses

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Weaknesses

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

A large number of ELL students in the district indicates a need for this type of professional development.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Weaknesses

Not identified or addressed within the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 10:18 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 10:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396D100434)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	25
TOTAL	25	25

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 06: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396D100434)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

Through the studies cited on pp. 9-11, the applicant demonstrates the hypotheses that support the proposed project.

The proposed intervention has been piloted for two years and the applicant provides details of the study and outcomes on p. 12, 13, and 15 of the proposal. These promising results suggest that a more formal and systematic study is warranted.

The outcomes of the pilot study demonstrate that the proposed project likely will have a positive impact on student achievement, particularly for those students whose home language is not English.

Weaknesses

The proposal does not contain any weaknesses in Section B.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The proposed project will use a quasi-experimental, pre- and post-intervention comparison design (p. 16). The sample of teachers will be purposefully selected, with the control group serving as the treatment group the following year (interrupted time-series design)(p. 17). The study will collect baseline data and analyze the quantitative results using ANOVA and HLM. All of these elements are appropriate for the proposed project.

The data sources listed on p. 17-18 will provide high-quality implementation and performance feedback data, as well as permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving the intended outcomes.

The teacher surveys, focus groups, and classroom observations (p. 18) will provide sufficient information about the key elements necessary to facilitate the project.

The evaluators for the project include staff from Inverness Research and the Center for Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (p. 24). Their respective CVs demonstrate their evaluation experience.

Weaknesses

Section D does not contain any weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 10:05 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396D100434)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	25
TOTAL	25	25

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 06: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Exploratorium -- Institute for Inquiry, - Institute for Inquiry, (U396D100434)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

On p. 8-10, the applicant thoroughly describes research-based findings in support of the proposed project, along with a hypothesis. The applicant presents the results of a pilot study implementing the proposed intervention with promising results in English learning as well as science on p. 11-12. The applicant demonstrates through their summary of existing research and the pilot study a great potential for positive impact on improving the achievement of ELL students in English as well as in science.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The quasi-experimental design proposed on p.15-16 is appropriate for the proposed study. The research questions are well thought out, including a question on short- and long-term costs of the model (p. 15). Table on p. 16-17 lays out the outcome measures and data collection associated with them. Multiple aspects of data analyses are addressed, including taking care of nested student data within classrooms.

Periodic assessment and performance feedback, including teacher data and logic model evaluation, are described in detail in Appendix H.

Reporting with sufficient detail for replication is described on p. 18.

Appropriately allocated resources for evaluation are addressed in the budget section.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:15 PM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 06/27/2010 4:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396C100661)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____

Technical Review Form

Development 23: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396C100661)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The application states that there has been success in raising student achievement among students, while some subgroups still lag behind. Some of these students are found in the special needs subgroup. When at risk factors were studied, it was found that 34% (11600 students) of the students fall into at least one category. There is clearly an unmet need.

The need for a data system that focuses on a personalized learning plan for

each student is seen as a valuable plan. The goals, objectives and outcomes are aligned and measurable, adding to the viability of the program.

The proposal is commendable in its exceptional approach to continual raising of the bar for all students, in addition to significant gains to date.

Weaknesses

None noted

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The application states that this district has committed itself to employing technology throughout the district. Technology is available in both the instructional and the administrative areas and seems to be readily available, which reflects the pervaseness of the technology plan.

In addition, it is a district where many students are achieving, since it has

made AYP in 2009 and it has an 87% graduation rate.

This project will bridge the gap between having data available for teacher use and supporting teachers in formulating a plan to use the data in a meaningful manner that impacts student achievement. The district has made a decision to move the process to a higher level and push the use of data to a higher level. The district has closed the achievement gap between subgroups as shown by an increase in graduation rates.

The focus of this grant is one that is often difficult to achieve - that is, the use of available data to impact student achievement directly. The district has submitted a proposal that addresses that very difficult but necessary task in a comprehensive manner.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The application states that the district has worked with the Center for Leadership and School Reform to develop a continuous improvement model. Another partner will develop the integrated data system that is needed for this project. A local University will assist in the external research study.

The number of students to be impacted and the cost was included in the application.

The cost is scale up is included.

Dissemination will take place through professional organizations, as well as state and federal agencies.

The project is designed to be used with the entire district, so scaling up at the district level will not be needed.

The details for this section support the proposal well.

Weaknesses

The evaluation of outcomes will provide significant direction for other school districts in the nation that choose to follow this model; however, the application provides only one comment regarding replication on p.21.

A full discussion of the possibility of replicating this project successfully is not provided. Since this district has a reputation for high student achievement, it should leverage that position to share this important initiative with similar districts.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 states that funds will be generated from private funding, in-kind resources and other support to assure continuation of this project.

The previous commitment to the use of data in this district is an advantage and would be a positive element in the continuation of this project.

The application notes the use of a train the trainer model and online follow-up. This process will also support the sustainability of the project.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 application provides a management plan. A specific timeline is provided with deadlines for accomplishing each task noted.

The staff, including the project director, include an appropriate mix of staff with expertise in academics and technology, which are important elements that directly relate to the goals of this proposal.

Weaknesses

There is a concern that the first task in the plan is the securing of partners for

private match and research. If that fails to happen, it seems that other steps will not follow. This plan needs to be expanded in order to insure successful implementation.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/27/2010 4:16 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2010 6:03 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396C100661)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	22
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	21
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	7
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 23: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396C100661)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Building a data base on student preferences and profiled needs will be helpful in guiding pedagogy and interventions.

Goals, outcomes and effects are clearly laid out on page 7.

The approach is exceptional and state-of-the-art. I expect that this type of data analysis is the future direction of education.

The population needs are well established.

Weaknesses

The timeline is useful but not sufficient.

This is a challenging data base to build and will require state-of-the art design which only comes with top flight software design. The project does not highlight the challenges with building such a data base and raises concerns about how clear these draw backs are, how the technology will be proven, and, whether the designers are sufficiently skilled and committed for the long haul.

Reader's Score: 22

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The project anticipates covering virgin territory in the design of the data base proposed.

They have been making significant strides in building a data rich and technology savvy district.

K-8 grading and reporting system is a good example of the advanced work they have accomplishing. P12

System wide plans in the past have been implemented that indicate they can accomplish plans such as this.

Data shows evidence of improvements in API scores and on California's standardized tests.

Data on pre and post student variables such as interest in applying to college showed progress.

Weaknesses

More disaggregated data would be helpful in understanding the trends in student performance.

Reader's Score: 21

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Infinite Campus reaches over 4.5 million students with its current applications. All products created in this project will be available to Infinite Campus' clientele.

The external partners will support the development and scaling of the project.

The resources are easily transferable to other sites after this project.

Projected costs for scaling up the project are clearly articulated.

As a technology leader, the district feels confident in its ability to deliver the proposed outcomes.

Weaknesses

Limited detail is offered on the actual activity that would extend and bring the project to scale. In particular, the dissemination of the information and products is limited to the description of a list of organizations and the client list of Infinite Campus. The mechanics of this dissemination could be clearer.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Prior uses of data demonstrate a commitment to moving forward with data.

Use of train-the trainer model will support sustainability. P.6

The marketplace concept should create a useful resource for gathering and disseminating information.

The willingness of partners to share in-kind resources will support the long term sustaining of the program.

There is significant stakeholder support that should help the program stay active after funding.

Weaknesses

Limited detail is offered on the actual activity that would sustain the project.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

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

Strengths

1) General project planning can be gleaned from the implementation schedule on page 5.

There are intended outcomes and measurements for EngageMe on page 8.

2) The skill level and experience of primary staff is significant and demonstrates their involvement in similar initiatives.

Responsibilities of each partner are articulated in detail on page 21.

Weaknesses

P. 4 does offer some background and information about the role of Infinite Campus but it is unclear of their capacity to drive the technology design proposed. More on their bona fides is required.

Timelines and benchmarks are required to better understand the flow of the project.

Reader's Score: 7

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success

(0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 6:03 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 5:59 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396C100661)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 23: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396C100661)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The application seeks to provide a centralized database consisting of student demographic and academic data, and a searchable bank of lessons (Learning Marketplace) that the teacher can use to target students' weaknesses. The project will serve approximately 34,500 students in 35 schools. (abstract; p 3)

The application provides current (2008-09) disaggregate data for students with disabilities, those who are economically disadvantaged and Hispanic students to indicate the need for this project. (p 3) For example, 13.3% of the ED population in grades 1-8 failed to meet the passing standard in math on the state's standardized test; 23% of SWD and 12.2% of the Hispanic population also failed to meet this standard. (p 3) Of these populations, only 52.9% of the economically disadvantaged, 54.1% of the SWD and 72.7% of the Hispanic students graduated contributing to the overall graduation rate of 87.6% for the district. (p 3)

The application states that their SMS provider will extend the capabilities of the already existing program to provide teachers with the ability to make predictive decisions in addition to corrective decisions for the purpose of increasing student learning. (pp 4, 5) Activities/lessons in the Learning Marketplace will be aligned with Common Core State Standards in math and English language arts and aligned to the courses taught by teachers. (p 5)

Goals include increasing student achievement, decreasing the dropout rate and increasing graduation rates. (p 7) Intended outcomes and measurable effects are clearly linked to the stated goals and include access to appropriate real time student data, needs [data] driven instruction, student activities and resources matched with performance levels, targeted professional development to support mastery of standards, standards alignment and a user friendly interface for teachers, administrators and students. (p 7) Measurable effects are stated in achievable, quantitative terms. For example, "a decrease in the number of students grades 6-12 who have 4+ indicators of high need by 10% by the end of year 5 in all subgroups and in total." (p 7)

The application provides thorough information explaining how they will address the unmet academic needs of students including those traditionally considered "high risk" because of socio-economic or minority status. Goals and objectives are clearly linked, and outcomes are measurable.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The project demonstrates the ability to significantly increase student achievement. For example, the applicant, Forsyth County Schools, has demonstrated success in implementing the use of technology to communicate and engage the local community, improve the delivery of services and the quality of education in public schools. The district has received 19 state accountability awards in the past year and has achieved AYP goals. Custom applications have been created to supplement data analysis for the purpose of increasing student achievement, and the district has contracted with the state to foster innovation through a reprieve from state laws and SBOE rules while holding teachers and students to even higher accountability measures. The district has instituted a k-8 standards-based grading and reporting system, offers a virtual school, a non-traditional charter high school, evening school and expanded opportunities for students to earn high school and middle school credits. (p 12)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The application addresses the number of students to be reached by the proposed project and provides information to bring the project to scale.

For example, the application proposes to reach 34,500 students through the project at a cost of \$4,738,500. (p 20) A partner match will develop the fully integrated data system. Total cost per pupil is estimated at \$18.00, \$8.00 of which is already budgeted for licensing of the SMS. (p 21) Projected costs for 100,000 students is \$800,000 per year, 250,000 students-\$2,000,000 and 500,000 students is \$4,000,000. (p 21)

The applicant's partner and SMS provider will incorporate the proposed system into its core product, thereby making it available to all of their customers at no additional charge. (p 20)

This information indicates the applicant and the partners have worked together to develop a viable plan for bringing the project to scale.

Weaknesses

The application does not specifically describe the manner in which the project and project outcomes will be disseminated. For example, it is unclear as to whether "affiliation with" and "additional mechanisms" include publications, speaking engagements and/or information made available via the Internet. (p 21) A stronger application would have included specific venues, such as speaking engagements, national conferences, published journal articles, etc., for disseminating project processes and outcomes.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 project includes a clear plan for sustaining the project after the funding period. For example, the applicant, Forsyth County Schools, will pursue in-kind resources and private funding to ensure the sustainability of the project. (p 21) Stakeholders, including those previously identified and the Board of Education are committed to standards based learning and have expressed their support for the project. (p 22)

The SMS provider and partner have pledged support and a commitment to incorporate the Learning Marketplace and other components into the existing student management software.

Train-the-Trainer models will be implemented to ensure all users receive direct instruction, and online training modules will be made available for on-demand access. (p 6)

These activities and strategies should be sufficient for sustaining the project beyond the length of the funding period.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 application includes a management plan adequate for achieving the objectives of the proposed project and will employ the services of personnel with the qualifications and experience necessary to implement and develop project initiatives.

A timeline (pp 5-7) was included in the application and responsible parties have been identified (pp 5-7; 22) The application states that in-kind resources and private funding will ensure the project is completed on time and will continue beyond the budget period. (p 21)

Key personnel appear to have the education and expertise necessary to manage the proposed project. For example, the Project Director has 19 years in education as a classroom teacher, school administrator, curriculum leader and school improvement director for the state department of education. (p 23) The Chief Technology and Information Officer previously served the State Department of Education where he managed a budget of \$150,000 million to build and implement the state's education technology initiatives. (p 24) This individual will support the Project Director in the day-to-day management of program operations. (p 24)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

The application did not address this priority.

Weaknesses

The application did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 application did not address this priority.

Weaknesses

The application did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The application did not address this priority.

Weaknesses

The application did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The application did not address this priority.

Weaknesses

The application did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 5:59 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396D100661)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	5
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	19
TOTAL	25	19

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396D100661)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 proposal offers an explicit, reasonable hypothesis on page e7 about the impact of personalized learning experiences on student outcomes. This hypothesis is testable given the experimental research design. The hypothesis appears to coincide with departmental priorities, as specified on page e8.

There is research evidence to support the utility of individualized instruction based on student differences, as cited on page e8.

There is research evidence to support the utility of formative assessment, as cited on page e9.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not explicitly demonstrate that the proposed project will have positive impacts on student learning. There is some evidence of positive effects from the individualized instruction and formative assessment pieces, as mentioned above, but little else. There is no estimate of magnitudes of impacts.

The particular combination of intervention components has not been tried before, or at least such attempts were not mentioned in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 5

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The randomized nature of the evaluation will allow for unbiased estimates of the impact of the intervention. The staggered design allows for impact estimates in Year 1 while not limiting the intervention to certain randomly selected schools in the long run.

Growth curve modeling is an appropriate methodology to examine achievement trajectories as a result of the experiment. The applicant correctly points out the clustered nature of the data and seems to understand the need for HLM to account for clustering.

Implementation fidelity will be measured and included in the model, which addresses factor 2 of the key factors. By using both qualitative and quantitative methods for examining implementation, there will be a richer description of the intervention on the ground. The evaluators will also feed back the implementation data to allow for program improvement.

The attention to multiple student outcome measures, including short term and long term outcomes, will allow for the examination of the persistence of impacts on students.

Weaknesses

Power analyses indicate the sample size is adequate to detect effects of .22

standard deviations. However, given that the lack of presentation of sample sizes in the previous section, it is unclear if effect sizes of .22 standard deviations should be expected.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/22/2010 7:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396D100661)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	6
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	21
TOTAL	25	21

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Forsyth County Schools -- , - , (U396D100661)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 proposers have provided a traditional literature review that argues for the creation of a personalized learning system based on citations about the national need for such a system. They provide evidence that the three underlying concepts around which the intervention is built are reasonably well supported by research, i.e., 1) personalized learner plan addressing high needs, 2) formative assessment. and 3) mastery of standards-aligned activities and resources. The proposed intervention builds on and extends services that are in place. It is clear from the review that there is well-reasoned hypothesis that merits further research.

Weaknesses

The proposers indicate that prior research shows that formative assessment can produce effect sizes of .4 to .7. They argue that having all three components should give a larger effect. The argument is weak and would be strengthened by tying the proposed intervention more closely to work that estimates effect sizes.

Proposers indicate that the intervention as presently configured has not been tried. While the components of the intervention have supportive evidence . results from a limited pilot would have strengthened the proposal. The proposers have not made a convincing argument that is reasonable to

assume that their intervention will achieve the effect sizes achieved in previous research.

Reader's Score: 6

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The proposers have developed an evaluation plan that used a time lagged design to form comparison groups. They will use growth curve analyses to answer questions related to achievement. They have conducted power analyses to determine sample size and will be able to detect an effect size of .22. The study design is strong because it includes comparison groups and will be able to make relatively strong causal conclusions.

The proposers describe a process evaluation that includes tracking implementation using a variety of data sources interviews, focus groups, artifacts, and surveys. Given the criteria that there must be ample implementation data and sufficient information about the elements of the intervention to facilitate further development and replication, this aspect of the proposal is strong.

The qualifications of participants and their allotment of \$810,000 to conduct the evaluation suggest that there will adequate resources to conduct the evaluation. It is clear that the evaluator has been closely involved in the process and on p. 20 they indicate that Dr. Michael Spector has wide experience with federal grants and that the Program Evaluation Group has a long track record of conducting rigorous program evaluation research.

Weaknesses

none

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 7:20 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/26/2010 6:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100748)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	19
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	18
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 08: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100748)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

IDEA Public Schools presents a proposal for a Learning Center to coordinate efforts for professional development for teachers and principals. This county is very needy, where poverty, and needy students are the majority. The IDEA schools have found successes in implementing change and want to share their learning experiences with another local LEA.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Based on data provided by the applicant, Hidalgo County represents a poverty stricken area with low graduation rates and low percentages of residents attending higher education courses. The lack of residents attaining higher education status leads to a small pool of local teacher and school leader talent.

IDEA has shown successes with students in this needy community and has a waiting list for its high performing charter schools.

Teach for America, a prospective partner, recruits, places, and supports a number of teachers in these schools. Other teachers in the organization do not receive the same support.

The applicant seeks funds to support the Rio Grande Valley Center for Teaching and Leading Excellence that will recruit, select, evaluate, reward, train, and retain teachers and school leaders from the two LEAs mentioned in this proposal.

The Learning Center will mimic Teach for America's proven teacher supports such as a Summer Institute and a data-driven coaching model.

The Learning Center will plan for a Teacher Leader Institute as well as training for assistant principals and instructional coaches.

The applicant proposes a partnership with Dr. Tichy to equip principals to be energetic change agents.

The applicant states specific goals and objectives with measurable outcomes.

Weaknesses

The applicant's definition of an experienced teacher is one with strong student performance and two years in the classroom. The applicant did not provide enough detail to justify that two years in the classroom was enough to consider a teacher an experienced teacher. The applicant should have clarified why it considered two years of classroom an experienced teacher and if the turnover rate of teachers had impact on the teachers that were considered experienced.

The applicant did not specify what tool would be used to evaluate teacher rewards based on student performance. Student achievement as a means for teacher rewards based on standardized tests is not a fair as it should be based on Pre-Post test where the data shows growth over time.

The applicant is seeking funds to implement an on-boarding or induction program. This on-boarding or induction program seems like a large amount of work when there are reputable and successful induction programs that can be modeled.

Test scores shared in the experience section show that there may not be as big of a need as portrayed in this section.

Reader's Score: 19

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The IDEA schools were developed based on the need of students. The applicant is looking to change the way the schools create expectations and teach students. Some of the same strategies that made the IDEA schools a success will be used for this Center for Teaching.

Both LEAs show potential for successfully implementing change as student achievement has increased in both districts.

IDEA and PSJA will work together to share ideas, needs, and issues to work

toward supporting students in this very needy community.

Weaknesses

There is significant evidence of the strategies IDEA used to improve student achievement but it is unclear what PSJA has implemented even though they show improvements.

The applicant is not able to share how they have made significant improvements in gaps between students and graduation rates. In fact, their test scores are very good and this is not consistent with the initial need for the project as stated in the beginning.

Reader's Score: 18

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The program will eventually reach 50,365 students.

IDEA is fiscally sound and has sufficient management and personnel to create a successful partnership with PSJA to bring this project to scale.

IDEA will allocate their talented staff and leaders to spearhead this endeavor.

The goal of the Learning Center is to provide mechanisms for good teaching where if proven effective, could be replicated successfully in a variety of settings and populations and even established as a non-profit where districts might purchase their services.

Applicant provides initial costs as well as projections for increased students.

The applicant plans to disseminate information via the Internet and education reform conferences to include case studies, blog posts, journal articles, workshops, trainings, etc.

Weaknesses

It is not clear how the IDEA projects a 95% increase enrollment as well as a 17% increase in enrollment for PSJA. This task in itself is a big job.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Due to IDEA's proven strategies supported by increased student achievement, they have been able to enlist strong stakeholder support from individuals, corporations, and foundations locally, regionally, and nationally.

The purpose of the center is to coordinate efforts, resources, and experts in a central location organized by professionals to make the work of professional development affective, efficient, and impact the maximum number of students. Most of what is being proposed at the Center is something that at a much smaller scale is already being accomplished. This is evidence that the applicant has the resources and support to sustain this project.

"IDEA and PSJA will not hesitate to re-allocate resources to a program that is generating student gains."

The applicant also discusses the fact that if this Center proves valuable, they might seek non-profit status and become a service for pay that other LEAs might utilize.

Weaknesses

The applicant might become a service for pay. In these economic times, that may not be a feasible approach to sustainability.

The applicant did not discuss the current status of the teachers and what their perceptions are for the implementation of this professional development.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Two professionals, one from IDEA and one from PSJA will run the Center. Having a representative from both LEAs will ensure the needs of both entities are being met.

Project Director and key personnel have the prerequisites needed to

successfully run this program.

Management plan is complete with parties responsible and milestones.

Weaknesses

The applicant is proposing to increase the number of students in its Charter School, incorporate a district into its professional development, and add new partners. It is not clear that there are enough resources, personnel, and time to accomplish this task.

There were no specifics on the skills the Teacher Development Coordinator and the Leadership Development coordinator had.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

No direct impact on early learning for students.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

No support for college prep classes.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Language learners and students with disabilities will be impacted by this Learning Center but the grant does not directly address this issue.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or

2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

No evidence of rural LEAs.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 6:11 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 0:49 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100748)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	3
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	6
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 08: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100748)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant intends to address the human capital situation in two districts within a low income high needs area of Texas where it adjoins the Mexican border. The districts have low achievement and higher turnover rates. The applicant intends to pair with Teach for America in terms of recruiting and placing teachers and providing staff development for teachers and administrators. The applicant indicates that while it operates its own system of charter public schools, it does not have a scale up strategy of its own and will use this project to develop one. The project intends to increase student achievement as well as teacher retention, and also to eliminate teachers/administrators who do not perform sufficiently. The applicant's design is of high quality and it has access to some of the nation's experts in human capital management. The reader's positive view of these aspects of the project is tempered, however, by other factors described below.

The TAKS results presented in the chart on p. 16 appear to indicate that the district's overall achievement in all curriculum areas is not significantly depressed. The lowest average is 67% in Science, with ranges of 85% in Reading/ELA, 92% in writing, 76% in math, and 88% in social studies. These result appear to contradict the high needs status of the districts as described in the narrative. Further, the district has 11 schools with "exemplary" status and 15 "recognized" and has doubled the number of exemplary campuses in one year alone. Nine schools were named as "Best in the State" by Texas Monthly Magazine based on a study done by the National Center for Educational Accountability. It is difficult to reconcile this information with the stated high needs bordering on desperate status of the districts as presented in the early part of the narrative.

Since the applicant operates its own system of charter public schools and also has a large waiting list plus plans of its own to increase more than 100% in the next five years, it is difficult to see that the applicant has capacity to both do that in its own behalf and also manage and operate a similar project on a much larger scale involving two school districts with large enrollments. Further, the applicant indicates it will look at nurturing additional relationships with other districts in the valley. (p. 27)It is not clear that the applicant would not be overextended and would be able to be successful at all three of these complex and intensive endeavors simultaneously.

The voices of teachers and others who would be most directly involved in and affected by the project are not represented within the narrative.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant intends to address the human capital situation in two districts within a low income high needs area of Texas where it adjoins the Mexican border. The districts have low achievement and higher turnover rates. The applicant intends to pair with Teach for America in terms of recruiting and placing teachers and providing staff development for teachers and administrators. The applicant indicates that while it operates its own system of charter public schools, it does not have a scale up strategy of its own and will use this project to develop one. The project intends to increase student achievement as well as teacher retention, and also to eliminate teachers/administrators who do not perform sufficiently.

Weaknesses

While the applicant indicates it will take advantage of TFA and others for its project design, it also intends to develop what seems to be an induction model (identified here as "onboarding," an undefined term which the reader presumes refers to an induction phase). There are existing high quality induction models for teachers, including but not limited to California's highly successful Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA), the New Teacher Project's model, and Connecticut's portfolio assessment model. The project could benefit from these proven nationally applicable models instead of expending resources on creating an additional model. Since California's student population is closely related to that of Texas, that model and/or the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project model might potentially be a good fit.

Given that TFA is basically a two-year commitment from participants, and given the high needs status of the region as a whole as a residential community for living, it is not clear that providing additional new teacher support in and of itself would be sufficient to improve retention rates. The applicant indicates it would address teacher compensation, and also remove ineffective staff, but these matters are locally bargained and subject to contractual arrangements.

It appears that the applicant's own turnover rate at 16% is actually higher than the districts' rate at 12%. (p. 4)

Reader's Score: 20

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as**

demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant currently operates charter schools with approximately 5,500 students and has a waiting list. The applicant's approach is derived from the International Baccalaureate model which emphasizes high expectations, small school size, partnership with parents, and an extended school day and year. (p. 15)100% of its three graduating classes went on to college and 97% persist.

Weaknesses

The TAKS results presented in the chart on p. 16 appear to indicate that the district's overall achievement in all curriculum areas is not significantly depressed. The lowest average is 67% in Science, with ranges of 85% in Reading/ELA, 92% in writing, 76% in math, and 88% in social studies. These results appear to contradict the high needs status of the districts as described in the narrative. Further, the district has 11 schools with "exemplary" status and 15 "recognized" and has doubled the number of exemplary campuses in one year alone. Nine schools were named as "Best in the State" by Texas Monthly Magazine based on a study done by the National Center for Educational Accountability. It is difficult to reconcile this information with the stated high needs bordering on desperate status of the districts as presented in the early part of the narrative.

Reader's Score: 20

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant indicates it has increased its own schools' enrollment from 896 to 5,493 between 2005 and 2009. The districts' enrollments have also been growing about 3% per year. The projected per-pupil cost per year would be \$49.56 at the end of year 4 of the project as the project would affect all of the students in the target districts. (p. 25)

The applicant indicates it would dedicate a senior leader to this project who would take over as the Director of the center. The leadership team will include a TFA representative also.

The dissemination plan includes documentation via the internet and at education reform conferences plus potentially nurturing additional relationships with local districts and spinning off the center as a non-profit service provider. (p. 27)

Weaknesses

Since the applicant operates its own system of charter public schools and also has a large waiting list plus plans of its own to increase more than 100% in the next five years, it is difficult to see that the applicant has capacity to both do that in its own behalf and also manage and operate a similar project on a much larger scale involving two school districts with large enrollments. Further, the applicant indicates it will look at nurturing additional relationships with other districts in the valley. (p. 27) It is not clear that the applicant would not be overextended and would be able to be successful at all three of these complex and intensive endeavors simultaneously.

The applicant recognizes a potential significant difficulty in replicating this

project on a larger scale is that it involves working with existing high quality national organizations with reputations for excellence and that replicator sites would need access to enough high quality coaches and trainers on a sustained basis. (p. 29) The applicant acknowledges that it is very difficult for individual schools and districts to recruit and retain significant numbers of talented trainers and coaches, particularly districts located in high needs or undesirable geographic areas. (p. 29)

Reader's Score: 3

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant indicates it has raised \$27 million from investors and other foundation sources. (p. 29)

Weaknesses

It is not clear what the district management and teachers think of the planned project, or the level of support from these stakeholders. Given that the project will rely on coaching strategies, intensive support requiring teacher leadership, and identification of ineffective teachers and administrators, it would have been important for the voices of these affected participants to be known.

Reader's Score: 6

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 will establish a center consisting of four full time staff members. (p. 30)The center director will be an executive from IDEA and a former district teacher and thus will be familiar with both entities.

A table of management activities is provided indicating timeline, responsible parties, and milestones. The level of detail is minimally sufficient to understand how the project will operate.

Weaknesses

The qualifications for the Teacher Development Coordinator and the Leadership Development Coordinator are not provided.

The activities chart indicated a milestone as "Support contracts, and baseline systems complete." It is not clear what "contracts" are being referred to, as no contracts were discussed in the narrative, or what the "baseline systems" are.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

This priority is not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

This priority is not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

This priority is not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

This priority is not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 0:49 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/26/2010 6:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100748)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	22
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 08: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100748)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>IDEA Public Schools, a high performing charter management organization and Pharr-San Juan Alamo (PSJA), a large innovative public independent school district, will work in concert with Teach for America and Dr. Noel Tichy (NYC Leadership Academy) to create an end to end human capital pipeline based on proven, yet innovative methods. Public education in the Valley is under undeniable pressure to serve an expanding high need student population with an extremely limited educator pool. TFA will share proven</p>

tools and processes for effective teacher recruitment and selection. TFA will share its data driven coaching model. The CMO will create the Teacher Leader Institute to meet the instructional and leadership needs to support IDEA and PSJA. The Center will work with TFA to adopt the Outcomes-Causes-Solutions training model. There are 5 clear and comprehensive goals stated.

Weaknesses

There are a variety of other teacher induction and mentoring resources that might prove to be a better "match" for this project besides Teach for America.

Reader's Score: 22

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

IDEA enrolls almost 5,500 students on campuses in 6 communities throughout the Rio Grande Valley. It provides a high quality, focused approach to teaching and learning that is derived from an International

Baccalaureate model. It has an extended day and school year. It focuses on students' individualized performance goals. The flagship IDEA campus has graduated three classes of seniors, 100% who enrolled in a 4 year college or university. For the 2009-2010 school year, the TEA labeled 11 PSJA campuses with an Exemplary status and 15 as Recognized.

Weaknesses

With the high accolades and exceptional data that IDEA has shared, it is questionable as to whether there is sufficient need for this project.

Reader's Score: 20

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.**
- (2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.**
- (3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.**
- (4) 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.**
- (5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

Strengths

The Center will directly impact 1,198 teachers and promising leaders over the project period. The impact of the program will reach 50,365 students as well. IDEA is a fiscally sound and responsible LEA with sufficient management capability. IDEA's established partnerships with PSJA and TFA's Rio Grande Valley Regional staff give this grant initiative a solid foundation to implement the project and achieve the intended results and outcomes in four years. There is a table that shows the per student estimates for the proposal at scale. The Center will seek to build internal capacity with each district partner over time.

Weaknesses

NONE

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

IDEA has raised \$27 million from investors and has a number of proposals pending. It has funding from the Gates Foundation, Title 2 and Title 1 that currently supports leadership and teacher training. IDEA and PSJA will not hesitate to re-allocate resources to a program that is generating significant student gains. IDEA has strong stakeholder support from individuals, corporations and foundations locally, regionally and nationally.

Weaknesses

NONE

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

IDEA and PSJA have created a project management plan to ensure the activities are completed with a high level of quality and in a timely fashion. The application fully states the responsibilities and qualifications of the key personnel. Their resumes are included in the appendices. There is a timeline and milestones for the first year of the project.

Weaknesses

Although there is no requirement for a timeline and milestones for subsequent years in the life of the grant, with such a massive project, it would seem relevant to include this information.

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 Addressed

Weaknesses

Not Addressed

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Not Addressed

Weaknesses

Not Addressed

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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 Addressed

Weaknesses

Not Addressed

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not Addressed

Weaknesses

Not Addressed

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 6:15 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 10:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100748)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	6
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 06: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100748)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 provides two hypotheses for the proposed project on p. 11 and 13. In addition, the research supporting these hypotheses is provided on p. 11-13.

The combination of the research provided on the specific facets of the proposed intervention, as well as the collaboration of Teach For America and Dr. Noel Tichy, suggest that, if funded, the proposed project likely will meet the goals stated on pp. 9-10 and have a positive impact on student achievement.

Weaknesses

The applicant states on p. 8 that the proposed intervention has not been widely adopted.

The proposal could be strengthened by specifying the expected student achievement results.

Reader's Score: 6

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following

factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the project. The evaluation will use a randomized control trial, with students randomly assigned to teachers participating or not participating in either of the two interventions (p. 17). The sample of teachers assigned to NTI training will be 120 in Year I, and 240 in Years 2 and 3 (n=600). Fifty teachers will receive ILI training for each of the five years of the project, for a total n of 300. Control teachers will be blocked on school, grade, and subject (p. 180). The evaluation will rely on both HLM and survival analysis of teacher turnover and retention (pp. 20-21). The power analysis detailed on p. 21-22 demonstrates that this design is suitable for detecting the likely effects of the intervention.

The methods of evaluation include surveys, focus groups, interviews, and secondary analysis of 24,000 students in two districts (pp. 18-19). These methods will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, as well as permit assessment of progress toward achieving the intended outcomes.

The evaluation will include qualitative data (training observations, site visits, interviews, document reviews, and case studies) to help provide information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development and replication (p. 20).

The evaluation will be led by Viki Young of SRI (p. 23). Xin Wei will be in charge of the quantitative data analysis. Their CVs demonstrate their respective areas of expertise. Rachel Howell and Angela Luck will be in charge of the qualitative research (p. 23). The total evaluation budget is \$1,076,749 and seems sufficient to carry out the evaluation plan.

Weaknesses

No CVs were provide for Howell and Luck, and thus it is difficult to judge whether they have sufficient experience to take the lead on the qualitative evaluations.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted**Last Updated:** 07/23/2010 10:05 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100748)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	6
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	19
TOTAL	25	19

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 06: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: IDEA Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100748)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 describes research-based findings supporting the proposed project on p. 10-11.
On p. 12, the applicant briefly describes improved academic outcomes as a result of implementing one of the proposed components of the planned intervention.

Weaknesses

On p. 12, the description of reported effectiveness produced by implementing a component of the proposed interventions any numerical values, e.g. percentage increase or effect size.
The applicant does not specifically address how the project if funded would elicit a positive effect on student achievement or growth.

Reader's Score: 6

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

On p. 16-17, the applicant proposes quantitative and qualitative methods for the proposed project. The qualitative methodological aspect is appropriate for a development study. Research questions and outcome measures are well defined. Data analyses, including power analysis, are well thought out and described on p. 19-21.

The question of periodic assessment and performance feedback is briefly addressed on p. 21-22.

Sufficient detail in reporting for further work is addressed as the report will follow WWC guidelines (p. 22).

Sufficiency of resources is addressed.

Weaknesses

It is questionable whether the researchers would have complete freedom in randomly assigning students to new vs. old teachers within each school. The method section would have been strengthened if the applicant described how they will assure complete random assignment within each school.

On p. 21-22, the description of periodic assessment and performance feedback lacks detail. It is not clear what kind of data will be presented formatively, to whom, and how "usefulness" of the program will be evaluated based on that data.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:22 PM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 06/23/2010 5:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396C100105)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	3
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	7
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	5
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 02: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396C100105)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The project is modeled on the applicant's successful implementation of their Performance Excellence Model, a national best practice. Goals and objectives indicate that the applicant has engaged in planning that is likely to ensure successful development of the project. Prior successful grant management and a track record of closing the achievement gap between sub-populations of students suggests that the project team is suited to complete this i3 project as described. The project is ambitious and is expected to serve 21,168 students and 1,564 teachers over five years. Dissemination plans, replication potential, and scale-up feasibility of the project are not clearly described.

Note: Strengths and weaknesses comments are numbered according to each selection criterion that is addressed by each comment.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

1. The project is described as based on the applicant's successful implementation of their "Performance Excellence Model" (PEM), "recognized as a national best practice" (p. 2). The Instructional Facilitators structure has resulted in success and increased achievement for regular students, but the applicant states that three of the structures alone are not working well (p. 3). The applicant appears to have the capacity to identify program weaknesses and implement revisions and/or restructuring to increase the efficacy of a project. The refined and restructured integration and "cross-functionality" of the four structures within the strategy framework may be innovative and may have the potential to produce exceptional outcomes (pp. 2-6). The intent of the project is to expand the PEM to ". . . address a largely unmet need with a focus on high-need students" (pp. 2-3).

2. As listed in Table 2 (pp. 7-9), the three project goals and objectives for each goal are clearly defined and measurable by specific assessments or instruments, and include measurable outcomes linked to priorities. The outcomes are ambitious and have potential to be achieved by the end of the grant period.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

1. The applicant has experience with grant project implementation and management, as described in six examples of grant projects within the last eight years (pp. 13-14). The six grant projects appear to encompass components of the proposed i3 project (e.g., Response to Intervention). Based on these projects and an assumption that each is implemented with fidelity and successful management, the applicant is likely to be capable of management of a project of the proposed size and scope.
2. Based on data provided, the applicant appears to have significantly closed the achievement gap for all students and shown significant improvement increasing the graduation rate by 20% in eight years. The majority (98%) of teachers are highly qualified, exceeding state standards (pp. 14-15).

Weaknesses

1. As described, the grant projects selected to support the applicant's experience do not have definitive outcome statements of the interim or final success of each project (pp. 13-14).
2. It is unclear if data is contradictory in the percentage of teachers who are highly qualified (98%) as the applicant states that "Pre-test [state] Teacher Evaluation data . . . show that 49% of teachers were either "accomplished" or "distinguished" . . . post-test data found that 80% of our teachers met these standards" (p. 15). Lacking is an explanation how the latter data correlate to the stated 98% highly qualified.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

1. The project will serve 21,168 students and 1,564 teachers over five years. Existing programs support 34-35 of the project schools (p. 19). The project intent is to expand the capacity of existing programs by restructuring the existing framework and integrating existing programs into one project (p. 19). The school district intends to provide in-kind support with personnel, while commitments have been made by private sector partners to contribute funding or in-kind support if the grant is awarded (pp. 19-20).

2. Based on the applicant's prior experience with the Response to Intervention model, the applicant is confident that the project can be further developed and brought to scale (p. 20).

4. The applicant provides a cost estimate per student of the proposed project and for scale-up (p. 20).

5. A comprehensive dissemination strategy is outlined, including presentations at local and national conferences and use of technology venues, such as SKYPE conferencing and web portals (p. 21).

Weaknesses

2. Not evident is a clearly defined explanation of the outcomes from the applicant's presentation of ". . . key components in 13 states . . ." (e.g., what components were presented to what audiences) (p. 20).
3. The feasibility of replication of the entire project, rather than individual components (e.g., RtI) is not clearly explained (p. 20). Although the applicant states that the project can be replicated in diverse communities and settings, on what that premise is based is not explained.
5. The dissemination plan lacks details about the extent and frequency of activities and whether or not the applicant intends to assess the outcomes of the activities in supporting further development or replication within the applicant's state and/or nationwide (p. 21).

Reader's Score: 3

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.**
- (2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.**

Strengths

1. The project is anticipated to be continued through districtwide absorption of costs and continued volunteer tutors. Based on previous experience with similar size and scope projects, the applicant anticipates the project will be sustained beyond the grant period. The maximization and restructuring of resource use is expected to support sustainability (p. 21-22).
2. A number of the components of the project are already in place and operational. The project model is a restructuring of the components with additional resources to increase the efficacy of a cohesive project, rather than continue to implement individual structures. The applicant intends to plan for sustainability throughout the grant project through a 5-step process to periodically assess the project progress and feasibility (p. 22).

Weaknesses

1. Although the applicant states that ongoing costs will be embedded in the school district improvement plans, it is unclear how the district will "absorb costs" beyond the grant period (p. 22). The ambitious project, of which many components are already in place and operational, may require resources and funding that the district is unable to absorb. A realistic and feasible contingency plan is not described.

2. Detailed, explicit steps to assess project sustainability and refine or revise the project throughout the grant period are not evident. The applicant provides an outline of a 5-step process for sustainability of the project; however, the steps are somewhat generic. For example, a specific procedure of how the applicant intends to "take inventory" of current status and progress of the project is not included (p. 22).

Reader's Score: 7

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

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

Strengths

1. Table 7 highlights project milestones during three key time periods and includes the key person(s) responsible for each project task (pp. 23-24).

2. Based on the Narrative descriptions and resumes of existing key personnel, the project team appears to be highly qualified to implement and complete the project (p. 25; Appendix C). Job descriptions for personnel to be hired are included. The existing key personnel bring a broad range of experience and expertise to the project that is likely to ensure successful outcomes during and at the end of the five year grant period and within budget.

Weaknesses

1. The management plan is broad and does not include specific information

on the project milestones (pp. 23-24). For example, "Design integrated work of four support structures" (p. 23) does not define or explain what that means or how the milestone is determined (e.g., completion of an integrated work plan by grade level or teacher needs specifying the extent of cross-functionality of the four support structures).

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority is not addressed

Weaknesses

Priority is not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Priority is not addressed

Weaknesses

Priority is not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

As described, the project intends to implement a multi-faceted approach to improve the academic outcomes of LEP students, close the achievement gap between regular and special education students, and increase college and career readiness of all students, including special needs and LEP. It appears that the plan will be to align and integrate the implementation of the four key strategies that form the foundation of the grant project to improve teacher quality and thus, improve the achievement of special needs and LEP students.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority is not addressed

Weaknesses

Priority is not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/23/2010 5:57 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/26/2010 3:27 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396C100105)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	7
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 02: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396C100105)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

One of the strengths that the applicant addresses is the blending of the four components (instructional facilitators, instructional technology, response to intervention, and exceptional children) and providing cross-functionality of the support structure to increase teacher effectiveness and improve the academic achievement of their high-need students.

The 3 tiers of increasing intensity is another strength. By starting with the

least aggressive and only increasing the intensity of the interventions when needed, allows a better use of resources (time and people).

The district has not adopted the model and currently only one of the four components of the model (instructional facilitators) is working to support the teachers, hence 50% of students referred for services not being eligible. The need for the screening and interventions are clear and the proposal makes that need well known.

The project has a clear set of goals and objectives and a plan to achieve the goals and objectives. (page 7 and 8 of 25)

The evaluation system (page 6 of 25) allows the applicant to monitor and track the effectiveness of the teachers and the plan by using a rubric in conjunction with the present state model of evaluation.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment,**

or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

One strength of the applicant is the fact that in the past the applicant has successfully implemented projects similar in size and scope of the requested grant. (page 13)

The applicant provides data to substantiate the claims stated.

The applicant demonstrated their ability to significantly close achievement gaps in 2008-2009 by at least 10% in Reading and Math for all students. In 2002 the applicant district ranked 75th lowest in end of grade reading, but increased to the top 20 in the state. Additionally, the applicant is able to show a decrease in the dropout rate, and increase in attendance, and an increase in the number of teachers that are hold national board certification. Page 14 Table 4

Weaknesses

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant proposes to serve 35 schools, over 21,000 students, and more than 1,500 teachers. The applicant demonstrates that the plan calls to expand the number of instructional facilitators and exceptional children specialist to reach all students as planned.

The applicants current situation serves as a strength because it indicates that the applicant will be able to utilize their existing infrastructure and current personnel to achieve their goals. Their prior experience managing similar projects is further strengthened by several coordinators, a EC director, an associate superintendent of instruction and the director of the leadership academy. Also, the applicant has committed matching funds and in-kind donations from several sources.

The applicants proposal to partner with the NC Department of Public Instruction garners the ability to replicate their idea throughout the state. Using the RTI model further adds to their credibility as the research shows that it is widely accepted impacts student success positively.

The applicant estimates the average cost per student for program implementation is \$237 million and that calculates to \$23.7 million for 100,000 students, \$59.2 million for 250,000 students and \$118.5 million for 500,000 students.

Weaknesses

The application does not provide a detailed outline about the dissemination of information nor the frequency or replication.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers'

unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

One of the applicants strengths are the current resources and support that contribute to the potential sustainability including an executive cabinet that supported pursuing the grant and committed to sustaining the plan long term; a task force of leaders that will continue to develop the sustainability plan; on-going skill-embedded training; and the four core support structures. Additionally, the State Education Agency will support the proposal as well.

Another strength is the applicants four prong approach to the planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work by answering the questions of 1. Where We Are, 2. Where are we going, 3. How will we get there, and 4. a written plan that details the strategies and implementation phases to achieve sustainability.

Weaknesses

The application is unclear how the district will absorb the cost of sustaining the plan beyond the grant period. It also lacks detailed, explicit steps. The process is too vague to be reliable. There is no timeline for sustaining the plan either.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Page 23, Table 7 outlines the applicants management plan with three phases, spanning five years, including the persons responsible for implementing and

monitoring the program. The goals and measurable outcomes are clearly defined along with the timeline for implementing each phase. It appears that the plan outlined is strong as each aspect has a specific person or team of persons responsible for overseeing the implementation and completion. The training and experience of the key personnel demonstrate the ability to create, implement, and maintain an effective plan of action. The applicant included very specific job descriptions for each of the key personnel that work directly with the proposal. Additionally, they have specified a position for an Accountability Coordinator and an Independent Program Evaluator (see Appendix C).

Weaknesses

The management plan is too broad and lacking in specificity. It needs to define the milestones. (Page 23-24)

Reader's Score: 7

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 addressed

Weaknesses

Not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The applicant adequately addresses the two groups, students with disabilities and the LEP population, by utilizing researched based strategies including Response to Intervention and Professional Learning Communities. The narrative clearly outlines the plan to provide support to teachers and students

through inclusive models, collaboration and coordinating the IEPs of the students with disabilities. Also, their previous work shows that they are prepared and equipped to continue closing the achievement gap and increase the number of students graduating in both sub-groups.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority not addressed

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 3:27 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 2:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396C100105)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	5
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 02: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396C100105)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Grant is well written and well organized.
It is specific and detailed.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

This grant is based on research-based strategies that will support teachers and principals and incorporate e1 response to Intervention and Professional

Learning Communities which will improve the academic achievement of students with disabilities and English language learners. Teachers will incorporate special education interventions into the regular classroom. Extensive evaluation and research is reported in page e3 is ongoing to meet the needs of the students, it incorporates rubric, observations, with inner-rated reliability and teacher evaluations, e5. Students are supported using Response to Intervention. The district has experience with grants of this size. They will support new staff after the grant is over e22.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The district implementation of Performance Model earned the National

Institute of Standards and Technology award in 2008. Page e11, a main component of this model is raising achievement and closing gaps.

Iredell-Statesville has improved graduation rate of LEP by 29% and with students with disabilities by 19% as reported in page e1.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Eligible and qualified personnel are already working to implement the grant. Additional staff, if needed, will be incorporated into the district after the grant ends.

The grant will serve 35 schools, 21,168 students and 1,564 teachers.

The cost to reach 100,000 students would be \$23.7 million,

250,000, students would cost \$59.2 million,

and to reach 500,000 it would be \$118.5 million.

The project will be presented at conferences and other venues across the nation.

The district has made considerable effort to meet the needs of its diverse population and in particular those with disabilities and English language learners. Numerous grants and awards e13 have helped Iredell-Statesville outperform other districts in the state.

Weaknesses

The dissemination process although mentioned is not detailed.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

There is evidence of partners support to meet the demands of the implementation e20.

There are different phases to implement the program.

Weaknesses

It is not specified how the program will continue to be implemented after the grant ends. However, it was mentioned the staff will be incorporated into the

district.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan is organized in different phases which outline the milestones and shared responsibilities. The personnel identified are qualified.

The management plan incorporates responsibilities and milestones.

Weaknesses

The evaluation group needs to be described beyond the years of experience, and in relation as to how they are going to conduct the evaluation or what method they will use.

It is not clear in the application, who is responsible for each of the objectives and phases of the program.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Applicant did not address

Weaknesses

Applicant did not address

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Applicant did not address

Weaknesses

Applicant did not address

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

This grant was written with this priority in mind. Meeting the unique needs of Limited English Proficient students and of students with disabilities are the major goals of this grant. This innovative research-based plan will implement numerous strategies such as Professional Learning Communities, and Response to Intervention to improve the academic achievement of these students.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Applicant did not address

Weaknesses

Applicant did not address

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 2:48 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/24/2010 3:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396D100105)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	22
TOTAL	25	22

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396D100105)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

This proposal will coordinate two key educational strategies, RTI and PLC, by building an interconnected, well-staffed, support system to improve teacher quality. The research that is cited on RTI and PLC is current. The researchers involved in the cited studies are well-known and respected for their contributions to the field on teacher professional development and school change (e.g., Darling-Hammond, Marzano, Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University).

Over the past several years, the district has focused on improvement through the implementation of various research-based professional development and instructional support models such as the Performance Excellence Model (2003), Smaller Learning Communities(2002), Professional Learning Communities(2005) and RTI(2009). The quality of implementation of the Performance Excellence Model is verified by the district's receipt of the Baldrige National Quality Award.

Each of these models was implemented with extensive planning by providing training, practice, and coaching. At the same time, positive changes in key indicators (percent proficient, reducing achievement gap) were noted. The changes are hypothesized to be related to the implemented models. Given the research showing the positive relationship between teacher quality and student achievement, it is likely that their hypothesis is highly probable.

The implementation of the proposed combined models and support structure is expected to strengthen the positive impact on teachers and students in the district. Given the small to medium size of the district (21,000 students) and the relatively small proportions of ELLs (6%), students with disabilities (11%), and students with low SES, the likelihood of success for the targeted, high-needs students is high.

Weaknesses

None Noted

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

The evaluation design includes both qualitative and quantitative data collection that will be triangulated to provide depth of understanding for interpretation and recommendations. The metrics include standardized test scores for reading, math, and End of Course assessments over time. The set of qualitative instruments is comprehensive, including interviews, focus groups, open-ended survey questions, observations and meeting minutes. The first two of the three research questions posited are process-oriented and explicitly target fidelity of implementation and the documentation of such. The data will serve to springboard discussions of challenges and support decision-making for mid-course corrections.

The plan for data collection includes multiple administrations of various instruments over time. The quarterly meetings and user-friendly reports will facilitate discussion of program process across stakeholders.

There is a comprehensive description of the ways in which the project will be documented to produce guidelines for future replication. In addition, the roles and responsibilities of the four support structures, job descriptions of the key project staff and the characteristics of the sample will be documented and revised as needed.

Weaknesses

Graduation and drop out rates need to be operationally defined prior to data collection. The use of standardized definitions will be helpful for future program replication.

The use of a Fidelity Index will coordinate the wealth of qualitative information collected. A more detailed description of the source of the instrument or how it will be developed and validated is needed.

Although measureable goals are established for student achievement, the analyses to be applied are unclear. Page 17 indicates that "data from quantitative sources will be analyzed using descriptive statistics" and "effect sizes will be computed between groups" In the next sentence, quantitative data are described as the "Fidelity Index, surveys, administrative records, EVAAS, teacher evaluations, and growth plans." Analyzing "between groups" implies two groups but there is no discussion of group assignment to indicate the presence of a control. T-tests and chi-squares are cited as procedures to be used. These statistics are typically less robust than analyses such as Analysis of Variance and may not be the best to expose the effect. It will be important to consider the unexplained variance due to the interdependence of the variables within a survey, for example.

Since there will be a staggered implementation of the pilot schools, the inclusion of comparison groups would be possible and would add to the value of the design.

Although the evaluator costs are sufficient for year one, the costs may need to increase as the number of participating schools increase. The number of evaluator hours estimated is low at 50 hours per month given the volume of qualitative data collection included in the plan.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2010 3:38 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396D100105)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	11
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Iredell-Statesville Schools -- , - , (U396D100105)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

STRENGTHS: The proposal responds to Absolute Priority One and provides previous findings on the COMPASS research which is based on the What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards which is the gold standard for educational research. The proposed model extends previous research by including professional development coaching (p.12). It integrates the Plan-Do-Study-Act framework to include data based decisions to promote project fidelity and potential for outcome achievement. The proposal includes a logic model which clearly delineates the theory of change and aligns with the goals, objectives and outcomes described on page 7. The project hypothesis is presented on page 10 and is supported by professional development research, performance-based teacher evaluation, response to intervention research and professional learning community's research results (p.10-11). Previous project attempts that demonstrate promising results are highlighted with the Performance Excellence Model, and the individual effect sizes of each of the proposed project components in Table 3 (p.12) warrant more formal study so project effectiveness can be verified. The extension of the research with a more systematic design has the potential for determining the impact on student achievement that the current research infers. The proposal recognizes the potential barriers to implementing professional development and proposes to integrate solutions to these barriers in the project if funded (p.12) which should strengthen the evidence and increase the likelihood for success.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: The four tenets of the model's relevant research are described thoroughly on pages 10-11 to support the project, but narrative that ties up the four pillars and directly links them to the potential for replicable success in the proposed project is needed. Perhaps the applicant should add two to three sentences on page 11 that summarizes and highlights what is known in the research and how it will be used together to develop the proposed model.

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

STRENGTHS: The proposal discusses the logic model to support the hypothesis and align the project activities. Three evaluation questions (p.16) align the evaluation plan with the hypotheses. Both process and outcome evaluation components are discussed. A mixed methods approach will be used to collect data to test the hypothesis and address the evaluation questions (p.16) which will support documentation of the key project components to further facilitate development and testing. The methods for data collection, analysis and reporting are described on page 17 as are the measurement tools, some of which are standardized and well respected in educational research such as EVAAS. Quarterly meetings to discuss evaluation findings and continuous quality improvement feedback loops are built into the evaluation model. The Fidelity Index will be used to provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach so the project components can be further developed and tested in other settings. The

evaluation will include the use of web-based data collection methods to increase the efficiency of data collection. The evaluation is funded at 10% of the project budget which appears to be sufficient for the size and scope of the evaluation plan as described. The job descriptions provide the roles and responsibilities of the project staff and how they will work with the evaluation team (Appendix C) which appear to be sufficient for data collection, analysis and reporting to support implementation and determine project effectiveness.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: Much of the evaluator's experience is in social work and not in education as evidenced in the resume on page 7-9 of Appendix C. The evaluation appears to be based on a one group pre/post test model which is not a very strong model to determine project effectiveness. The proposal would be improved by including a comparison group with which the group receiving the intervention will be compared on the quantitative measures. It would also be possible to use the baseline data collected to compare growth with a time series or regression discontinuity design which would strengthen the evaluation model. Much more discussion is needed regarding the research design for the evaluation. In particular, on page 17 it is stated that effect sizes will be computed between groups but the groups are not defined. Likewise, although the quantitative measures are listed, the psychometric properties of the measures are not discussed. It is therefore difficult to determine the validity and reliability of the instrumentation and which will impact the generalizability of project.

Reader's Score: 11

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High
Schools (U396C100380)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 62: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -- Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools (U396C100380)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>The applicant demonstrates a need for the project and presents an comprehensive approach to working with high needs students. The strategy of utilizing trimesters is a unique strategy that has not been widely</p>

adopted. The goals and objectives are clear, specific, and measurable.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant has demonstrated success with the program proposed on a limited basis in their school district. The applicant has closed the achievement gap utilizing the trimester program in some of the districts' schools.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant has the capacity to develop the project. The program can be replicated in other districts with other student populations. The applicant is partnering with Education Northwest to produce a formal guide on program results.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary

considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant is currently utilizing the major components of the program in high schools throughout the district. The applicant has formed strategic partnerships with colleges, business and community groups, and other stakeholders to ensure that the project continues after the grant period.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 developed a management plan with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones. The management personnel selected are qualified to handle the proposed project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 applicable

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 had developed a program that will assist students in preparing for college. The program also provides support to students from knowledgeable adults.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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 applicable

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or

improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

not applicable

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:28 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 8:56 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High
Schools (U396C100380)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	66

Technical Review Form

Development 62: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -- Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools (U396C100380)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Making Time for What Matters Most. The project is aimed at 6 high schools and includes four goals: improve achievement and close achievement gaps, decrease drop-out rates and increase graduation rates, increase college readiness and access, and improve teacher and school leader effectiveness. This is proposed to be accomplished through increased learning time, increased time for personalized student support, and increased time for teacher learning to improve instruction.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit

strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The program proposes to add at least 67 hours of "learning time" annually, specifically to address the needs of struggling learners, in six district high schools. This will be coupled with additional learning time through double periods for those students who need a deeper immersion type intervention, effectively increasing instructional time each day to 140 or even 210 minutes in a single subject.

The project includes research based effective practices including a weekly 55 minute period which will consist of focused college access curricula, delivered by an adult who will stay with each group throughout their high school careers. This program will also include focused time for teacher learning and collaboration, cross disciplinary learning teams that will meet each week to discuss the personalized learning needs of each.

Weaknesses

Increasing student contact time is a research-based effective practice when coupled with high levels of teacher content knowledge and expertise in high quality instructional practices during that extended time. The measurement proposed for teacher content knowledge lacks an objective measure, instead relying on "teacher perceptions of self efficacy." (p. 5)

Methods whereby students would be selected for the additional 70 or 140 minutes periods (in addition to the existing 70 minute period) for students needed extra assistance are not described in sufficient detail to determine if they are linked to the priorities.

Reader's Score: 20

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The proposal cites student achievement in two high schools to demonstrate how it has significantly closed achievement gaps and increased graduation of its students. At one school overall reading scores have increased 26% in two years and 10% in mathematics. Students in poverty closed the achievement gap in reading (23%) and math (8%). At Shawnee the gaps in reading scores between blacks and whites in the last year have been reduced by 12.2%.

Graduation rates at both Western (9%) and Academy@ Shawnee (6%) have increased.

The applicant clearly described projects of similar size and scope undertaken and the positive results that emerged from those projects (see Section E).

Weaknesses

In its statistics showing overall increases in student achievement at Western High School, there was no closure of the achievement gap between blacks and whites in reading and only a 3.1% (not percentage point) closure in mathematics. There is also little of no closure in mathematics performance between blacks and whites in the last year at Shawnee. No data was provided for the other four high schools.

Reader's Score: 20

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The application provided clear evidence that it has the capacity to take large academic projects to scale through its examples of previous and current work, including Every 1 Reads, and Developing Futures in Math.

The project plan calls for the production of a "formal guide" and "user guides" in best uses of increased learning time that will be carried out by project partner Education Northwest.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.**
- (2) 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 documents the district's ability to garner public and private support of its academic programs through entrepreneurial fund-raising.

The project plan places two district cabinet members as project leads, creates a leadership team at each school, and has a communication plan in place to share results and practices with principals, resource teachers and curriculum directors. The application states, "The goals, strategies, and programs described herein are not dependent on continued funding from external sources, but rather are incorporated [into] the on-going improvement plans of JCPS." p. 23

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (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.

(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 management plan is clear and detailed, describing activities, timelines, and who will be responsible for each step.

The qualifications of the project director and key personnel are well matched to the project activities.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 CAT program with 55 minutes per week devoted to post secondary success directly addresses this criterion.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 8:56 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:51 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High
Schools (U396C100380)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	75

Technical Review Form

Development 62: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -- Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools (U396C100380)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Directly linked to Absolutely Priority 4(b), the application targets six persistently low-performing high schools for demonstrating the effectiveness

of switching to a five-period trimester school year, adding 30% more learning time for struggling students and increasing time for electives and advanced classes. The project also includes a rapid employment of prototyping for continuous improvement, such as to the extent that core curriculum better aligns with the state's common core standards. For example, five 70-minute courses per day for each of the three 12-week trimesters are now allowing its students to earn more credits in four years (30 vs. 24). Additionally, four other strategies will add at least 67 hours of learning time in the school year. (Pages 1, 2, 6)

The project's three overarching goals are clearly stated; e.g., provide structures and supports for student mastery of core courses in year one; provide a range of personalized supports to students to increase college readiness; and improve teachers' pedagogical and student support practices. Large qualitative objectives range from increased monitoring of student intervention with rapid engagement of supports, such as immersion courses or peer-to-peer support, to enhance teacher knowledge and attention to students with unique challenges. The trimester also makes time for a weekly 55-minute College Access Time (CAT) period where 20 students are paired with a supportive adult who stays with them across four years of high school; as well afterschool CAT classes and summer institutes. (Pages 2-7)

This project is somewhat unique in its collective group of approaches in a 3x5 trimester plan, with accompanying components. This project pulls from best practice models, such as the reportedly successful Talent Development High Schools and First Things First high school reform that integrating advisors as advocates and involve parents in academic goal setting, for example. (Pages 10-13)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant demonstrates that it has experienced success in significantly increase student academic achievement. The applicant adequately discusses challenges, such as its operation of two Title I schools classed as NCLB in need of improvement tier 5-2, where 82% of students are eligible for free or reduced price lunch program. By implementing whole school reform, the recruiting and retaining of qualified teachers is 92.2% and 98.7%. In two years, overall reading scores have increased by 25.5% while math scores have increased by 10% with slightly higher gains made by African American students. Over the last three years, graduation rates have risen 9%.(Pages 12-13)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further

developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant clearly states that 5,800 students will be reached by this more comprehensive approach. The applicant demonstrates significant capacity to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period, as made evident by its implementation of other large-scale projects, e.g., Every 1 Reads, an \$8 million effort engaging 10,000 trained volunteers in tutoring and mentoring students and reducing the percent of struggling readers from 18% to 9% over the past four years. The applicant has also successfully managed a \$25 million Developing Futures in Education grant from the GE Foundation (2005) with an additional \$10.5 million granted by the Foundation for the next three years to further develop the math and science initiative. Added proof of capacity includes more than \$93 million in grants and contracts, along with partnerships with more than 600 organizations, businesses, corporations and foundations. (Pages 21-22)

The applicant clearly states that the cost the proposed project (including anticipated cost-share and \$1 million for evaluation and technical assistance) is nearly \$6 million. Therefore, it is suggested that replication in six similar schools would cost approximately \$5.2 million, with some economies of scale for larger districts. The estimated costs to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students are \$23.7 million, \$59.2 million, and \$118.5 million respectively.(Page 23)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant absolutely demonstrates it has a history of garnering external resources to continue promising practices and model initiatives after project grant funding expires. Additionally, the District is a member of a collaborative Joint Commitment to Educational Attainment wherein area post-secondary institutions, businesses, a myriad of organizations and the Mayor's Office have pledged to work together to increase the number of college graduates by 40,000 by 2020 in Jefferson County. With two district Cabinet members leading the project and similar engagement at each school, it is likely that the infrastructure will be adequate to integrate the practices into ongoing operations. The project is replicable district-wide and across Kentucky as suggested.(Pages 23-25)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 thoroughly demonstrates that the very qualified Executive Director for their internal research and development arm (Mr. Camins) will commit .25 FTE of his time to serve as Project Director in coordination with Mr. Burks, another Cabinet member. Camins has led numerous National Science Foundation grants and other major initiatives. Other key positions and functions include a College Access Time Coordinator, Master Scheduler, Counselor, and Team Members at each school. The applicant will utilize the services of a qualified external evaluator, also named in the proposal. (Pages 25-28)

Weaknesses

The applicant provides a general timeline; however, it does not include measures or sufficient milestones to demonstrate objectives that can be achieved on time and within budget. (Pages 27-28)

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 requested

Weaknesses

Not requested

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 requests Competitive Priority 6. This is appropriate as College Access Time is a critical component of this initiative. Long-term mentors are matched with students, along with peer-to-peer support, for the purposes of college readiness and admission.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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 requested

Weaknesses

Not requested

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

not requested

Weaknesses

not requested

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:51 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High
Schools (U396D100380)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	8
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
TOTAL	25	18

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 01: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools
-- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High
Schools (U396D100380)

**1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10
Points)**

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

STRENGTHS:

Three research questions are identified by the applicant. These include looking at the amount of time that successful students need for remediation and accelerated learning activities; How do successful students become engaged, challenged, and affiliated; How do effective teachers use time to collaborate, and to improve teaching practice.

The applicant demonstrates how they have implemented some of these concepts and practices already and provides recent evaluations, references and research conclusions to document the success. (pp 7-9)

Additional rigorous research and references are provided to help document why these practices were included. Many of the items are from well known authors, and researchers and appear in well-respected peer-refereed journals.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES:

The only topic missing from discussion that would have helped to strengthen this proposal is Communities of Practice , or Professional Learning Communities which are both allowing teachers the time and opportunity and professional development to collaborate and build their team relationships. There is a wealth of research and information explaining and defining and demonstrating the effectiveness of this practice on student achievement and advancement.

Reader's Score: 8

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

STRENGTHS:

The applicant proposes specific measurable and observable goals, objectives, and outcomes as a result of their identified needs. (p 4) An external evaluator is identified. Identified staff are well qualified to conduct an evaluation of this magnitude.

Specific research questions are proposed to be studied. (p 16) The applicant identifies that they will conduct an experimental study using multiple methodologies. The applicant includes a table of data to be collected , when

and how is identified.

A detailed outcome evaluation is included with specific ways that conclusions will be determined. Continuous and ongoing discussion are included between the evaluator and project staff. Evaluation activities are included on the management timeline plan.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES:

The applicant states that they have an IRB review board, but does not provide any details about any of the required assurances and refers the reader to some other documents. It is unclear how or what required human rights and individual assurances the applicant will provide.

The budget only identifies about 4% to be allocated to the entire evaluation. This may not be enough resources in order to conduct the longitudinal and multiple data collection throughout the life of the project.

The three components of their project: Academic Acceleration, College Access Time and Teacher Professional Growth. Do not easily lend themselves to the targeted audience or the overall proposal to turn around six persistently low-performing HS.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:44 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:03 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High
Schools (U396D100380)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	19
TOTAL	25	19

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 01: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools
-- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High
Schools (U396D100380)

**1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10
Points)**

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

One strength of the proposal is the literature review outlining existing research. The JCPS team effectively provided an overview of the research pertaining to their three priorities for restructuring the area high schools.

A second strength is that JCPS is currently implementing the proposed approach (i.e., trimesters with emphasis on core academics, individual attention through CATs, and professional development and PLCs) and has evaluated those efforts. As a result, JCPS already knows that their approach works in their community and has documented gains made by students, especially African American students. As a result, JCPS staff have realistic expectations about expanding their efforts and realistic expectations of student performance.

Weaknesses

Although the literature review was a good overview, one weakness was that little detailed information was provided. For example, the authors state that "schools that serve large concentrations of poor students were able to obtain

achievement gains" (see pg. 11) but it is unclear under which academic domains those gains occurred - reading, math, science, etc.

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

For the outcome study JCPS proposes use of a comparison group that has been matched to the treatment group using propensity scores. Use of propensity scores is recognized by evaluators and research scientists as an effective and appropriate method of matching participants for a quasi-experimental design.

A strength is that the evaluation incorporates both process (e.g., documenting the implementation of the problem based learning approach) and outcomes findings which will provide information on both what happened (i.e., process) and the impact (outcomes) of a JCPS's program.

Another strength is the inclusion of multiple methodologies across multiple stakeholders. Because the evaluation does not rely on data from only one assessment instrument or one stakeholder group, it is likely that the evaluation will capture important information about the impact of JCPS's program.

Weaknesses

One weakness is that the proposal did not clarify the source of the comparison group schools/students. It is unclear if JCPS will match schools and students within the district or seek other sources for the comparison group. Because the source of the comparison group students is not known, the appropriateness of the comparison group for this study cannot be determined (even though propensity score matching will be used).

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:03 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 62: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposal presents unique and innovative ideas for redesigning persistently low performing schools.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The LEA clearly demonstrates that it has made significant progress in improving academic achievement and decreasing the dropout rate. The applicant has experience in implementing projects of the proposed size and scope.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant has the capacity and the partnerships needed to develop the proposed project. The project can be replicated in a variety of settings with a variety of students. The applicant demonstrates that they have the resources and qualified personnel to develop and implement this project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers'

unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant clearly has the financial resources and partnerships needed to operate the program beyond the grant period.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 a comprehensive management plan with clearly defined goals, milestones and timelines included in the grant.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

The applicant outlines innovative strategies designed to enhance educational outcomes for high needs students in the early grades.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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's innovative practices provides innovative practices to support college readiness.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The applicant's strategies focus on meeting the needs of limited English proficient students.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

not applicable

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:28 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 8:56 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 62: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant, along with its "official partners" UNITE-LA, United Way of Greater Los Angeles and the USC Rossier School of Education, proposes to enhance and embed a transparent, systematic and sustainable turn-around process for chronically low achieving schools. In this project, operations and instructional plans from internal and external groups will compete to operate both the lowest performing "focus" schools and new "relief schools" designed to ease overcrowding in low- performing schools.

The three goals of the project are to enhance the public schools' choice selection process, support the implementation of the instructional plans of the selected providers, and to implement accountability and continuous improvement measures.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to

the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The application proposes an innovative program to address persistently low performing schools through solicitation of entrepreneurs to take on the LAUSD's most challenging schools. Members of the LA Compact, led by United Way and LAUSD will work to increase the number of applicants for each focus and relief school. It is anticipated that these applicants may include existing school personnel, organized labor, non-profits, and charter associations.

A carefully planned communication plan from outreach, pre-application support, and training in effective practices in turning around low-performing schools is described. Consultants and coaches will be made available to assist applicants during the development stage of the process.

LAUSD will also assist applicants in revising and implementing their instructional plans and applications, to start or restart their schools, and link selected applicants with additional resources. The LAUSD proposal contains a full and detailed list of these support activities.

LAUSD describes a two tiered accountability system which will hold the focus and relief school operators accountable for improved student performance, and LAUSD accountable for providing tiers of support to those schools to ensure they have the opportunity and supports to succeed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the

size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

LAUSD provides evidence of a number of partnership projects of similar size and scope.

Examples of student performance at both focus and growth schools was included in the proposal. The first round of the Public School Choice Resolution took place December 2009 to February 2010, too late to affect achievement data for the 2009-10 school year. However, overall, LAUSD raised its API scored by 11% in 2009, and met the AYP graduation criteria.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the

proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The project seeks to serve 60,000 students during the grant period and during scale-up another 300,000 students.

Members of the LA Compact have committed to assist LAUSD in its described project activities. UTLA and AALA, the largest education related labor organizations in LA County, have provided support and expertise in the first cohort and along with the project partners and other non-profits, have begun a concerted campaign to secure private funding and additional commitments.

The California Charter School Association will also work with LAUSD on this project and have committed to providing resources to the effort.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 LA Compact is the identified vehicle through which the applicant proposes to sustain the improvements achieved as a result of this project.

This project enjoys high levels of support as evidenced by letters from, among others, United Teachers of Los Angeles, California Institutions of Higher Education, City of Los Angeles, LAUSD Board of Education and Superintendent, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, American Federal of Teachers, the Governor of the State of California, and the LA Educational Research Consortium.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Project milestons, the role of each partner, and specific activities are well described.

Weaknesses

The work plan lacks data about who will be responsible for each milestone.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

More detail would be required in the application in order to determine the degree to which the requirements in this section were met.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

This criterion was not addressed in the application.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

While this may certainly be part of the plan, more detail would be required in the application order to determine the degree to which the requirements in this section were met.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 8:56 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

TOTAL 80

75

Technical Review Form

Development 62: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>Project need is apparent. The Los Angeles Unified School District (lead applicant) is the second largest district in the U.S., with 675,000 students attending 658 public and charter schools, with 322,000 of these students attending one of the more than 260 elementary, middle and high schools in</p>

Program Improvement 3+ status (2009). Over 81% of students qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program; over 90% percent are non-White; nearly 41% are English language learners; and approximately 11 percent have special needs. Only 52% of students graduate on time; however, graduation rates increased from 66.0 in 2008 to 71.1 in 2009. (Page 2, Appendix H)

The application is based on the hypothesis that, through a bold competition among operators of turn-around schools, a portfolio of innovative schools will be created, supported and sustained, to better respond to the needs of the local community and systemically turn around low achieving schools. In August 2009, a smaller scale competition met with success as the 260 lowest performing schools solicited plans from internal educator-led teams, management organizations, external nonprofit agencies and charter school operators. Subsequently a resolution was presented to and adopted by the LAUSD School Board, thus paving the way for this initiative. (Pages 3-5; Exhibits 4, 5, Appendix H)

The applicant ties directly to Absolute Priority 4 as an exceptional innovation to turn around persistently low-performing schools (three or more years). It may go beyond whole school reform efforts, including public school choice, in its specific focus and plans to ensure turn around, support, and sustain student learning and achievement. The applicant asserts that this plan differs from similar reforms in Boston, Chicago, New Orleans, New York, and Washington, D.C. It differs in the degree of parental and community involvement in selecting schools and collaboratively shaping who will operate the schools and in what manner (instructional models, etc.); as well as the tangible work done through the influence of the broad and diverse L.A. Compact (18 major institutions with experts and the will to engage parents, teachers, bargaining units, organized labor, nonprofit organizations, administrators, and private businesses. and access to other stakeholders, including families). (Pages 4-9, Exhibit 6, Appendix H)

Accountability and transparency are integral to the three-year initiative to turn around chronic academic underperformance. Clearly stated and well-discussed goals include (a) Enhance the Public School Choice Selection Process - with new supports; (b) Support the Implementation of Instructional Plans of Selected Teams - as overseen by the applicant's Innovations and Charters Division; and (3) Implement Accountability and Continuous Improvement Measures - creating two parallel oversight systems; top review school choice processes and to implement a new performance management framework applied to all schools in the district. (Pages 7-10, Exhibit 6, Appendix H)

The applicant provides extensive data and information in Appendix H,

including a tool for annual data collection and tracking of key initiative activities which clearly demonstrate a high degree of planning and forethought (Exhibit 10). A well-planned timeline of goals and activities (Exhibit 11) demonstrates when and how measurable objectives, linked to the Priority, will be achieved.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant presents multiple examples of other successful initiative and efforts which have resulted in significant improvements. In 2009, the applicant raised its API scores by 11% while six Title 1 schools exited Program Improvement status, and 48 made AYP, thus will be exiting that status if targets are again met in 2010. On the other end of the spectrum, 27 schools have been honored as 2010 California Distinguished Schools by the

Department of Education. (Page 17)

The applicant states that the L.A. Compact document with goals, strategies and specific measures to allow the community-at-large to track progress, etc. is modeled after a Boston Compact to pool resources. Signed 30 years ago, the Compact has produced notable outcomes, such as increasing college attendance rates from 50% in 1985 to 78% in 2007. (Page 15; Exhibit A, Appendix H)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

During the grant period, as many as 36 low performing focus schools (8-12 each year) and 30 new relief schools will go through the public choice process impacting 60,000 students. Eventually, 260 persistently low-performing schools or 300,000 students will be affected. By the end of the third year, the applicant anticipates that the independent assessment will produce a roadmap for other school districts to use in their transformation efforts. (Page 24)

There is broad-based support to develop and take to scale the school improvement initiative. All 18 member organizations of the L.A. Compact, including two education labor-related organizations, the United Way, the Chamber of Commerce and others, have committed in writing that they are fully committed to further development and scaling, including prevention-oriented strategies before schools reach Program Improvement year 3 status. Additional commitments have been made by the Walton Foundation and the Wasserman Foundation; and past support from the Ford Foundation and the California Community Foundation adds credibility. (Pages 23-24)

It is strength of the application that the cost per child for this three-year, \$6 million, highly replicable initiative, is only \$100 each. The approximated cost to reach 100,000; 250,000; and 500,000 students is \$9.4 million; \$23.5 million; and \$47 million respectively. (Page 25)

Weaknesses

The applicant does not sufficiently address in its narrative the mechanisms to be used for broadly disseminating information on its entire project so as to support further development or replication in other communities and states, including but not limited to educators. (Page 25)

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

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

Strengths

(1) The applicant makes an adequate case for stakeholder support as will be provided by the L.A. Compact for the purpose of sustaining improvements and systemic reforms. For example, the applicant states that key representatives, including the Mayor, will continue to meet as the L.A. Compact Development Strategy Work Team, responsible for coordinating individual organization fundraising plans, grant development, and leveraging opportunities. (Pages 25-26)

Weaknesses

The applicant does not sufficiently address planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities or benefets into the ongoing work of the school district itself.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

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

Strengths

The applicant presents an adequate management plan, including the building of necessary internal infrastructure and overall capacity of the district, while gathering external support and engaging the community. A well-defined timeline of key activities, roles and responsibilities is included as Exhibit 11. (Pages 26-29; Appendix H)

The applicant clarifies the reporting and support structures, with Mr. Cortines, District Superintendent of Schools, leading the effort. He will be supported by Mr. Hill who manages strategic initiatives and will serve as the liaison with Compact partners. (Pages 26-27; Resumes)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

This innovative competition includes developing plans on how each school will address early learning and integrate early childhood education in their overall instructional plans, such as through collaboration with community providers and preschools, including Head Start. (Page 1 and attachment)

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 clearly affirms that this initiative requires detailed plans from each competing school for ensuring college access and career readiness, using a p-20 framework. This intent is also supported by official partners, UNITE-LA and the United Way of Los Angeles, and others including institutions of higher education. (Page 1 and attachment)

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The applicant specifically declares that participating schools are required to address the needs of special populations, including those with learning disabilities and English language learners. Experts provide training in both developing and implementing plans shown to help raise achievement for students with disabilities and those who are limited English proficient. (Page 1 and attachment)

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:50 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2010 3:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396D100336)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396D100336)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 project description provides an articulated vision for a plan to turnaround low performing schools. Research on various school improvement models such as site-based management, pilot schools, and charter schools is identified, along with the limitations of each initiative. The site-based management model allows for decentralization and takes the decision-making process closer to the student environment. Pilot schools also include a decentralization of power, as well as the authority to hire and evaluate the principal. Charter schools allow for innovative ideas in education and for targeted focus on groups of students with unique needs (students at-risk of dropping out). The locus of control for both the pilot and charter schools comes from partners external to the public education system. Problems with the models have been studied by Calkins(2007). Lack of buy-in, confusing policy designs, and fragmenting training are cited as reasons why certain of these models have not met with success. The crux of the proposed portfolio model is the belief that school authority and structure need to fit the culture of the school community. The research is summarized in the work of Hill(2006) and Lake and Hill(2009). Based on the weaknesses of models identified in the research, the roles of the LAUSD administration and the collaborative partners are crafted to provide support and monitor accountability to further study a model's potential .

Weaknesses

The outcomes of the 2009-2010 LAUSD initiative are undetermined. The evaluations are still in data collection phase. Some anecdotal success stories are presented but it is too early to draw conclusions about the success of the school models. The replicable impact of any one type of school design is not available for discussion. There is no discussion about specific portfolio school reform efforts that do not succeed.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

The evaluation design is broad, which is appropriate given the multiple layers of depth(organizational structure at the school and district level) and breadth(portfolio of the school reform models)of the proposal. The range of data collected will provide information across all fronts, including organizational, school, teacher and student level. Each wave of schools selected to participate will be monitored and analyzed using standardized assessments, survey instruments and rubrics.

The expertise of the evaluators includes knowledge on policy implementation and school reform, case study analysis and implementation, and education finance and governance. This collection of expertise and the assignments to specific aspects of the evaluation(schools and organizational support) will allow for pointed attention to key elements of implementation. The skill set of the L.A. Compact partners provides an unprecedented support system for analysis and interpretation of the data. Compact organizations such as the USC Rossier School of Education, UNITE-LA,

and the United Way of Greater Los Angeles offer critical perspectives on indicators of successful change efforts.

To examine the individual school level models, five case studies, covering the district's grade level spans, will be conducted in each of the three phases of the program rollout. The close attention to detail provided by the case studies will supply the kind of in-depth information needed to determine the extent of implementation of the model and the degree to which the district's support systems were needed and utilized. To provide a way to summarize and compare school model success, rubrics will be designed to guide the analysis.

Four separate quasi-experimental studies will compare initiative schools to control schools to study the longer term outcomes of success on critical outcomes. These outcomes (student achievement, graduation rate, teacher retention) require an extended period of time to measure in a system where organizational change is just beginning.

Weaknesses

The umbrella of evaluation activities covered is extensive and will demand on-going communication across the educational components. There are references to end of year reports in all of the separate research efforts. There may be a need to include more frequent communication across smaller subsets of evaluators to manage the volume of data collected.

The evaluation resources appear to be low at \$200,000 per year. Given the number of quasi-experimental studies (4) and the 5 case studies per year, the resources may be spread too thin. The Data Analyst position, filled by an internal employee of the LAUSD, is not included in the cost of the evaluation but may introduce an element of bias to the interpretation of the data.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2010 3:38 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396D100336)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	5
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	17
TOTAL	25	17

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396D100336)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

STRENGTHS: The proposal responds to Absolute Priority 4 and Competitive Priorities 5, 6 and 7. It builds on previous work initiated in August of 2009 by the LA USD which is the current applicant. The hypothesis is presented on page 2 and the research presented demonstrates preliminary positive results in the use of a portfolio of innovative school models to turnaround low performing schools. School reform research from across the country is cited which highlights the key features of a portfolio system that the proposed project intends to integrate into the proposed initiative (p.11 & 13). The proposal highlights barriers to success for portfolio models from research on prior implementations and how the current project will remedy those barriers to increase the potential for successful outcome achievement (p.14).

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: The data presented on page 14 is very limited. It cannot be determined if the results cited on page 14 are statistically significant. For example, clarification on the magnitude of a 78 point jump in API score for the Belmont High School needs to be further anchored with statistical significance. Likewise, there is no discussion on the magnitude of the effect

since the effect size, number of students, schools and specific implementation features are not discussed. The proposal would be improved by including specific information on the methodology used to evaluate the previous efforts and provide details of the magnitude of effect and impact on student outcomes that can be expected in the proposed project based on the previous research. The information from the Boston Compact research (which is presented on page 15 in the Applicant Experience section) should be included in the research section as well to support the proposed model.

Reader's Score: 5

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

STRENGTHS: The evaluation will use mixed methods to address three evaluation questions. Both process and outcomes components are discussed that will capture data on both the key components of the project and project effectiveness. The process outcomes will include a check of fidelity to document the project key components that may impact outcomes. Case studies of 10 schools will be included to document context and process for the evaluation which will be vital since the portfolio model includes several models with distinct implementation features that will need to be captured to ensure replication and transferability. Rubrics will be employed to determine quality of implementation plans for the various models and will be supplemented by surveys to school leaders to cull for factors of low and high performing schools. This information will also assist in distinguishing the impact of specific factors on project outcomes and will inform future replication potential. Outcomes will be compared based on frequency,

duration and model of the intervention to compare differences and factors associated with outcome differences. The inclusion of this information will maximize the utility of findings by creating the potential for explaining differential impact. Outcome measures are described on page 21 and appear to align closely with the anticipated project outcomes. The evaluation methods include interrupted time series and regression discontinuity design methods to determine student outcomes which could temper the short amount of time that the evaluation will cover (3 years). The data collection tracking key is detailed and presents the phase in of various data collection activities (Appendix). The University of Southern California, Rossier School of Education and RAND Corp. will be the independent external evaluators. The evaluation team has the requisite skills to conduct an evaluation of the scope proposed.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: The budget for USC and RAND are combined so it cannot be determined if the allocation is sufficient to cover the individual pieces. The budget should specify the costs for each evaluation partner which aligns with the specific scope of work for each partner so sufficient resources for scope of work can be determined. More information is needed on the data analysis, continuous quality improvement reporting and how results will be used to inform practice. Although continuous quality improvement is underscored in feedback to school choice implementers in their plans, it is not built into the evaluation plan as only annual reporting will be required which does not account for mid-course corrections. Three years does not appear to be enough time to determine long-term outcomes as stated on page 19 such as student achievement changes and school climate changes. It is not clear how the evaluation efforts will be coordinated since there are two distinct evaluation organizations involved collecting a large amount of data.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/28/2010 11:48 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396C100977)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 39: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396C100977)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant presents an exceptional approach and design to support the academic achievement of each student under their care.

Evidence of an 11 year history of extensive data analysis being used to inform curricular initiatives is integrated into the justification of a need within the applicant's jurisdiction. When evidence of needed curricular reform was identified, the applicant began to make instructional shifts centered around the "academic characteristics of students who are successful in advanced level courses" creating a strong foundational, systemwide culture of using data to inform instructional decisions. When data from their efforts, once analyzed, showed partial success, rather than abandoning their implemented reforms, the applicant built upon their implemented reform efforts modeling how when a cycle of continuous improvement is the expectation, continuous learning from adults and students is the result.

The longstanding, ever deepening, culture of systemic, ongoing, reflective practices and learning clearly support the moral imperative presented by the applicant of providing each child a college-ready curriculum.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant provides an innovative, creative approach impacting all students' access and preparation for college ready curriculum and advanced courses throughout their K-12 education leading to college admission and success. Extensive and appropriate analysis of data that identifies progress toward meeting the Annual Yearly Progress targets included in the NCLB legislation is used to identify a significant, unmet need within the LEA.

The goals presented by the applicant are grounded in the needs of students as identified through careful analysis of their assessed needs. The applicant identifies 1 critical goal and 3 detailed objectives that represent the essential, foundational elements needed for continued improvement of adults and students alike. Additionally, all activities derived from the goal and objectives are intricately interwoven with the identified project priorities presenting a seamless articulation of what is needed for each student to obtain a college ready, academically stimulating educational experience.

Weaknesses

The applicant describes the inclusion of an "overview professional development video" to give teachers information as an example of the type of multi-media presentations embedded into their project design. (pg 6) Further clarification regarding the delivery model for utilizing the multi-media presentations detailing an approach that is facilitated by an onsite teacher leader is needed to clearly articulate the need for sustained dialogue amongst all teachers and administrators.

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant provides exceptional evidence of their 11 year journey and past performance in bringing projects of similar size and scope to scale. Extensive and impressive evidence is provided that supports a systemic and pervasive culture within the LEA where, "student achievement will not be predicted by race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or language differences." (pg 15) including LEA publications of expectations collaboratively created with multi-stakeholder groups, compacts with employee associations, as well as independent, invited evaluations by esteemed education entities including Harvard, Phi Delta Kappa, and The College Board to uncover the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of adults systemwide and the impact on student achievement.

The applicant also demonstrated a detailed, accurate analysis of AYP data showing sustained evidence of closing of multiple achievement gaps in multiple, benchmark grade levels. Of particular note is an almost 50% reduction of the achievement gap at the 5th grade level in mathematics. In 2003, a 41% point gap between Hispanic students and White students existed. By 2009, even with a 12% point gain by the White subgroup, the Hispanic subgroup achievement gap was 20% points with 76% of this subgroup showing proficiency or higher in mathematics.

Added to this profile is an 18.4% increase from 2004 to 2008 in the percentage of highly qualified teachers working within the LEA. As of December 1, 2008, 93% of the teachers serving students are highly qualified as defined by NCLB legislation as well as 453 teachers who are Nationally Board Certified.

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.**
- (2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.**
- (3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.**
- (4) 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.**
- (5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

Strengths

The applicant identifies the number of students potentially impacted by their project as well as providing start up and scale up cost estimates. The capacity of the applicant to further develop the project and bring it to scale are unquestioned when considering the commitment to continuous improvement clearly documented throughout their application. The inclusion of Pearson as a partner provides for national dissemination possibilities and opportunities.

Weaknesses

The online platform for assessments that is provided by Pearson presents limitations for replication in remote, rural areas where technology access is impacted by access to high-speed Internet connectivity.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant provides extensive evidence ranging from employee compacts/contracts to the inclusion of curriculum personnel, administrative personnel, and fiscal personnel in the accountability and reporting process. This approach indicates that this project has the broad support of multiple stakeholders, including parents and students, who are involved in its success. Additionally, this multi-stakeholder culture demonstrates that the incorporation of the project purposes is already incorporated into the ongoing work of key personnel.

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 provides evidence of a highly experience group of educators with a wide range of expertise, who are responsible for the project implementation and success. Detailed responsibilities, budgetary support and articulated strategies are included in the plan.

Weaknesses

The timeline provided by the applicant includes strategies by no milestones or target months for implementation to gauge program progress across the multi-year project.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in

kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

The applicant provides clear evidence and documentation of a project that, "develops critical and creative thinking skills and builds academic success skills required to be a life-long learner" through "cross-curricular connections" that will "unleash the natural curiosity of young children and build the habits that mark the academic mind- persistence, questioning, an collaboration." (pg 1)

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 numerous strengths of this project are encapsulated by a description of what the applicant identifies as providing "Supporting college access and success" provided on page 1 of the application, "using as its basis the results-oriented MCPS accelerated curriculum, backmapped from Advanced Placement and international Baccalaureate standards" delivered to elementary students.

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The applicant includes the incorporation of the "principals of Universal Design for Learning" into all aspects of the project providing for the unique instructional challenges presented by students with disabilities and limited English proficient students. (pg 1)

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

This priority was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 11:48 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 0:44 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396C100977)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	77

Technical Review Form

Development 39: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396C100977)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Project North Star is a creative way increase the rigor and expectations for all students regardless of their race, income, national origin, gender or disability. It will address students with disabilities and English Language Learners. Beginning at the elementary level it is going to create a pipeline of communication for children all over the world.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed

project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant described the project as an innovative way to increase the graduation rate via backmapping to determine the need to close the achievement gap between elementary and middle school using AP enrollment in high school as a predictor. The applicant will partner with a Pearson,LLC curriculum content specialist to close the gap by writing curriculum designed to infuse art, social studies and science with math and reading to be delivered through OAEIC (Online Elementary Integrated Curriculum). The professional development will be job embedded and archived as a resource. The goals and objectives of the project were clearly stated.

Weaknesses

No Weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Based on an eleven-year process of systemic reform, the applicant learned habits of teachers and students that needed change and as a result partnered with Pearson, LLC, the world's leading publisher of education content and assessment. The project was named North Star to guide students through a lifetime of learning. MCPS has a proven record of implementing complex systemic reforms that result in positive outcomes. Two notable projects, one a system ready trajectory and the development of new professional growth system.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate

information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The number of students proposed to be impacted by the project was provided and the cost per student. The number of teachers and administrators to receive professional development was also provided. As evidenced by the applicant's ability to implement complex systemic reforms demonstrates the district's ability to bring high quality reform to scale. Replication of North Star is feasible because all instruction guides, assessments and professional development will be online.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Since the proposed project is the key to its mission, the applicant and its partners will contribute to sustainability. The district will contribute instructional development expertise and roll-out support. Pearson, LLC partner will contribute assessment and professional development expertise and the promotion of the product in national markets. The board of education has indicated their continued support of the project.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 described the qualification of the project director and other key personnel and resumes were provided. The management plan was provided.

Weaknesses

While the management plan was provided, there was no evidence of milestone included.

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

North Star will be the next generation elementary instruction using OEIC.

Partnering with Pearson on a one-of-a-kind research based project is super. The natural curiosity of children begins at Kindergarten. They will be able to explore it from a global perspective.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses note.

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 project included the development of a unique college-ready elementary school. The project began preparing students for college by making them aware of careers industry as early as kindergarten.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Since there is a high ELL population, this project will assist students with learning vocabulary and understand English which allow for better communication. In addition, technology is the key the success of the project.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Applicant did not address.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 0:44 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2010 6:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396C100977)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	78

Technical Review Form

Development 39: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396C100977)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Montgomery County Public Schools in partnership with Pearson LLC proposes a project called North Star that will produce a curriculum and an online professional community that will guide elementary students toward college readiness. It is based on sound research with the capacity to complete the project in three years. Prior research has shown that Montgomery County Schools have improved student achievement and closed the achievement between racial/ethnic groups and the poor. The curriculum will be available nationally when completed. This is an excellent project.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Montgomery County Public School will partner with Pearson LLC to realign its elementary curriculum and student assessments to further improve student achievement and close achievement gaps among racial groups. The need is clear to better prepare students for college or the work place. There is one goal. Increase the number of high school graduates and eliminate the achievement gap among racial/ethnic groups and the poor. Three objectives are cited for these projects. The objectives paraphrased are, (1) develop a K-5 curriculum in cooperation with Pearson LLC in core subjects that can be adopted nationally utilizing online learning communities, (2) create the online learning community. (3) increase the number of underrepresented students performing at advanced levels. Research by the project proponent supports the creation of the North Star curriculum.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as**

demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

Montgomery County Schools has an enviable track record of implementing curricula revisions to meet changing student needs. The project cites three major initiatives in Montgomery County School District that produced significant achievement gains for all students and produced achievement gains that substantially reduced the achievement gap between Whites and Asians compared to Hispanic and Blacks. The district is tied for first place in the nation among the fifty largest districts in the percentage of students graduating.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Strategies are written that indicate the project will be brought to scale on-time and within budget. Both Montgomery County and Pearson LL have committed additional funding to ensure the project is completed properly. The grant money will be used to hire special personnel to develop, implement, scale-up and evaluate the project. The project is replicable in that the curriculum will be developed and will be online. Per student costs of the project are included. Information about the project will be disseminated broadly through many avenues.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

It is clear the project is sustainable through the three year funding period and beyond. Pearson LLC, through the North Star product has proven to support passing AP/IB and STEM courses that prepare students for college. A strong commitment and financial resources from both Montgomery County and Pearson LLC contribute to the sustainability.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan is designed to meet the project objectives on time and within budget. Experienced and well trained staffs from Montgomery County and Pearson LLC are to manage the project. Montgomery County Public Schools in partnership with Pearson LLC proposes a project called North Star that will produce a curriculum and an online professional community that will guide elementary students toward college readiness. It is based on sound research with the capacity to complete the project in three years. Prior research has shown that Montgomery County Schools have improved student achievement and closed the achievement between racial/ethnic groups and the poor. The curriculum will be available nationally when completed.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

This project focuses on student readiness for college eventually, but in the short term on improving achievement in core subjects. Goals, objectives, activities, milestones and measurable outcomes are included. A standards based curriculum will be developed for elementary grades beginning with kindergarten.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 online professional learning communities initiative supports activities at the elementary grades that will affect college readiness.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The needs of students with disabilities and English Language Learners are addressed in this project. Achievement, college readiness, and high school graduation are all a part of this endeavor.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority not addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2010 6:43 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/26/2010 1:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396D100977)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	5
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	6
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	11
TOTAL	25	11

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 03: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396D100977)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 research cited is relevant and supports the significance of possible effects of the proposed program to be implemented. The research that the program is based upon has both internal and external validity.

Weaknesses

More information about the student populations of both the control and treatment schools needs to be included in the studies cited. It is unclear if the priority populations will be addressed from the research discussed, since the population demographics are not defined. Although college readiness is a long term goal it is unclear how the research for the project cited is relative to support the scope of this proposal.

Reader's Score: 5

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The evaluation plan is thorough and included in the timeline for the scope of work for the duration of the project. The method to be used is clearly described and how the analysis will be conducted is included in this description. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected and analyzed. The plan includes both summative and formative reports; therefore the data will be used to guide improvements for the duration of the project.

Weaknesses

The analysis is not clearly defined so the study cannot be replicated. The independent variables are not clearly defined. It is unclear how the underrepresented students will be included in the evaluation plan, which is the objective of the project- to increase the numbers of students. The budget does not clearly represent all components of the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 6

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/26/2010 1:25 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/26/2010 10:14 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396D100977)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	4
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	4
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	8
TOTAL	25	8

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 03: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Montgomery County Public Schools -- ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs - ,Office of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (U396D100977)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

There was a listing of studies provided as evidence in support of North Star in STEM subjects.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not provide sufficient research-based evidence or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed North Star project in reading. For example, the one quasi-experimental study that provided results of student North Star success in reading did not provide adequate information to conclude the significance of the results. There is no information about the research design, including sample size, type of analyses performed; length of curriculum implementation; the schools/students included; baseline scores, components of the curriculum, etc. to make the claim that the North Star curriculum will increase the likelihood that students will score at the advanced levels.

There are no results reported for the success of any previously tested project similar to the proposed project.

The applicant does not provide research-based evidence of the feasibility of online professional development and/or components of PD that show if and/or how PD is translated into practice. Thus, objective #2 does not have a reasonable hypothesis that supports the proposed project.

Reader's Score: 4

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

The applicant provided information about the statistical analyses that will be performed.

Case Studies will be used to supplement findings.

Weaknesses

The applicant proposes a quasi-experimental study; however there is no detailed information about the design (ie. use of treatment control, pre-test/post-test etc.); therefore the methods of evaluation may not be appropriate for the size and scope of the proposed project.

There is no information about targeting a specific priority student population of interest for this grant application. For example, the applicant does not provide a definition or information for the underrepresented students and districts that will be considered for their proposed project. It is uncertain

what high-needs students the applicant proposes to target. Therefore, without sufficient information about the underrepresented students, the proposed project does not facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

The applicant does not supply information about the key elements/components of PD and curriculum that make for proposed improvements in teacher practices and student achievement, thus it is unclear if the project can be replicated or tested in other settings.

The strategies for objective 1-3 (attachment G), appear to be inconsistent with the development/ roll-out of a K-5 curriculum. For example, the K-5 curriculum will be in development in Year 1 for MCPS, therefore, it is unclear how the proposed field testing of the OEIC in 5 partner schools in Year 1 will occur. This inconsistency is not appropriate replication.

Project evaluation, interim progress reports, and final grant evaluation reports for the programs in the partner schools are proposed to occur in Years 1 & 2. The summation of final results within the first two years of a five year program does not provide for high quality implementation data, performance feedback and/or permit appropriate/accurate periodic assessments of progress toward achieving intended outcomes to increase percentages of traditionally underrepresented students performing at advanced levels along the Seven Keys to College Readiness.

Although an implementation guide will be developed for district and school leaders in partner schools, there appears to be no online learning community that supports professional development for teachers at the partner schools. Equivalent programs will not be implemented within MCPS and partner schools; therefore, student outcomes in the partner schools will be inherently different from MCPS schools. This inconsistency does not allow for appropriate replication and/or evaluation outcomes.

The methods of evaluation (as proposed in the scope of work) are not sufficient strategies to conclude if the proposed program may be associated with student outcomes. For example, the applicant only provides analyses of student characteristics and outcomes, however there are no correlational analyses conducted for program inputs (ie. PD components, curriculum components) that may be related to student outcomes.

The timeline of activities and budget ends in Year 3 of a 5-Year project; therefore, the project plan includes an inappropriate use of funds and activities to carry out an effective evaluation.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/26/2010 10:14 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2010 11:27 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396C101182)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	3
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 63: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396C101182)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant presented a clear case for middle school grade reform and the need for whole school reform within the targeted middle school. The strategies and activities were clearly outlined and comprehensive in targeting whole school reform across three states (North Carolina, Illinois, and California). The applicant clearly explained why the approach was

exceptional in that it builds off of extensive national and state infrastructure with dozen of leaders who work together to improve middle-grades education and in that it addresses school reform through comprehensive, systemic approach in changing schools' culture to be one that supports high expectations, shared leadership and decision making, professional learning, and a sense of shared accountability. Further, the applicant demonstrates that the proposed project in exceptional in that it not only addresses whole school reform but also targets high need students at risk for dropping out and provides specific targeted intervention services to them. Finally, the applicant clearly demonstrates that the approach is exceptional in that it uses a multi-layered system of support that includes school coaches, high-performing mentor schools, and mentor principals. (Pages 1-4). These strategies provide for a strong project to adequately address absolute priority 4 in that the proposed project turns around persistently low performing schools not only through whole school reform but also through targeted intervention for specific high need students.

The applicant clearly lists objectives, activities and strategies to enable them to reach absolute priority four, competitive preference seven, and competitive preference 8. The applicant's objectives are strong in that they relate to improving structures, norms, and processes in the targeted school (for whole school reform), to improving academic excellent (in setting high expectations for students and aligning curriculum with high expectations and standards and in promoting professional development opportunities for teachers to address students' unique needs), to close the achievement gaps, and to foster developmental responsiveness (through providing comprehensive social and mental health services and creating a safe and positive learning environment for students). These project objectives are comprehensive and clearly demonstrate the applicant's plan to address absolute priority four (to turn around persistently low performing schools).

Weaknesses

The applicant did not clearly detail in the project narrative the academic needs of the 18 targeted middle schools for project implementation. The academic data provided in the application's appendices was confusing, as it was difficult to determine what the acronyms represented in the column headings for some of the data. It was also difficult to compare the academic needs both between the 18 targeted schools and between the schools targeted for service (Pages 1-4, Appendix 8). It would have strengthened the application to demonstrate the needs of the students in the schools targeted for services through a comprehensive table or chart provided in the project narrative.

It would have been helpful to see measurable outcomes related to the project goals, objectives, and strategies related to the project goals (Pages 5-9). For example, it would be helpful to detail out what specific percentage of students from each targeted school should obtain reading, math, or science proficiency. Having measurable objectives provide a clearer project vision of anticipated outcomes and allows the applicant to have benchmarks to determine if they are making progress toward anticipated project outcomes.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant describes a wealth of experience in implementing projects similar in scope to this project and similar in size. The application has provided on-the-ground technical assistance to the Chicago Middle Grade Project to increase academic rigor and improve outcomes for a cluster of 24 K-8 schools with a school-within-a-school middle grades program. The applicant also operates a "States to Watch" program that works in partnership with multiple LEAs in 19 states and which encompasses over 250 schools. Further, the applicant's partners (Illinois Middle Level Schools, League of Middle Schools, the North Carolina Middle School Association

and the Academy for Educational Development) have a wealth of experience in school reform. (Page 13-15). The applicant also demonstrates experience in grant administration, managing a 4 year \$3.1 million grant from the United States Department of Education aimed at improving math performance for students with disabilities, students who are Limited English Proficient, and students who live in rural communities. (Page 13). The wealth of experience in working in a number of states with multiple LEAs on school reform issues, the wealth of experience that the official project partners bring to the grant, and the experience in federal grant administration clearly demonstrate that the applicant has the capacity to deliver and implement the proposed project (given their experience in implementing programs the same size and scope of the proposed project).

The applicant demonstrates improving student academic performance in working in partnership with LEAs. One Michigan pilot school that was part of their project had students increase math performance by 36% over. Further, the partners of the proposed project have worked with hundreds of schools (which combined in working with middle schools) (Pages 13-15).

Weaknesses

There were no weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.**
- (2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.**
- (3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.**

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant's statewide networks clearly demonstrates that it has the capacity to reach nearly 18,000 students over the project period (with 10,000 of those student in Year 1 being reach from 18 urban and rural schools in three states. The applicant's network of partners and the States to Watch program will further give the applicant the capacity to bring the project to scale. (Pages 19-21)

The agency has the capacity to scale up the project with partnering organizations. These partnerships are demonstrated by the letters of support provided. The 50 National Forum member organizations and the 80 state-level partners across 19 States to Watch states also demonstrate the agency's capacity to replicate the program, as community stakeholder support is so strong. (Page 20)

It is feasible for the program to be implemented with a variety of students in a variety of populations. The proposed project demonstrates that the school reform will take place in both urban and rural settings with a variety of student populations in schools that are low performing schools. With the right resources from the proposed project, any small rural community, medium-sized cities, or large cities could use the model (Page 21) for whole school reform (and for targeted intervention services to high need students).

Weaknesses

The applicant does not list the cost of the program for 100,000; 250,000 or 500,000 students, as required under this criteria. The applicant only lists the cost per student to by \$100 per student, and that the entire budget per year averages around \$1.5 million (with \$1 million being contracted out to program partners for direct services in the three targeted states of North Carolina, California, and Illinois (Page 21). The applicant fails to list the cost of the project for 100,000; 250,000; and 500,000 students.

The applicant does not clearly describe mechanisms to distribute project

information. (Page 20-21). It would strengthen this section of the application if the applicant listed how they will use their national network of partnerships to creatively disseminate project information and results to schools, communities, and school districts which have persistently low performing middle schools. It would strengthen the application if there were several strategies to disseminate the program results on a local/ regional level for school districts wishing to replicate or adopt the program, on a state-wide level (for statewide agencies who want to be part of the States to Watch program), and on a national level for national-level partnerships and potential service collaboration and coordination of national-level support services provided to schools.

Reader's Score: 3

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.**
- (2) 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 applicant has engaged the support of key stakeholders and discussions plan to look for state and local funding, including school funding after the project period ends. The applicant states that funding will be sought in the states of North Carolina, Georgia, New York, and California as much of the "States to Watch" criteria is already deeply embedded in the state's policy and guidance to schools. (Page 21-23). With the program deeply imbedded into policy, it is likely that funding may be obtained to continue project activities as funding is often given from states if it aligns with the state's policies and priorities. (Page 21-23).

The applicant describes how the work will be incorporated into the ongoing work of the States to Watch Network. The applicant describes how the schools will work collaboratively together as a professional learning community as they work together for a shared vision of middle school reform, how schools will receive ongoing support from their state team and other schools in the States to Watch Network, and support from their "redesignation process" which occurs every three years for schools to make

continuous improvement toward their school's individual plan and project goals. (Page 22-23). These three key strategies are strong evidence that the applicant has a clear plan for incorporating project activities into the ongoing work at the targeted schools beyond the period of the grant.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not describe specific sustainability strategies for the national non-profit to provide overall structure and support to the project beyond the period of the grant. (Page 22-23) For example, while the applicant mentions that state funding will be sought to support state level efforts and while the activities will be incorporated into the ongoing work of many schools targeted for services, the applicant provides no specific project sustainability strategies to fund its national non-profit the \$500,000 cost for project management and oversight, which is still an integral part of the program to provide project support and guidance to the States to Watch programs. It would strengthen this section of the application if the applicant had a detailed sustainability plan with specific strategies to cover overhead and management costs beyond the period of the Development grant.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 clearly lists a management plan with clearly defined project responsibilities. The applicant provides a detailed Work plan for the Schools to Watch: School Transformation Network, which clearly detail project tasks to be accomplished each quarter of each year of the project. This work plan also lists specifically who is responsible for each project tasks (Appendix H). Further, the applicant's management plan is strong in that it provides strong management practices as a national organization that is proposing to target schools and provide services in three separate states. The applicant's

management plan includes cross-state training, developing electronic platforms and hosting webinars, creating tools for replication, and compiling project reports. The applicant also lists a strong plan for statewide management through using the States to Watch training teams for working with the schools individually through mentoring, coaching, providing professional development, and assisting in leadership. Each school will also assess needs and create an action plan specific to their school and meeting the identified needs.(Page 23). This multi-layered management approach (on the national, state-wide, and school level) provides a strong management plan that clearly demonstrates the applicant has the capacity to implement the large-scaled program.

The applicant clearly demonstrates the capacity of the project personnel for the project director and clearly demonstrates the experience of the States to Watch Director in each state. For example, the Principal Investigator manages the Forum's \$3 million United States Department of Education grant and has experience in working with 24 low-performing middle-grades schools through Chicago's Middle Grades Initiative. The California, Illinois, and North Carolina States to Watch Directors have experience in working with numerous schools for school reform in effort to improve the academic achievement of students in that school. (Pages 23-24).

Weaknesses

There are no weaknesses found in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**

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

Strengths

The applicant did not write to this competitive preference.

Weaknesses

The applicant did not write to this competitive preference.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 did not write to this competitive preference.

Weaknesses

The applicant did not write to this competitive preference.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must

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

Strengths

The applicant will address competitive preference 7 by paying special attention to students with disabilities and students who are English Language Learners. Each school's action plan will be tailored to provide services unique to the needs of student populations in these targeted schools (whether it be professional development for teachers or high-level support for students). (Page 2).

Weaknesses

There were no weaknesses found in this section.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The applicant will reach and serve 6 rural schools across two states (California and North Carolina). The applicant will address the challenges that rural schools face in meeting the needs of all students through assisting them in obtaining and retaining highly qualified teachers who can teach high-level math and science courses and in providing professional development activities for the staff. The applicant will also assist these rural schools by providing the tools and targeted resources to assist schools in school reform. The applicant will also incorporate coaching techniques and link the rural schools in the area who are higher performing schools to be a mentor to the rural schools targeted for services. (Page 2).

Weaknesses

There are no weaknesses found in this section.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 11:27 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 5:50 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396C101182)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 63: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396C101182)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

This application seeks to bring systemic change to low performing schools. The application incorporates the known best practices of high performing schools. The applicant understands the importance of creating a school culture of high expectations, as well as the continual use of data. The important first step is to create a shared vision of what high performance looks like. There are many excellent materials that create a strong foundation - a rating rubric, a comprehensive self assessment for the school,

the use of SMART goals, a curriculum aligned to state standards, the creation and management of an action plan, and a continual focus on closing the achievement gap.

The applicant has a strong plan for achieving the objectives. The objectives are linked to the priority of turning around low-performing schools.

Weaknesses

The application would be enhanced by the listing of specific, measurable project achievement goals. "90% of students will be proficient or above in reading and state assessments by the end of the third project year," for example.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicants have a successful track record turning around challenged

schools. Three Chicago school are now making AYP and have seen gains in math and reading. The organization is now working in 19 states, with over 250 schools. Evidence of success is presented for each of the grant partners.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The program intends to serve 10,000 students in year one, and nearly 18,000 students by the fourth year.

The applicant has a large network of support, and the capacity to realize these numbers.

Again, due to the broad support, it is highly probable that the project can be replicated successfully in a variety of settings.

Weaknesses

The applicant did not list the costs of the program when serving 100,000, 250,000 and 500,000 students.

The plan for dissemination could be clearer.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant has ample support from stakeholders.

Multiple methods - foundations, state funds, for example, will be sought to support a relatively inexpensive (\$100 per student) transformative change.

Weaknesses

The applicant would be stronger if the cost to continue to program beyond the grant were better explained.

The applicant did not indicate how they would create artifacts, documentation, program manuals, etc., that would aid in continued operation at the school level and for starting programs in new schools.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

A strong management team is presented.
Electronic platforms and use of webinars to connect program participants is a good strategy.
A work plan is presented.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in**

kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

The Applicant did not write to this competitive priority.

Weaknesses

The Applicant did not write to this competitive priority.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 did not write to this competitive priority.

Weaknesses

The Applicant did not write to this competitive priority.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

This application addresses the unique learning needs of students with disabilities and English Language learners. The program includes universal design principles, differentiated instruction and co-teaching.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

This program addresses a specific need of rural schools, the limited ability to recruit and retain highly qualified teacher, as well as providing sustained access to cutting edge professional development.

The program has a high likelihood of success in bringing practices and strategies to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates and increase high school graduation rates to rural communities.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 5:50 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2010 5:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396C101182)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 63: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396C101182)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Applicant is addressing low performing schools across several states focused on middle level learning,, culture, and environment, an area often overlooked.

Applicant expands on model used by several schools in network with solid

infrastructure and based on current research.

Project goals are clear and strategy is easily identified in matrix of goals, objectives and outcomes.

Description of project is thorough and clear with references to appendices that provide expanded detail.

Weaknesses

Did not clearly specify goals and the measures to determine if outcomes are met.

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Applicant lists projects similar in size and scope, that have been successfully managed and completed.

Applicant gives evidence of closing the achievement gaps for targeted students.

Applicant has established broad network of schools and leaders to dig into what works for schools, providing training, research, mentors, and support.

Weaknesses

There are no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Applicant identifies strong network with infrastructure that has expanded project across numerous states and schools with success.

Qualified and experienced personnel are employed and support the network and schools in the past projects listed. Demonstrated scale up abilities are shared.

Replication strategies are shared and address variety of student populations with minimal cost per student.

Dissemination plans include the various networks the schools and project are members of and online sharing mechanisms

Weaknesses

Applicant does not share information on the cost to scale up to 100,000 to 500,000 students, although the cost per student is included in narrative.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Applicant will use success to leverage future funding.

Applicant shows that committed individuals have sustained through resources shifting to other initiatives; yet, committed and talented people have donated time, money, and effort to sustain and grow the network and work of the project.

Applicant's framework is embedded in many states' education agendas providing optimism for funding as results show the effectiveness of the program.

Weaknesses

No visible support is present at this point. Applicant references success in sustaining the work as resources diminish and plans to use success and results to leverage more support and funds.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Management plan is clear and specific with duties assigned and goals clearly stated.

Exemplary personnel to direct project and manage projects with experience to support size and scope of project.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses are identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Weaknesses

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Weaknesses

This competitive preference was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Applicant identifies this as a focus of their grant with plans to support the priority.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Applicant identifies rural schools to participate in the network and has strategies that will support improvement and achievement in rural districts.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2010 5:38 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 10:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396D101182)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	24
TOTAL	25	24

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 06: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396D101182)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 demonstrates that the proposed intervention is research based. Four hypotheses supporting the proposed project are provided on pp. 2 & 4. The theory behind the proposed project is stated on p. 5. The research base supporting these hypotheses is outlined on pp. 9-11.

The abstract indicates that state Schools to Watch (STW) programs operate in 19 states. The applicant also provides on p. 9 the results of a study in Kentucky using STW. These results are promising and suggest that a more formal and systematic study is warranted.

The applicant demonstrates through the research supporting its hypotheses and on other similar programs that the proposed intervention is likely to improve middle school achievement.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not have any weaknesses in Section B.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following

factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The applicant will use matched, quasi-experimental design for the evaluation. The research hypotheses to be investigated are listed on p. 16. The sample will include 18 treatment schools in 3 states, as well as 18 comparison schools, with the matching criteria outlined on p. 16. The analyses will use t-test, ANOVA, and HLM (p. 19). All of these factors contribute to an evaluation that is appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

The evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data due to its use of a school rating rubric, SISS surveys, focus groups with school leadership teams and teachers, and the tracking of coaching activities via coach logs (pp. 16-17). Progress toward achieving the intended student outcomes will be evaluated through the use of SISS quantitative data and other student achievement data (p. 18).

The surveys, focus groups, and coaches' logs, in particular, will help provide information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development and replication.

The evaluation will be led by Nancy Flowers of CPRD. Her CV demonstrates her evaluation expertise. The budget for the evaluation will be \$140,000 per year (p. 19). This seems sufficient given that the evaluation will take place in 18 schools.

Weaknesses

The evaluation plan does not include information on the number of teachers and administrators to be included in the sample. This information would be

helpful for ascertaining the exact extent to which the evaluation plan is appropriate for the project.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 10:05 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396D101182)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	24
TOTAL	25	24

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 06: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform -- , - , (U396D101182)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.
- (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 provides research-based evidence in support of their proposed project.
On p. 12-14, the applicant describes a previously conducted study using the proposed intervention with promising results.
On p. 13, the applicant predicts positive results based on the proposed intervention specifically in closing achievement gaps among student subgroups.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality

implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

Proposed study design, a matched quasi-experimental mixed methods, is appropriate for the project. Main unit of analyses is identified. Research hypotheses are well defined on p. 17-18. The applicant proposes three sets of analyses for initial group matching, longitudinal, and qualitative, in line with the study design. Potential nesting effect is accounted for by the proposed hierarchical linear modeling analysis approach.

On p. 18-19, the applicant identifies quantitative as well as qualitative measures for periodic assessment and performance feedback, i.e. STW, Rating Rubric and focus groups.

Description of results reporting on p. 20 suggests enough detail for replication purposes. The applicant proposes to report back to the schools, STW teams as well as to the USDOE on student and school outcome data. Sufficiency of resources for evaluation is addressed on p. 20.

Weaknesses

On p. 17, the applicant specified that school will be the unit of analyses. Because power calculations are not included, it is not clear if they will have enough power to detect an effect.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:26 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/21/2010 3:59 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100242)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	22
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 43: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100242)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

This is a strong proposal from a network of schools in New England. It includes urban, suburban, and rural schools. It focuses on changing participating schools' schedules, culture, and environment to support teams of students and teachers in developing and implementing personalized, inquiry-oriented instructional systems. The organization has a history of success. The management plan is well-developed and clear. The personnel have appropriate expertise. The project has a likelihood of sustainability.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposal presents the following hypothesis: "A network of schools, working together to create authentic tasks and common rubrics to measure uncommon assessment tasks, will foster personalized learning resulting in higher student achievement, as demonstrated by lower dropout rates, higher graduation rates and demonstrable success after high school." To assess this hypothesis would require understanding the role of the network, the nature of making tasks 'authentic' tasks, as well as how to measure them both through rubrics, performances, and traditional measures of student achievement and attainment. The proposal then takes care to define what it means when describing personalized learning and common rubrics. This is a good indication that the proposed project has identified the core issues it will address and how to measure them.

The proposal's focus at four levels of innovation--student, teacher, school, and project--is described clearly. It appears to take into account important considerations at each level, such as managing school schedules and the school culture among administrators and teachers. These are all significant strengths.

Weaknesses

The proposal describes the activities of within-school teams of teachers, including developing inquiry-oriented curriculum modules and developing related assessments. However, there is a great deal of variation in how teachers may conceptualize the appropriate curriculum or prepare assessments. Curriculum development is greatly dependent on both content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge, and neither is discussed with any detail in the proposal. Additionally, assessment development can be very difficult, particularly if a variety of related but unique tasks are required. This difficulty is only amplified if the tasks are performances rather than questions or items.

Reader's Score: 22

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The proposal describes the organization's prior experiences in implementing a variety of grant activities both internally and with partner organizations. The schools have also demonstrated ability to increase student performance overall, to reduce gaps between subgroups of students and the larger student body, and to boost postsecondary enrollment for students in its technical education program.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student

populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Initial estimates of the cost of curriculum materials are at \$800 per student, but with this cost reduced as materials are produced and can be used subsequently (to about \$100 per student). This is very low cost, especially in the out-years when the materials are stable.

The proposal indicates that the project will be able to affect 11,000 students by the end of the grant period through its Network. This is a very large number and indicates the potential for impact of a multi-school program. Furthermore, the proposal suggests that the states in which the network schools are located have committed to implementing the program more widely if the results are favorable.

Weaknesses

While the proposal describes the costs as being low for materials, it does not estimate the cost of the personnel required for institutional support and change. A reading of the proposal makes it clear that the intervention is not simply in the creation of materials (whether curricula or assessments). Rather, the majority of the investment is in transition support teams at the school and project level, programs to alter the school culture to support cooperation and personalized instruction, and changes to the schedule and physical spaces for teachers to meet in teams and groups both for planning and instruction. These are ignored in the calculation of costs, but would be essential for any successful implementation to scale.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 project will likely be sustainable. The purpose is to reframe the culture, schedule, and operation of the participating schools. The project describes ways that these changes would be maintained once the grant ends, through changes in the school leadership and through collaboration with other partners whose involvement is not contingent on grant funding (e.g., CSSR). Furthermore, the project has support from other partners--such as state education agencies and other external entities--that will help it continue.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan is very clear in describing the milestones that the project will set for itself and the activities that it will conduct to meet these goals. Both the milestones and the activities are appropriate. Reaching the milestones will be advanced and reviewed by internal teams and by a Performance Assessment Review (PAR) board. The board members identified are highly qualified and respected, and the plan lists the specific capabilities that will be sought for other PAR members not yet

identified. The other project personnel have extensive experience in school leadership and change.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

None. This is not addressed.

Weaknesses

This is not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 proposal describes the project's focus on preparing students academically for college. This is an important part of increasing college access.

Weaknesses

The project provides little or no information on how it would address students' understanding of financial considerations or support structures related to college entrance and completion.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The proposal asserts that the personalized approach may allow students with disabilities to develop skills and abilities.

Weaknesses

Beyond the statements summarized above in Strengths, there was little information on the specific actions that students with disabilities or English-language learners would perform to support their development and

achievement.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The proposal includes Network members from multiple rural LEAs in New Hampshire and Maine and appears to be attentive to the ways that rural schools' needs would differ from urban and suburban schools.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/21/2010 3:59 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/23/2010 6:37 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100242)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 43: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100242)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Strengths:

The applicant represents an alliance of schools with a demonstrated need. Enrollment and achievement data is provided in support of need, particularly for high-need students.

A collaborative network of schools proposes to work together to engage in innovative efforts to improve teaching and learning. The approach is similar to Coalition of Essential Schools but is also tied to state standards for academic achievement.p3 This is an unusual collaboration that crosses state borders and invites outside experts to observe, assess and advise schools for program improvement. Peer site visits and consultations are also planned and represent an open invitation for constructive criticism, collaboration and improvement. The needs of students with disabilities is addressed early in the narrative; personalized learning experiences and high expectations are woven into this program. Overall improvement goal is stated with reference to program "strands" and a graphic illustration of the process for implementation and improvement. Outcomes are clearly stated in the evaluation plan with measurable outcomes for graduation rate and college admissions, logic model and evaluation chart.

Weaknesses:

The outcomes provided state improvement efforts for both teachers and students but some outcomes do not include baseline or measurable statements.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

1)The applicant represents an alliance of schools with a demonstrated need. Enrollment and achievement data is provided in support of need, particularly for high-need students.

A collaborative network of schools proposes to work together to engage in innovative efforts to improve teaching and learning. The approach is similar to Coalition of Essential Schools but is also tied to state standards for academic achievement.p3 This is an unusual collaboration that crosses state borders and invites outside experts to observe, assess and advise schools for program improvement. Peer site visits and consultations are also planned and represent an open invitation for constructive criticism, collaboration and improvement. The needs of students with disabilities is addressed early in the narrative; personalized learning experiences and high expectations are woven into this program. p. 4

2)Overall improvement goal is stated with reference to program "strands" and a graphic illustration of the process for implementation and improvement. p6/7. Outcomes are clearly stated in the evaluation plan with measurable outcomes for graduation rate and college admissions, logic model and evaluation chart (all provided on P.18 and in appendix).

Weaknesses

1) No weaknesses

2) The applicant does not provide clearly stated objectives with measurable outcomes. The outcomes provided state improvement efforts for both teachers and students but some outcomes do not include baseline or measurable statements.p. 8, 18 and appendix.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

- 1) The applicant has demonstrated success in managing large school improvement efforts. Currently, they are managing a 1.2 million Smaller Learning Comm. grant with evidence of success stated with data support improvement in teaching and learning. p. 12
- 2) Data provided indicates improved academic achievement for student in math and English and includes the improvement of high need student populations and decreased dropout rates. p12

Weaknesses

- 1) No weaknesses
- 2) NO weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

1) The proposed project will serve 11,000 students in the participating school districts. The project design is collaborative and attentive to reaching all students. p. 17

2)As described, this program has the capacity and the thoughtful planning to ensure further development and expansion to more schools in a consistent effective manner. A steering committee is particularly charged with leading these efforts. p. 17 The evaluation plan is all designed for continuous improvement to allow for further development. p. 17

3) Resources and expertise for this project are diverse and range from proven leadership models for urban, suburban and rural schools; innovative use of technology; peer consultation for teacher effectiveness and engaging students in inquiry based learning; and outside expertise for content and pedagogy. p. 18

4)Cost per student is initially \$800 for \$1500 students. As the project expands the costs will be reduced to \$100 per student. Much of the cost is professional development.

5)The network of schools in this application and the partnership organizations are experienced in replication successful programs and widely disseminating information and findings. p. 18

Weaknesses

1)through 5) No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

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

Strengths

1) The applicant explains a wide range of resources and the intentional design for sustainability and continuous improvement. Stakeholder support is evident through other project successes, involvement of stakeholders and in letters of support. p. 18 and appendix.
2) The project purposes, activities, and benefits are designed and implemented to become an ongoing and expanding part of education in the participating schools. p. 18

Weaknesses

1) and 2) No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

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

scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

- 1) The management plan is detailed and describes a thoughtful and deliberate approach to planning and implementing project components in each school . Responsibilities are described for each milestone and key activities. Timeline is described by academic year and summer activities. p. 21
 - 2) Qualifications and experience of the project director and key personnel are described with reference to their responsibilities. Qualifications are well suited to the project roles as stated. p. 21
- Resumes are provided and are appropriate for the responsibilities.

Weaknesses

- 1) No weaknesses.
- 2) No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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 applicable.

Weaknesses

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

This project is innovative and includes collaborative, inquiry based strategies to improve academic achievement for all students and increase graduation rates and access to college.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The personalized learning experiences included in this program are designed to reach students at all levels and all circumstances. Serving students with

disabilities, language learners or other difficulties is specifically addressed by the applicant.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

This program includes several school districts that work collaboratively and with outside experts for content and pedagogy. Several rural schools are included and program components will specifically address the needs of these school populations.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/23/2010 6:37 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2010 3:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100242)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 43: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100242)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Project describes an exceptional approach - design of authentic learning tasks and common rubrics across a four-state region, with uncommon assessment tasks allowing for personalized learning.

Also unique and important is the cross state collaboration and focus on statewide standards, with the attention paid to moderation studies.

Built upon results from NY Performance Standards Consortium - evidence-based programming.

Common rubrics for authentic learning tasks are an important way to maintain nationally (or regionally) consistent high standards; the authentic learning tasks should make the learning more relevant, engaging, and deeper for students.

Supportive, collaborative professional development is important and often unavailable in rural schools; this project addresses that need.

Goals are explicit, driven by strong hypothesis. "Decrease # of dropouts, increase # of graduates." Four strategies clearly identified towards achievement of these goals, with a timeline for achievement of objectives.

Attention paid to changing school culture, very important and often overlooked consideration.

Needs assessment was conducted on network teachers and students, and results suggest a value they attribute to the implementation of this project.

Weaknesses

lack of information/specificity about scope/focus of intended curriculum revisions and lack of implementation strategies.
Which disciplines are involved? How will students interact with the revised curriculum?

Reader's Score: 20

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for

all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

Applicant in second yr of successfully implementing USDOE \$2.5 million grant for high school transformation. First year evaluations show increased achievement in students' MCAS scores, increased # of students from technical high schools entering postsecondary education, reduction in achievement gaps between groups of students.

Plymouth South HS recognized as one of 11 MA high schools reducing drop out rate in 2009.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

11,000 students will participate in minimum two inquiry-based projects over 5 years.

Participating schools within network are part of larger systems (state, etc.) that can be used for wider dissemination and replication.

Cost per student drops to \$100 by year 5

Project Evaluation team from national ed research organizations, further dissemination possible in this way.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Cost per student drops to \$100 by year 5

Proposal focuses on changing school cultures, making it more likely that change will continue beyond grant funding.

Project Steering Committee will be comprised of wide range of stakeholders, including NEASC, State DOE reps, local school and community reps, Congressional and union reps.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Plymouth Supt. Of Schools will serve as Project Director.
Objectives, timeline and milestones clearly defined.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Increasing student engagement and relevancy of assessment tasks in high school better prepares students for college. One must complete high school before one can enter college.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2010 3:29 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/24/2010 3:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100242)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	6
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	8
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	14
TOTAL	25	14

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100242)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 New England project is based on the New York Performance Standards Consortium and its success on dropout and graduation rates and on student success after high school. The cited research supports the use of performance assessments and inquiry-based learning compared to traditional assessments and instructional delivery.

Evaluations specifically on the New York Consortium high schools post higher graduation rates, higher daily attendance, and more students headed for college. On the other hand, students served by the Consortium tend to be lower performing students of color from lower socio-economic status. A graph of all NYC school ratings compared to Consortium ratings on student progress and achievement shows higher progress ratings for the Consortium schools.

A longitudinal study that began in 2001 follows the path of Consortium students into college. Preliminary results of the study show greater percentages of students who persist in attending 2- and 4-year colleges compared to national rates.

Weaknesses

The research findings on inquiry-based learning have several qualifications

that could dilute the possible impact of the program in broader-based replications. The type of student who is successful in this type of program may need to be capable of understanding "highly specified"(p.8) content such as genetics or macroeconomics. Typically, struggling students are more inclined to register for basic level courses.

In general, the results of the research are presented out of context. It is difficult to understand the significance of the data without a comparable control group. For example, "59% of those attending two-year institutions re-enrolled for a second year"(p10). Fifty-nine percent could be a good or bad number depending on the goal. In some cases the Consortium-related research numbers are compared to a national or state rate. Comparisons that show the impact of the program need to be based on groups of matched students taking a broad range of classes.

Reader's Score: 6

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The process measures are fully adequate (observations, meeting notes, interviews, etc) and should be sufficient for documenting the implementation of the program. The Performance Assessment Review Board will serve to validate the school activities and the school process providing a quality assurance team of experts with different perspectives (education and business) on the successful implementation of the program. The PAR will spend time in the field with students and teachers to gain a first-hand look at the program in action. The Project Steering Committee will serve to monitor time, budget and progress toward goals. The combination of these two

boards watching the quality and the quantity of the program will provide an important oversight role to keep the project moving along and in tack. Evaluation reports will be due three times per year. The final, yearly report will synthesize the year's findings for both process and outcome objectives. The evaluation design includes a wide range of variables (attendance, classroom observations, surveys, interviews) to measure the implementation process. The variety of measures from different sources will serve to improve the overall interpretation of the results. The outcome measures are on graduation rates and postsecondary enrollment. These data, operationally defined, will provide credible information about the critical impact of the program on student achievement.

Weaknesses

The evaluation methods focus heavily on program implementation. Since the New York Consortium alone has 24 participating schools, the focus in the New England design could better support the program's potential by further emphasizing measures of student achievement.

Both curriculum and performance assessments will be developed for use by teachers and students. There is no explanation of why assessments from other Consortium participants couldn't be used in this effort. Also, there is a process research question that specifically asks the extent to which the Performance Assessment Review Board functions effectively. There is no comparable question that relates to the validity of the performance assessments themselves. The rubrics for scoring the performance assessments will be written by teachers and students in the Summer Institute. No methods to validate the newly written performance assessments are mentioned.

The evaluator will wait until Year 5 to write an overall summary of the data collected, including achievement success and fidelity of implementation. The proposal is unclear about the extent to which each year's report will be comprehensive.

The outcome measures specify a 4% or 10% annual increase. There is no available rationale or documentation that supports the selected rate of change.

The evaluation will be conducted by a four person team under the direction of an identified member of the UCLA SMP staff. The qualifications of the 4-person team are not included in the proposal. The experience of the senior evaluator is more heavily focused on descriptive studies. The analysis of student achievement may require a more robust statistical approach.

The evaluation budget of \$120,000 per year may not be sufficient for a four person team to collect and synthesize the heavy volume of process data.

Reader's Score: 8

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2010 3:38 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100242)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	17
TOTAL	25	17

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Plymouth Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100242)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

STRENGTHS: The proposed project responds to Absolute Priority 3 and includes professional development for teachers to increase inquiry-based curriculum to create authentic tasks and common rubrics to measure uncommon assessment tasks to impact student outcomes. The hypothesis stated builds on the previous successful results of the New York Performance Standards Consortium research. The proposal includes research results on inquiry-based curriculum and cites positive outcomes in use for macroeconomics, genetics and science that improve student outcomes, including lower dropout rate, higher college-bound rate and higher daily attendance (p.9). A longitudinal study is cited that demonstrates student persistence in higher education (p.10). The results of the research indicate that more formal and systematic study is warranted that would test the model to determine further effectiveness. The operational definitions in the footnotes are helpful in providing meaning of the statistics presented.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: It is not clear that the research findings cited on pages 9 & 10 are statistically significant although a comparison with national rates for student enrollment and completion are presented. More discussion is needed on how the lessons learned from the previous research will be applied to the proposed project. For example, the specific factors that contributed to the

success of the New York Performance Standards Consortium research that will be replicated in the proposed model to increase the likelihood of success should be discussed. Also, more discussion on the transferability of the findings from the research on macroeconomics, genetics and science to the proposed project's curriculum content needs to be included to make a direct link with the potential for success of the proposed project.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

STRENGTHS: The evaluation plan proposes a five year longitudinal study to determine project impact (p.13). The evaluation will employ a mixed methods approach gathering both qualitative and quantitative data which should provide sufficient information for documenting the key project elements to determine project fidelity and impact. A sample of the evaluation process measures are listed on page 14 along with the evaluation questions and appear to align with the project hypothesis and objectives. Sample outcome measures are also included along with the data collection methods for each outcome measure to document project effectiveness through standardized instruments. The evaluation will be supported by a team of four evaluators from the UCLA School Management Program and the results will be examined by the Project Steering Committee comprised of external experts who have the leverage to ensure recommendations are used by the project implementers. The lead evaluator has significant experience in multi-site, multi-state education evaluation. She also has extended experience working in schools and with the current project team. The budget

for the evaluation appears to be adequate and aligns with the scope of work.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: The logic model in Appendix H is difficult to read and is missing the assumptions, resources and short-term outcomes of the project. It is unclear if the design is a one group pre/post test design or will have a comparison group. Further discussion of the specific research design to ensure validity of findings would improve the proposal. Likewise, more discussion on the instrumentation to be used including validity and reliability would help illuminate the appropriateness of the instrumentation with the outcomes. Although the fidelity of the project is discussed and there is information on collecting process data including various surveys, document reviews and observations, it is not clear how the key elements of the approach will be captured and documented to facilitate further development and replication. The outcome evaluation plan in Appendix H would be improved if the time points for data collection and the analysis methods were included in it.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2010 5:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396C100641)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	15
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	12
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	3
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	5
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	7
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 56: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396C100641)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposal indicates the applicant will address the unmet academic needs of Hispanic and ELL students with a focus on STEM.

The proposal links language skills and mathematics by looking vertically

across grade levels.

Weaknesses

The data presented in Table 2 on page 3 would have been more useful if achievement gap data was included for the white population, the non-LEP, and the non-free/reduced lunch eligible students in the school.

Initially this proposal discusses focusing on the needs of Hispanic and ELL students, but it does not seem to be carried through in the description of the project. It would be useful to know what is innovative about the STEM program components in high school that will help Hispanic and ELL students be more successful and increase their achievement.

It was difficult to follow all the pieces included in this project; a graphic might have helped. Also, the text jumped back and forth between what students would be doing and what teachers would be doing independent of students. For example, page 3 to 4 talks about the elementary to middle to high school components of the program, but jumps to teacher work including professional development and technology tools teachers will use.

The bottom of page 4 the proposal makes a statement about teachers applying 'technology resources as tools to increase student achievement'. Since technology does not increase student achievement, applicant might want to think about how a reader interprets statements such as this.

The proposal needs to list measurable goals. Some of the outcome statements could have been goals. Many of the goal statements should have been objectives/actions for achieving the goals.

The proposal focused on products, not the process of data-driven decision making. The description of the program suggests previously built assessments, possibly from a commercial vendor, will be used to measure student progress. Best practices would suggest the teachers need to build those assessments to align to the instruction and state standards.

Reader's Score: 15

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

Initial informal data shared in the proposal suggests the applicant has seen some success. Since it was over such a short time period that would not allow for the full impact of the elementary program to be experienced in the middle and high school programs; thus, they might expect to see more success.

Weaknesses

The proposal needs to present all the data for gap analysis (Table 2).

The reader would like more information on the STEM certificate; it would be useful want to know if it is more rigorous than a high school diploma.

Reader's Score: 12

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other

partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant appears to be prepared to provide services to 3,800 students, including 2,345 Hispanic students.

Applicant has not identified any barriers to implementation of the project.

Weaknesses

The proposal lacks a lot of detail about scaling-up to more students or schools.

A limited plan is outlined for dissemination of results of the project.

Reader's Score: 3

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Due to STEM, the applicant has the involvement of business partners as well as a local university to help support the ongoing work.

The applicant appears to be able to consistently generate funding for innovative programs.

Weaknesses

Grant monies are being used to support middle school and high school work. There is no information regarding a plan if outside funding is not available.

Reader's Score: 5

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 a leadership team in place to carry out the project.

The proposal suggests coordination between different existing programs to leverage work.

A timeline was provided to help identify milestones and persons responsible for the work.

Weaknesses

The project personnel do not seem to have strong STEM backgrounds. This may be a barrier when working on refining impact of work.

Reader's Score: 7

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Proposal does not provide innovative practices for early learning of children.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Proposal does not suggest innovative practices for college and career

readiness.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Proposal does not provide innovative practices for addressing the unique learning needs of students with disabilities and limited English Proficient Students.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Project does not provide innovative practices for rural schools.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 5:19 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 6:01 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396C100641)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

TOTAL 80

75

Technical Review Form

Development 56: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396C100641)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Saint Vrain Valley School District is proposing a project that uses an exceptional approach to a multi-faceted comprehensive strategy that should effectively and efficiently address the unmet requirements for targeted high-need students, specifically Hispanic and ELL students, at Skyline High School and the related feeder schools. The proposed strategy is to provide students with a replicable sequence of focused interventions to reduce the achievement gap and to make significant improvements.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed

project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant has designed a system that, first, brings supports and an augmented school year for elementary students to build a literacy foundation. Second, the system then shifts focus to Mathematics in middle school, using math labs and an augmented school year. Third, at the high school level they provide students with a science focus through a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics track which will provide students with an alternative in high school.

In addition, the project seeks to facilitate the evaluation, analysis, and use of student achievement and student growth data by teachers to inform the improvement of student achievement and student growth, as well as teacher, principal, school, or LEA performance. The project will provide necessary classroom information technology tools, professional development, time, peer mentorships, and collaborative opportunities for teachers. It will provide 400 students with a 35 half-day augmented school year for English Language Arts, and provide 550 middle school students with an enriched mathematics RtI program, an augmented school year, as well as provide 400 students with an alternative path to graduation through a STEM certificate program.

Goals, objectives, and outcomes for this project are provided by the applicant that seems reasonable and measurable. For example: Goal 1: Encourage and facilitate the evaluation, analysis, and use of student achievement or student growth data by teachers to inform decision-making and improve student achievement, student growth, or teacher, principal, school, or LEA performance and productivity.

Objective 1: Provide 3,800 students and their teachers with an instructional improvement system that supports data-driven instruction.

Outcome 1.1: Reduce the Hispanic drop-out rate by 20%.

Outcome 1.2: Increase the graduation rate for Hispanic and ELL students by 5%.

The applicant further support this project by pointing out that their research on mathematics supports the need for a foundation of language arts to understand symbols and problems, and that poor language skills correlate with poor math skills, especially for English Language Learners. The applicant also states that Mathematics is an essential foundation to Science. Therefore, it seems as if the project will fundamentally focus on improving a district-wide language arts achievement gap.

Also, the project will use peer mentoring as a form of technology professional development for teachers. Such an approach should be effective

and efficient for such a project.

The combined effects of this rather comprehensive program could have an outstanding impact on closing achievement gaps, producing significant improvements, decreasing dropout rates, increase graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment rates for Hispanic and ELL Students.

Moreover, the data from formative assessments will provide teachers with information about student performance on selected content standards that can then be used to modify instruction.

Weaknesses

More details ought to be provided on how the declared outcomes will be achieved, and all related goals, objectives, and outcomes should be aligned closely and written succinctly.

The project procedures must ensure that any data the educators receive must be collaboratively discussed and massaged to render it highly effective.

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Saint Vrain Valley School District has built a considerable private and public sector coalition to support the creation of a STEM Academy at Skyline High School. Grants are presently being implemented successfully and seem to provide the appropriate leverage to create a Skyline High School STEM Academy.

The applicant claims that the middle school and high school mathematics interventions have resulted in reducing Algebra I failures from 38% to 9%.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate

information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The proposed project would reach 3,800 students. These students include 2,345 students who are Hispanic and 1,648 who are English Language Learners.

Since the director of the program has 35 years of experience in the field of education to include teacher and administrator, has supervised up to 82 staff members, and managed a \$10 million budget, then the capacity is there to reach the proposed number of students listed for the project.

The project seems replicable in any K-12 system which serves a high proportion of English Language Learners.

The program seems to be a rather unique, logical, and effective use of resources that are usually present in most school districts. Thus, the potential to replicate that project would be high.

Since the first year of the proposed project will be the third and last year of funding from the Colorado Department of Education for a middle school Mathematics RtI component, the applicant seems to have the expertise necessary to successfully carry out the proposed project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

St. Vrain's Valley School District successfully manages a \$190 million

budget. The school district has great success related to completing innovative programs. Their STEM Academy has already received grant and foundation supports totaling more than \$800,000 from various public and private sources. Their middle school Mathematics RtI component program currently receives \$400,000 per year from the Colorado Department of Education. The district will continue to seek support for their programs from a variety of benefactors. For the most part, this project will be managed internally by the experts that have been grown through an existing human capital development design.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

St. Vrain's will establish a Grant Leadership Team to lead, coordinate, control, and monitor the implementation of the grant. The team will consist of the Project Director, the STEM Academy Director, and the DLC coordinator, the Success for Every Students Program Director, and the Principal, as well as, representatives from the six schools involved in the project. The project will also include an independent evaluator. The applicant also provided a management plan.

The project managers seem to be qualified, certified, and experienced with a diverse enough background to carry out the project successfully. For example: Ms. Regina Renaldi will serve as the project director. Ms. Renaldi holds a Master of Science Education: Policies, Foundations, and Administration and is licensed in the state of Colorado and Oregon as a School Administrator. She has 23 years teaching experience and 12 years

administrative experience to include seven years as an elementary and intermediate school principal.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority Not Addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority Not Addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Priority Not Addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority Not Addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The proposed project will reach up to 3,800 students. These students include 2,345 students who are Hispanic and 1,648 who are English Language Learners. Moreover, the applicant maintains that, since the current data shows definite gaps related to their Hispanic students, this project as well as other aspects of the educational process will be focused on the Hispanic and the ELL student population.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Priority Not Addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority Not Addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 6:01 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 1:13 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396C100641)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	15
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	3
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

TOTAL 80

50

Technical Review Form

Development 56: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396C100641)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

After the panel discussion it is agreed the scores will remain as submitted.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant proposes to serve Skyline HS and the 6 feeder schools which

will serve over 3800 students predominately Hispanic. The applicant proposes closing the achievement gap for the Hispanic students who have a dropout rate 85% higher than other populations. The project will focus on content areas, language arts, math and a school of choice model that will focus on STEM and will provide college prep and transition partnered with local colleges. Additionally, instructional time will be increased to include summer. Data driven decision making and information technology is innovative and critical to student improvement.

The applicant provided an excellent comprehensive needs overview of the proposed area to be served. It provided a thorough understanding of the demographics, location, population to be served and educational needs. The proposed project will address an unmet need for high need students and is not a practice where all the proposed components are implemented exclusively.

The applicant provided an excellent comprehensive objectives, goals and measurable outcomes that directly correlate to the proposed project. This information also provided a thorough understanding of the applicants experience and strategies for meeting the proposed project goals.

Weaknesses

The project plan did not address a parent involvement component or a strategy to address non academic barriers such as social service needs. These most often are barriers that impede educational success and are needs that should most often be met by the school. This could be the implementation of an adult advocate to mentor the student through unexpected issues. Technology does not improve student achievement on its own; the applicant needs to address how the technology will do so.

There is not an indication that the district has the deep understanding of the process needed to successfully apply the data driven decision making to make a difference on what they are doing.

The proposed goals, objectives and outcomes are not consistent; some of the outcomes should be goals or objectives. The way they are written appears as if the applicant does not have an understanding of goals and outcomes.

The applicant did not provide data on all of the subgroups to determine the size of the gap that the applicant is trying to close.

Reader's Score: 15

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant has extensive experience managing grants that support the proposed project. They have established a public-private partnership to support the creation of the STEM Academy which demonstrates confidence in the applicant from the community and support in their performance. Additionally they receive federal funding to support the STEM Academy.

The experience in research and implementing data driven projects is evident with the results of the STEM Academy, reducing Algebra failures from 38% to 9%. (Pages 12,13)

Weaknesses

The success is in individual components but not vertically as they moved across different programs. The vertical alignment is not addressed as they move from language to math across school levels.

Reader's Score: 20

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant proposes serving 3800 students at 7 schools, their current experience in implementing other school reform efforts supports their capacity to meet the required number of students to be served and to effectively manage the program through the stated strategies.

The applicant provided an excellent detail overview of the projected costs to include costs to reach additional students. However, cost per student for was not included and therefore, partial point will be awarded.

The applicant will develop a web site for i3 project to share project information and evaluation results. Additionally, peer reviewed journals, newsletters, evaluations will be disseminated.

Weaknesses

The applicant proposes a project that can be replicated to serve the same populations or adapted as needed, however, the plan lacks clarity and specifics on how to replicate it for various populations.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant is a school district that has extensive experience managing \$190 million budget and securing funds for The STEM Academy receives \$800,000 from 14 different public private funders. Funders include the Colorado DOE, CU Department of Engineering and National Science Foundation.

The proposed model will benefit from the evaluation and findings and can easily continue the project purposes.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not address a detailed plan for how the project will be funded beyond the grant period.

Reader's Score: 3

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 developed an excellent management plan that is comprehensive with the inclusion of objectives, milestones, tasks, and timeline. They propose the establishment of an i3 Grant Leadership Team that will include the Principal from all six schools to coordinate, manage, and monitor the implementation of the project. (Page 20-25)

The credentials and experience of some of the management team members are excellent and will provide the leadership necessary for the project.

Weaknesses

The plan did not include staff with science, math engineering experience as involved to some capacity in the development and implementation of the STEM section of the proposed project. The applicant does not have staff that has extensive STEM background which is crucial to the full implementation of the project.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 1:13 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 10:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396D100641)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	3
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	10
TOTAL	25	10

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 06: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396D100641)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

On pp. 9-10 the applicant provides the hypotheses for the proposed intervention.

On pp. 11-12, the applicant states that two previous interventions have resulted in improved student achievement outcomes.

Weaknesses

Limited research is presented on pp. 9-11 in support of the proposed intervention, thus it is difficult to judge if the hypotheses are reasonable.

The applicant does not provide sufficient details about the effects on p. 12 and their link to any anticipated effects, which makes it difficult to judge the intervention's potential impact.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The applicant states on p. 14 that the evaluation will use a regression discontinuity design (RDD). This is a potentially useful method of evaluation for the project.

The summative evaluation will include the results of the state's student assessment program (p. 15).

The evaluation will be funded at \$43,400/year, which may be sufficient if the only evaluation activity is analyzing the data for the RDD.

Weaknesses

The suitability of an RDD cannot be assessed due to a lack of information about the evaluation's specifics. For example, further clarification is needed whether Skyline High and its two feeder middle schools are receiving the treatment because they are below or above the cutoff scores. In addition, no information is provided about the size of the two samples, as well as the exact research questions to be addressed.

No additional measures are mentioned, thus it is difficult to know whether the evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data, performance feedback and sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project.

It is difficult to know if \$43,400 per year is adequate without having a more detailed evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 10:05 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396D100641)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	6
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	13
TOTAL	25	13

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 06: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Saint Vrain Valley School District -- Priority Schools, - Priority Schools,
(U396D100641)

**1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10
Points)**

**The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including
reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of**

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

Applicant provides research-based findings and reasonable hypotheses for their series of proposed interventions. For example, applicant provides evidence for the relationship between language and math skills in ELL students (p. 8) and data-driven decision making (p. 9).

On p. 10, the applicant demonstrates by percentage differences the effectiveness of a portion of the proposed intervention at elementary level and middle/high-school levels.

On p. 10-11, the applicant describes ways by which the proposed intervention will have a positive effect on closing the achievement gap for Hispanic students.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not provide any detail on the initial study, i.e. research design, whose results they are citing on p. 10.

A clearer description of estimated positive effect of the proposed intervention on outcomes would have strengthened this section, i.e. what type of achievement will be positively affected and at what grade level.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

Regression discontinuity design is an appropriate choice for the proposed project.
The applicant addresses the question of periodic assessment and performance feedback.
The evaluation as described by applicant would provide sufficient information for further work.

Weaknesses

On p. 13, the applicant makes a case for assigning schools, rather than individual students, based on their cut-off scores to control and experimental groups. From the description of the design on p. 13 it appears that those schools that have 65, 90 or 80% of ELL and Hispanic students scoring below a cut-off point in reading, math and science respectively, will be assigned to the control group. It is not clear why the applicant would assign schools that score below the cut-off point to the control rather than experimental group. In addition, as regression discontinuity design requires a larger sample size than an RCT, it is not clear whether the applicant will have enough power to detect an effect with schools being the unit of analysis. It is not clear from the description of formative evaluation on p. 14-15 what kind of data and will be shared and with whom.
Neither the outcome measures, nor the analyses are described in the narrative.
From the narrative on p. 4, it appears that the Data-Driven Decision Making system is part of the treatment (program). The control group therefore would

not have as many data points for periodic assessment to compare to the experimental group.
The budget is not sufficient for a complete evaluation.

Reader's Score: 6

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 3:20 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2010 1:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	76

Technical Review Form

Development 66: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant seeks to address teacher quality head on and on a large scale,

with the aim of reaching thousands of students.

The program components focus on human capital - teachers and principals, and will measure impact on student achievement.

Targeting early childhood grades, it is ambitious in scope, seeking impact where research indicates the longest range impact can be realized.

The program adds an early childhood specialization to the Teacher Fellow Master program, building on the masters program's foundation to address the need for more effective early childhood teachers. This represents a new strategy with strong potential for wide adoption in the field.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Miami Dade and the University of Florida bring large institutional strength to the proposed program and have successfully worked together to develop and maintain the Master teachers Initiative and the Principal Fellows program.

The school system has made progress in recent years in closing the achievement gap for minority students.

A local nonprofit partner ready Schools Miami is dedicated to piloting and implementing programs that improves outcomes for children from birth to age 8. It has successfully linked schools to agencies providing health and other services.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The goals of the plan are to go to scale very quickly. They include wide dissemination of the resources developed to educators, IHE's, foundations and others. (Narrative, page 7)

The Master teacher program has grown quickly. The University has managed to successfully replicate in several Florida LEA's .

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

All partners have ability to fund or obtain funds to further expand the programs. Steady growth in the Teacher Masters program has been managed by the university and includes funding partnerships with local districts.

The partners are committed to identification of ongoing public funding for the project and have secured public funding from a state children's trust fund, the legislature and the university's partnership with local school systems.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 leadership at the university and local school system has successfully implemented, funded and managed the training programs and are well positioned to manage further growth, which includes the early childhood masters.

Partnerships are in place between the university, school system and local community (Ready Schools Miami).

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with**

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

Strengths

The application's focus in improved early learning outcomes and address the most important resource - quality teaching.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

NA

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

NA

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 1:22 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 8:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students	1	0

(0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	71

Technical Review Form

Development 66: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The proposal is for four years and requests five million dollars. The applicant proposes to increase student achievement by improving teacher capacity for high learning educational programs specifically targeting early childhood educators. The proposal will positively impact over 30,000 students. The proposal address the Absolute Priority 1 (innovations that support effective teachers and principals) and competitive priority 5 (improving early learning outcomes).

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program

that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposal will reach students early to ensure higher achievement as they matriculate through the educational system.

The achievement gap begins early in the life of a child; therefore, the proposal focuses on early intervention.

Weaknesses

The goals of the proposal need a specific expected outcome with baseline data. The measurement of the goals is too subjective.

Reader's Score: 20

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant has great partnerships.
The district is making positive achievement gains.
The district has a 'B' rating.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The proposal will serve up to 30,000 children.

The applicant has the capacity to further develop and implement the project.

The cost is very reasonable.

The proposal will directly serve 584 teachers and indirectly serve 30,000 students at the cost of \$211 per student.

The applicant has a good plan to disseminate information on the project. The plan will support replication of the project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 proposal has a good sustainability plan. The applicant has partnered with an institution of higher learning to impact instruction. The proposal will continue to produce an increase in teacher capacity after the funding has ended.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 submitted a good management plan and will be able to achieve the goals of the project. The goals, objectives, budget, and timelines are clearly defined.

The key personnel are qualified and have the experience necessary to implement the proposal.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

The applicant targets early learning outcomes through increasing teacher capacity at the college level.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference point.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference point.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference point.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 8:18 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 4:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students	1	0

(0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	71

Technical Review Form

Development 66: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant's grant is impressive and works to boost a, if not the key area that is know to increase student achievement: teacher quality. The potential impact of the project could be quite strong, but the replicable nature of the project would quite difficult if there were not willing and able partners, such as described in the application.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant demonstrates the need in addressing teacher quality-- a critical human capital issue. Although the proposal is not a direct school wide intervention, it's impact is potentially broad, and it is an innovative approach as described by the goals (p. 7) and programming (p. 4).

Weaknesses

The application could be strengthened by adding a clear narrative (i.e. adding an explicit strategy to accompany the outcomes listed), expanding on four key outcomes described on page 6.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant presents strong evidence of positive reforms and demonstrates clear progress in reducing the achievement gap (p. 14). In addition, project partners, including the Kellogg Foundation, the University of Florida and the Early Childhood Initiative Foundation all have experience in managing projects similar to the proposed, and moreover, are part an existing consortium called Ready Schools Miami.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant clearly lays out the strategy and future capacity to bring to scale; however, one consideration with other districts replicating the idea would be contingent on the strength of the local university system

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant and partners provide strong evidence of sustainability, with a wide range of support from the district leadership, administrators and most importantly, teachers. The potential for planning between partners for ongoing work appears strong, given the existing relationships that have been formed through past efforts such as the creation and development of the Lastinger Center.

Weaknesses

The applicant may consider adding more details of the projected funding to sustain the project to "increase public investment and expansion of this work," as alluded to on p. 23.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 lists and describes key personnel, which all appear to be exceptionally strong and quite capable of managing a project of this magnitude. (p. 23-35)

Weaknesses

Given the scope and magnitude of the undertaking, the applicant would benefit from articulating the details of the management plan. Since there a number of very large organizations involved, a detailed explanation of objectives and benchmarks would certainly increase the strength of the application.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

The application supports the early learning outcomes criteria by significantly

boosting the human capital quality of it's early elementary staff.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

n/a

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

n/a

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

n/a

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 4:29 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:35 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396D101305)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	25
<i>TOTAL</i>	25	25

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396D101305)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10

Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.**
- (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.**

Strengths

1 STRENGTH OF RESEARCH-BASED FINDINGS OR REASONABLE HYPOTHESES STRENGTHS

1. In the abstract and on page 8 the applicant listed several studies directly related to two main elements of its model - teacher quality and school leadership. These findings were clearly detailed and research-based. They were tied directly to the hypothesis of the applicant.
2. On page 8 the applicant cited a study that indicated that school leadership explained 20% of the variance in test scores. This directly addressed a key element in the model of the applicant.

2 PROPOSED PROJECT ATTEMPTED PREVIOUSLY WITH PROMISING RESULTS STRENGTHS

1. On page 9 the applicant cited several studies that documented improved student performance and related indicators of attendance and suspensions.

These are keep components of the proposed model.

3 PROJECT LIKELY TO HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT AS MEASURED BY THE EFFECT, ON IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, CLOSING GAPS, DROPOUT RATES, GRADUATION RATES, COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS, COLLEGE GRADUATION.
STRENGTHS

1. On page 9 the applicant notes that it has documented previous academic performance success. Given the model's prior successes the program does appear to be likely to have a positive impact on student performance.

Weaknesses

1. There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

1 METHODS OF EVALUATION ARE APPROPRIATE TO THE SIZE

AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

STRENGTHS

1. In the Human Subjects section the applicant clearly and concisely detailed all the methods contained in the evaluation. These were very comprehensive and seem appropriate to the project.
2. In the Human Subjects section the applicant indicated it will use a randomized control selection procedure for the teachers in the masters program. This was well thought out and will include data from the control group for effective comparison with the treatment group.
3. On page 17 the applicant noted assignment challenges to the assignment of teachers to the control group. This was an acknowledgement of the inherent bias in attempts to randomly matching teachers. However, the applicant came up with two workable solutions which will strengthen the validity of the analysis.
4. On page 18 the applicant indicated it will conduct a power analysis to determine the sample needed to obtain the desired effect size and the corresponding sample size for the control group. This reflected a comprehensive and detailed understanding of the importance of determining the sample size to obtain better analysis outcomes.

2 METHODS OF EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION DATA AND PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK, AND PERIODIC ASSESSMENT

STRENGTHS

1. On pages 17 and 18 the applicant listed a number of activities that will be assessed and evaluated in a timely manner. With the ongoing involvement of the external evaluator this appears to be high quality analysis that will provide very timely and useful performance feedback and periodic assessment.

3 THE EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE KEY ELEMENTS AND APPROACH FOR REPLICATION OR TESTING

STRENGTHS

1. On page 19 the applicant explained the data analysis techniques included the analysis of three covariates. This was another indicator of the thorough and comprehensive thought that went into the design of the evaluation to maximize meaningful information that can provide insight into the many variables involved in the analysis.
2. On page 4 the applicant indicated that a unique component of the masters degree program will be the professor-in-residence who will work alongside the teachers and administrators within the participating schools. This will assist in having the teachers test out and obtain immediate feedback regarding implementation of theories learned in the classroom.

4 THE PROJECT INCLUDES SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR
CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION EFFECTIVELY
STRENGTHS

1. In the budget narrative the applicant provided a listing of funding allocated to the external evaluation and the funds seemed sufficient. The resume of the lead person with the external evaluator was also included and the resume details extensive experience in conducting evaluations.

Weaknesses

1. There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:35 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 10:33 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396D101305)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	25
TOTAL	25	25

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396D101305)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10

Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.**
- (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

Strengths: The applicants cite credible literature that supports the underlying hypothesis and the core features of the program (pgs 8-9).

The project has been piloted and preliminary results suggest it is effective (pg 9).

The proposed project has potential to have a positive impact on a large number of elementary school students by improving both teacher quality and school leadership (pgs 7-8). It may potentially impact student achievement and close achievement gaps.

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

Strengths: The applicant is proposing to contract an external evaluator to test the program using an RCT design to test the impact on teacher knowledge and performance, school culture, and student achievement (pg 15).

The design includes a formative evaluation that will be used to identify problems and provide feedback for midcourse corrections and program quality enhancement. The formative evaluation plan includes multiple measures and data sources (pgs 15-16) and qualitative and quantitative data. The summative evaluation design is strong (RCT; 50 schools) and includes multiple measures and outcomes (pgs 16-18). It includes testing a 3-level HLM model (pg 19).

The evaluator will prepare annual reports and assist the applicant partners with disseminating the program and results with a broad audience (pg 19).

The evaluation will be conducted by SRI International. A sufficient amount has been budgeted each year to cover evaluation costs (budget narrative).

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: No weaknesses have been identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 10:33 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/23/2010 11:15 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396C101107)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 60: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396C101107)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant, Search Institute, proposes to use a development grant to replicate and expand the Building Assets-Reducing Risks (BARR) Program. BARR focuses on first year high school students and proposes to increase their achievement through asset building in order to reduce academic failure, increase attendance, decrease disciplinary incidents, and decrease substance use. By addressing non-academic barriers to learning, the program increases achievement. They plan to expand to 10th - 12th grade at the original site in order to demonstrate that this program increases and supports college access. The program will be replicated in rural LEAs in Maine and a suburban-urban LEA in Hemet, CA.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit

strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The need for the project is clearly evident as demonstrated by data on the schools proposed for the development study and by the data demonstrating prior success and results from the project. (pp e 4 and 5). The goals are clear and there is an explicit strategy with objectives and measurable outcomes linked to the priority of turning around low performing schools. There is both replication and expansion of the program design in the application. All components of the category are addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant has twenty years of experience in implementing the project and has provided results that demonstrate their success and record of work with schools and LEAs. They have been successful in closing access gaps and achievement gaps in the high school in St. Louis Park. (page e 10) Their past performance and results demonstrate their ability to successfully implement a project of this size and scope. The size and scope of the project is meaningful to extend the work to additional grade levels which the applicant is prepared to include.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The project will reach 7,500 students over the four years and the applicant has the fiscal resources and the organizational infrastructure to bring BARR to scale. They have worked in 2,500 communities in the U.S. and administered millions of survey. They have distributed nearly 20 million units of publications and have relationships with America's major organizations to influence the development of strategies to positively affect youth on a very large scale. They included all the factors requested in the proposal. The estimates on scaling to 100,000 to 500,000 Students are included fro high schools of approximately 2000 students. They use both print and electronic media to disseminate their programs and activities. They train hundreds of educators annually.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.**
- (2) 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 applicant has the fiscal, capital, and human resources to sustain the project beyond the grant period. They fully intend to incorporate the project into the ongoing work of their organization and the work of their partner organizations. The LEAs also appear to be committed to sustaining the project and incorporating it into continuous school improvement plans.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 quality of the management plan is excellent. The plan includes all the components of that the grant application requested. The key personnel are identified and roles and responsibilities are described. BARR also has a manual which describes the roles of all school based personnel as mentioned on page e 23. Key personnel also have experience with projects of the size and scope described herein. The project is designed to achieve the objectives of BARR on time and within budget. The budget allocates many resources to the schools and LEAs to actually implement the project successfully. BARR will be building capacity in the school personnel through their management activities.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priority Not Addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 clearly addresses college access through Admission Possible.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Priority Not Addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The applicant addresses two schools in rural Maine to improve student achievement and increase high school graduation. The applicant has a previous relationship with Maine and commitments from many officials to support the development of the program.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/23/2010 11:15 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 5:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396C101107)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 60: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396C101107)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant made a consistent effort to thoroughly address each section of the i3 grant application. The proposed project was well planned and presented.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Proposed project identifies set goals and explicit strategies, see BARR Logic model (appendix H, pg. e0-e2)

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Applicant provided strong evidence (see pg. e11-e14) - 20 years experience working with large districts (e.g., New York, Seattle, Minneapolis, San Jose, etc.) with more than three million students in grades 4th - 12th) - greatest gains are in the area of student achievement (see pg. e8-e9)

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Applicant presented clear evidence to address all aspects of the section (see pg. e19-e21).

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Applicant successfully demonstrated capacity to sustain the project (e.g., the Search Institute resources and support of multiple stakeholders to sustain the project beyond the i3 grant).

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Milestones, timelines, key personnel, and roles/responsibilities are identified in the Management plan (see pg. e23-e25)

Weaknesses

The flowchart (see appendix H, pg. e3) - Coordinator is positioned in a supervisory status to the vice principal - this organizational chart will be problematic in many school districts when replicating the project.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Applicant will provide college and career readiness for high-need student population through the BARR program with extended services at the St. Louis Park, MN location.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

BARR will be implemented in four sites, including two rural sites.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 5:11 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/24/2010 9:10 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396C101107)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 60: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396C101107)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Meeting the needs of the the students in this demographic area is a huge challenge. The project is organized where students can learn to grow, become self-sufficient, and be responsible young adults during and after high school. There is a great need for projects that will meet the need of at-risk beginning high school students.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

Meeting the needs of the the students in this demographic area is a huge challenge. The project is organized where students can learn to grow, become self-sufficient, and be responsible young adults during and after high school. There is a great need for projects that will meet the need of at-risk beginning high school students.

Weaknesses

This is not a new approach according to the applicant. The applicant has already started the prototype in a high school setting. Page e0

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The Search Institute has a long track record of success with implementing such projects.
Pages e11-e14

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The organization has proven itself to be capable of continuing the project in many areas and on a higher level.
The Search Institute has replicated similar projects successfully throughout the United States. Pages e19-e20

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Evidence of support is attached to this grant from senators to members of the school. The Search Institute will build the efficacy of all stakeholders through continued training and coaching.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 institute's management team is comprised of experts in the area of student achievement that will be relevant to the success of the project. The institute has experience in handling such a project of this size.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Priorities not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

This project will allow at risk students the opportunity to create a successful future by equipping them with tools such as, talking to adults successfully, filling out paperwork properly, making contact with adults in a positive manner, and being an encouraging leader for others.

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Priorities not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

This project will be generate positive effects in various high school areas such as rural LEAs. This will allow for the continuity of success throughout the area.

Weaknesses**Reader's Score: 2**

Status: Submitted**Last Updated:** 06/24/2010 9:10 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396D101107)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	9
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	16
TOTAL	25	16

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396D101107)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

This project intends to replicate and expand the Building Assets-Reducing Risks Program(BARR)developed by the Search Institute. This program is listed in the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices.(p. 3) Research studies to support the need for this project and its significance are provided on pages 1-4. The research to support the use of BARR have all been conducted by the same two investigators - Benson and Scales. Therefore, there is value in investigating this program in other settings and with the assistance of an independent evaluator.

Weaknesses

Admission Possible will partner with the Search Institute on this project by developing a school-wide college access and success program for the BARR expansion.(p. 1) There is little information provided about this organization or studies on this program.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The project evaluator is an independent consultant, formerly a research scientist for the Minnesota Institute of Public Health. Researchers from the Search Institute will provide assistance to the project investigation. The research questions, process and outcome measures for the project are discussed on pages 15-17. The instruments to be used and the scales for the School Climate Survey have previously been validated. (p. 17) Table 2 on pages 6-7, presents the objectives for the replication sites and the expansion site.

Weaknesses

The amount of funds dedicated to the external evaluator do not seem sufficient for the scope of this project. The project would be enhanced by adding an additional independent evaluator since Dr. Sharma has worked closely with the school district on a number of grants and evaluation.

Reader's Score: 9

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 1:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396D101107)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	8
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	17
TOTAL	25	17

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396D101107)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.
- (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

Support in the literature for the theoretical framework of BARR (i.e., the Developmental Assets Model) was well documented. Compelling evidence exists that the BARR program has promise of efficacy (p. 3-4). As the team asserts, subjecting the gains observed in the past to comparison to another group would be an appropriate test. A caution here is that there may already be demonstrated promise of efficacy and that this project is actually beyond the development stage and is ready for a full experimental trial. Given that the team is proposing to replicate a program with positive effects documented in the past (with similar support), it is somewhat likely to have positive impact on students.

Weaknesses

There is a lingering concern about the new student populations in Maine and California. It is not clear if they are similar enough to the St. Louis Park SD students to constitute a true replication. FRL rates are similar, but there is a 24% difference between SLPHS and Hemet HS (p.4). This second BARR project has some elements of scale up.

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The evaluation questions and corresponding measures are described fully in the proposal.

Implementation data (for teacher's use of new instructional strategies) will be collected. One evaluation question is dedicated solely to this task.

The lead evaluator chosen is experienced and has built good relationships with school district personnel. This should help in gaining access to schools for critical data collection tasks.

Weaknesses

At no point did the proposal indicate the design of the evaluation. One can surmise that a pre-post design will be used, but it is not completely clear for all measured outcomes. According to the proposal, the final design had not been conceptualized. The proposal identifies a need for further study to include comparison groups but that element was not included in the evaluation plan.

Methods for collecting and the foci of implementation data are not described.

The team discusses collecting student data to facilitate development and replication. Implementation data from program delivery staff should be in the mix of data sources here.

The proportion of the budget allotted for external evaluation is 6%. This is acceptable but probably marginal.

Reader's Score: 8

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 1:46 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2010 7:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	24
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1

Technical Review Form

Development 18: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>The applicant provides a clear presentation of how TSIC addresses the needs of minority students and children of poverty. The FLIGHT model is an extension of the TSIC approach, with the project districts selected as ones that exhibited best in class implementation of the TSIC Advocacy model. The goals and objectives are well written, with specific targets and measures. The project includes a comprehensive strategy that involves mentors, parents, school staff, and student commitment--all of which have been</p>

shown to be necessary for success. The proposal presents a clear strategy linking goals, actions, and outcomes, all aligned to the project priorities.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant has 15 years experience in Florida serving a high need student population (page 16). It works with 21 districts across the state, and with numerous public and private agencies. The TSIC program has grown steadily each year in the number of students served. TSIC has demonstrated student growth in the LEAs in which the program exists, compared to other at-risk students. LEAs implementing TSIC show increased student GPA's, and an increase in the graduation rate for TSIC students.

Weaknesses

The applicant provided evidence of higher graduation rates compared to other non-program high risk students, but did not provide evidence of improved student achievement. This data, especially an historical trend, would have highlighted the efficacy of the model.

Reader's Score: 24

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant presented a clear growth plan to reach capacity during the grant, along with sufficient resources to assure student success. The narrative provided a thorough explanation of the strategies and resources TSIC would use to enhance the model and bring it to scale statewide. The LEA partners provide a demonstration of the feasibility of the project for replication in a variety of settings. The applicant not only provided the estimated costs for

scale up to 100k, 250k, and 500,000 students, but the process TSIC used to develop the projected costs. The narrative noted a variety of methods and strategies that TSIC would use to broadly disseminate the model.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant has an impressive array of private and public donors, that not only provide operating costs but student college scholarships. The narrative included a written sustainability plan, which indicates commitment to the model and a focus on success.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 narrative presents a well thought out management plan with quarterly milestones and activities, and the responsible personnel. The key project personnel has experience managing a project similar in size and scope (i.e., the current TSIC program)(pages 29-30).

Weaknesses

The applicant provides a timeline of activities and milestones (pages 27-29). However, the timeline is not sufficiently detailed regarding milestones and targets. For example, it is not clear when the new and enhanced technology applications will be ready to pilot and when they will be ready for large-scale implementation. All that is in the table (page 27, QTR 1) is a general statement of "initiate technology platform integration."

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

priority not addressed

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 7:57 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/19/2010 2:01 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2

Technical Review Form

Development 18: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant will assist school districts in increasing student data to increase high school graduation rates and improve college attendance rates. The applicant will use a student advocacy model that includes comprehensive services to support student success.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant has a developed intervention to help students prepare for successful matriculation to college and to experience academic success (p. e6). Data provided by the applicant reveals a pattern of success in improving student achievement as measured by high school graduation rates (Appendix H, pp. e10 and e.11). The applicant provides evidence that the achievement gap has been reduced through the application of the intervention (p. e16). Project goals, performance measures, and indicators are measurable and well defined.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant has demonstrated successful application of the intervention in school settings where the intervention has been developed and refined (p. e16). The applicant has expanded the program in a manner that suggests

extensive experience in managing complex projects and programs that now include 8% of high-need students in the applicant's state. The applicant establishes important partnerships to meet expectations of the project, including 26 community foundations, 21 local school districts, and nine community colleges (p. e16). A second review of the application resulted in scores being retained.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant proposes to closely refine the student advocacy element of its intervention as it prepares for state-wide scale up. Scale up cost estimates were professionally developed. A strategy to expand the project is a component of this development application, including the identification of key personnel that would be needed by LEAs as they are included in the scale up. A table of project resources (p. e22) identifies assets and strategies for the scale up process. A second review of the application resulted in scores being retained.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant has a consistent and substantial source of funding and in-kind support from various agencies. The intervention was developed and applied well before federal funding. Plans have been made for scale up beyond the funding period.

Weaknesses

Planning for sustainability with milestones or indicators is not evident in the project timeline. A second review of the application resulted in scores being retained.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 timeline, milestones, and responsibilities of the project are clearly delineated. The project administration will be led by a team of experienced and skilled professionals. Position descriptions include skills and abilities linked program operations.

Weaknesses

Linkages between the activities and outcomes are not fully developed through the use of benchmarks or indicators that link activities of the management plan to the measurable objectives of the project. A second review of the application resulted in scores being retained.

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Early learning experiences for young children are not included in the project design.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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 proposes an exception approach to helping students prepare for college and to provide them with resources to matriculate.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

The applicant has included specific accommodations in the intervention to include the target population of students in the proposed project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The applicant will include rural student populations in the project and the applicant will make accommodations to the intervention to meet their particular needs.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/19/2010 2:01 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/05/2010 10:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	24
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1

Technical Review Form

Development 18: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The innovative use of data to support the detailed program design and implementation prior to the initiation of the i3 initiative served the internal program design and matching staff supports are extremely integrated and substantive. A micro and macroscopic view of the high needs population begins early in their academic and school career and leads to a full set of programmatic supports, or wrap around services. The focus is on students with low income and high poverty needs, and a possibility of accompanying

social challenges also. Early identification of the needs allow for full analysis and program design for each participating student, school, and parent from middle school through college matriculation.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Dedicated growth seems to be the indicator for Take Stock of Children, Inc. They appear driven to provide a specialized service to the adolescent person, especially one that has been identified as high need. They've developed many public-private working relationships to provide the students with the best possible experience to bring trust in their lives. They are in touch with 26 Community Education Foundations, 21 local school districts, and 9 community colleges in various locations throughout the state of Florida. More than 7,600 students in grades 6-12 receive Take Stock

program services. It appears this organization grows in spite of itself. Wherever and whenever they are in a position to provide services, they do a step more to bring security into that relationship. To support a student, the school, and whomever else must be involved. New people are added to the circle of support, hence the basis for the growth. As they grow, the reviewer recognizes expansion and refinement; refinement in the use of technology and how they support. Seems TSIC receives funds from the DOE, along with access to technological benefits to improve the quality of their work. It's all in the relationship building. The research, the monitoring, the data refinement, the analysis and interpretive work becomes of high standard.

8% of Floridian high needs youth participate with TSIC, inc. daily.

Weaknesses

with the growth comes the understanding of change to redevelop the organization to provide even broader and more complex services.

Reader's Score: 24

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

With 94% of program dollar going to the student consumer, and new corporate endowments annually, along with a return on investment above 35% the capacity to scale up is apparent. The student population continues to grow, however, the graduation rates soar, and so does the percentage who raise their grade point averages. More students admitted to colleges and universities, and more students complete their higher education programs with graduate degrees. The work is not easy, and it never will. The overall effort self replicates and sustains itself through the many who change grow.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

TSIC appears to have gained substantial resources from programmatic support of service delivery and through various private and public funding streams including nonprofit and profit, volunteer assistance, as well as governmental agencies through national, state, and local funding for direct services delivery, Stakeholders via matching funds, and organizational investments. Further sustainability planning through task force efforts the the development of a Sustainability Plan following key evaluation findings which identify which program strategies have the greatest impact to support the partners and stakeholders in the expansion of services.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management plan although thorough, lacks the visual detail demonstrated in the narrative and appendices. Organized in quarter years the plan also lacks the intricate interfaces necessary for such an upscale project. The key personnel are more than appropriate for the size and scope of the project. In fact, most have been on the same work team for quite some time in various support positions. Many have organizationally developed to accept the up-line positions that support a project of this nature. There is continuous mention of fidelity in project implementation which speaks to the timeliness of operations and respect for budgetary concerns.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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: 1

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

TSIC will continue to partner with 3 LEAs to create: FLIGHT (Facilitating Long-Term Improvements in Graduation and Higher Education Tomorrow.).

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

Strengths

The project is designed to increase utilization of student data by school/district partners and stakeholders to identify high-need students and implement timely interventions to increase their academic success.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The project will support at-risk student participants receiving wraparound supports including ongoing, intensive academic and behavioral monitoring.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/05/2010 10:02 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396D100570)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	11
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	21
TOTAL	25	21

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396D100570)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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

TSIC seems to have a strong track record of helping students to enroll and succeed in college, as evidenced by the high proportions of students mentioned on page e1, e4.

The hypotheses listed on pages e7-e8 are reasonable hypotheses based on the literature described elsewhere. Each hypothesis is measurable and testable based on the proposed research design.

Five components of the FLIGHT system have been supported by education research (p. e14). Several support programs similar in nature to FLIGHT, but not containing the full wrap-around services offered by FLIGHT, showed some positive effects in WWC evaluations (p. e14)

Several earlier studies of TSIC suggested some positive results (e15).

The magnitude of the potential impacts is quite large, as noted in the text and table on page e15. If effects on high school completion and college enrollment are even a few percent in magnitude, the impact would be great when TSIC was scaled.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 10

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

The table on pages e7, e8 identifies objectives and appropriate measures for each objective. Both process and outcome objectives are included, which addresses factors 2 and 3 of the 4 key factors.

Evaluation information will be used to facilitate improvement in the FLIGHT program (p. 8) as requested in point 3 of the 4 key factors. The authors indicate that the evaluator will provide evidence in an ongoing basis, as well as at the conclusion of the study, as to the effectiveness of the components of the FLIGHT program for improving student outcomes.

The logic model in the appendix details the measures to be taken for each step in the causal chain. Again, the use of multiple outcomes will enhance the understanding of the pathways through which TSIC does or does not have impacts on student outcomes.

Methods for analyzing quantitative data (p. e18) seem appropriate, given that this is a student-level intervention.

Fidelity of implementation will be measured with multiple measures, allowing for the triangulation of findings as to overall fidelity.

Weaknesses

While not a randomized design, the use of PSM enhances the internal validity of the study as compared to a simple matching. However, the quality of PSM is always difficult to estimate in advance, and it will be impossible to ascertain whether effects identified are true treatment effects. A lottery approach would be superior from an internal validity standpoint.

The authors indicate that fidelity of implementation data will be combined into an index but are not clear on how that would be done. In general, their discussion of the ways they will measure fidelity of implementation is vague. More detail should have been provided about the specific types of questions they will ask participants or use in observation protocols to measure implementation fidelity.

The sample size as proposed is only large enough to detect an effect of .33 sd, which is a bit larger than would be ideal. If there were an effect of .25 sd, a meaningfully large effect, this study might miss it. A larger sample would be better.

Reader's Score: 11

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 8:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396D100570)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396D100570)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 proposers provide a traditional literature review documenting the effectiveness of the components of their proposed intervention. In addition they report results from similar programs evaluated by WWC that indicate moderate or strong effects and point out that none of the three examples included all five of the proposed components pp. e14-15

They have provided a strong rationale for the research hypotheses that are supported by good research. They also report studies of a limited range of participants that the report had promising effects which suggests that the study will be a contribution to the research literature because it will expand the types of settings and students who have been included in the research.

They provide a chart on p. e 17 that documents higher rates of high school graduation, matriculation and college graduation. The data are provided by the FDOE which has one of the more advanced data systems in the US. The differences shown are substantial and justify further research.

Weaknesses

The proposers report results of the two prior studies, but do not report the data that led them to deem the efforts promising.

The estimates of possible economic benefit are based on graduating all Florida students. But the applicants do not make a good argument suggesting that FLIGHT can achieve this level of success. The charts on p. e17 only a rate of HS graduation of approximately 95%. Therefore the estimate of savings is higher than is justified

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The proposed evaluation study is exemplary in its design. It includes the use of comparison groups and it provides both formative and summative data that can be used to determine effectiveness and implementation data that can be used for mid- course correction and later development and replication efforts.

The proposers have included a logic model as the basis of the evaluation that will enable them to evaluate intermediate and mediating variables

The proposers have conducted a power analysis that supports the proposed sample size.

The chart of evaluation questions on p. e18 includes a list of both quantitative and qualitative measures that will be used in the study. This list includes multiple measures for evaluating implementation, key elements, and student achievement. The list reflects judicious choice of measures which

will capture the various outcomes but will not involve excessive variables.

The proposed 499,998 dollars should be sufficient to accomplish the evaluation because it represents a significant portion of the allotted budget. They report that they will use a team that includes 8 full-time evaluators, an on-site assessment staff, a budget analyst, data analyst, technology analyst, and a technical write. This suggests that the group possesses adequate resources to evaluation the project.

Weaknesses

The proposers provide insufficient information about a timeline for the study implementation.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 8:24 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2010 5:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396C100771)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	22
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	6
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 27: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396C100771)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The project has merit. Strengths of the proposal include: clearly stated goals, quasi-experimental design, clear need for the project, and highly qualified organization. Concerns focused on the need for a tighter connection between the timeline, budget narrative, and budget.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

There will be 25,200 students in 120 schools affecting 1,000 teachers. They are all from large urban districts. The proposal also identified clear needs for the interventions within large urban districts.

There are clearly stated goals, for example: average one year's increase in language arts and math.

The proposal contained a strong plan for treatment and control groups - with a staggered start implementation plan. This allows for baseline and control group comparisons but provides the treatment to all students.

Weaknesses

The analysis of new schools is absent. There was a need for data on these schools. The selection process was not clear.

Reader's Score: 22

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

ANET provided strong evidence and independent reports of their ability to improve student achievement. The many letters and quotes (Appendix) acknowledging the positive impact ANET has had were impressive. Empirical data were also provided.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The numbers of students impacted (25,000 students and 120 schools) is

impressive.

The resumes indicated excellent capacity for effectively managing a project of this scope and sequence.

Replication of the project would require strong fiscal commitments by a district but it could be replicated.

The dissemination plan was acceptable.

Weaknesses

The start-up costs are not calculated into the scale-up costs, this inaccurately projects the costs at \$154.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 proposal explained specific plans for sustainability (encouraging the private sector support).

The school district is investing in the project.
There were strong letters of support from the partners.

Since these are new schools in existing districts they are building on continuous successes and improvements.

The proposal will allow for sharing of project methods and outcomes through the web portal

Weaknesses

The costs need to reflect how the districts will sustain the project.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

There was strong evidence that this organization could effectively manage the project. The personnel are highly qualified.

Weaknesses

It would have been useful to have seen the timeline aligned to project goals. There were no specifics in terms of the numbers of personnel required for the project.

The budget narrative was vague; explanations should always be tied to dollar amounts.

The budget narrative was vague; explanations should always be tied to dollar amounts.

It was not clear on what the "Other" category of \$800,000 included. It was also unclear what additional programs and services those dollars were to be expended upon.

The "project manager's" role was also vague.

Reader's Score: 6

Competitive Preference

**1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes
(0 or 1 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: 0

**2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success
(0 or 1 Point)**

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The proposal did not identify any Competitive Preference Priorities, thus no points were given.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 5:53 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396C100771)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	22
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	3
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	7
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 27: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396C100771)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant is focusing on developing a program that makes wider and more effective uses of school performance data bases. Support would enable the project to expand to serve an additional 120 schools and more than 25,000 students. Originating in Boston, the project would work with schools in tow additional states and in DC. The project would facilitate a closer alignment of standards, curricula offerings, assessment and teaching practices.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

This project addresses the challenge of having a persistent achievement gap. The applicant's plan involves a well-documented comprehensive approach that expands on the current program. Some 120 schools, grades 3-8, would be involved in the study. Data coaches would be deployed to assist teachers to make wider and more effective use of school achievement data.

Weaknesses

The analysis of needs and the actual condition and progress of schools and new districts that will be involved is less than adequate. The applicant merely cites the fact that they have similar profiles to those in the current batch of schools. It is less than certain that the (120) have been identified and the composition of schools surveyed or analyzed. There is an indication that to date the applicant is more experienced in working with charter schools.

Reader's Score: 22

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant appears to have substantial experience and the application

demonstrates an understanding for the need to implement a comprehensive program of intervention. The project builds on current programs that are operating in several different locations and evidence of progress is documented. Impact seems a likely outcome.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant's proposal builds on current and successful programs that are

operating in several school districts. The team to carry on seems to be in place.

Weaknesses

Cost considerations could have been given more attention. Cost data particularly the actual start up needed to be detailed. The dissemination plan seems less developed and strategic than might be expected given the applicant's experience.

Reader's Score: 3

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Because the project director and support team are basically building and expanding on currently successful program innovations, they appear to be in position to develop and market the program further, and in reducing start-up costs. An effective and supportive program in place provides a strong start up.

Weaknesses

Cost considerations are a growing factor as states are required to cut costs for K-12 programs. The applicant may be too optimistic in saying that schools will be able to build their capacity without having ongoing technical assistance and support from outside. There are no guarantees that membership fees will continue to be available.

Reader's Score: 8

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 management team and support personnel are well prepared to assume successful management of this innovative school intervention program. The staff appear to have strong academic credentials and have the ability to draw on faculty and students to support the technical services and evaluation component of the project.

Weaknesses

Project and evaluation managers need to be hired. It would be terribly important to get the full project support team on as soon as possible, and this may represent a challenge. Unable to determine the commitment from M. West

Reader's Score: 7

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:20 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/25/2010 11:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396C100771)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	22
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 27: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396C100771)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Anet schools are looking to increase achievement, in grades 3-8, with the possibility of reaching 120 low-income schools and 25,000 students.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

There is historical data to show that a margin of proficiency has occurred from the use of this program. Anet schools increase achievement by

increasing academic scores in grades 3-8. It has the possibility of reaching 120 low-income schools and 25,000 students. Data driven assessment can support instruction, professional development and management practices. A very specific glimpse is given visually of how Anet actually works in day to day operation. Anet is a system that supports the data available. Each objective is explained in detail including assessment, training, and networking. Strategy and partnerships are detailed in the progress of this grant, as the program has been in place in other MA schools.

Weaknesses

On page 12 the data is marginal, because it does not show significant achievement for the gaps being reached. Roles for personnel and management were not specific. Details of schools being targeted were not mentioned.

Reader's Score: 22

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Anet has a reputation for getting results, by demonstrating three years of data at 27% growth. It has expanded the number of schools in a rate of 172% which cannot be ignored. With private funding and 155% increase in students being served the historical growth cannot be ignored. There is also evidence of private and non-private schools utilizing this strategy. Criteria are already established and built into the program which adds to the consistency of the growth of this program. Gains are mentioned from a few BPS schools in comparison to the DCPS district. One campus received recognition for their achievements. Expertise is demonstrated as this program has been done before with information on page 15 and page 16 that this program is effective.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

There is a staff already in place and partnership to recruit from. Teach from America is used to recruit coaches. A new project manager and evaluation manager for the new schools is proposed with only start-up costs and initial funding for staff being utilized from this grant funding. Membership fees are used to counteract the other needed funding for bringing this to scale. Strategies are consistent, because it already has other schools in place- this is a big strength. There is value to having evidence of user satisfaction with 100 % membership remaining with Anet each year. Dissemination is established with many facets.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

There is strength knowing that the costs will decline during the program. The mix of decreasing costs and the use of replacing subsidiaries will help Anet to be self-sufficient. It is noted again that private sector partnerships will help to support this program and are specifically mentioned with a letter of support. Membership fees paid by the schools will replace grant subsidiaries. The planning of this program is solid and respectively thought out. Commitment from schools does not appear to be an issue, including availability to work with the superintendents. A cash reserve is

noted to keep this project going.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Many key personnel are already in place with exception to the hiring of the project manager and evaluation manager. Criteria and experience needed for these two positions matches the need of this program. There has been no history of personnel leaving the program and Anet even reports the consistency of the personnel upon return.

Weaknesses

Although there is shown expertise for these personnel some roles are not explicit and need more clarification.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 11:55 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396D100771)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	22
TOTAL	25	22

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396D100771)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 ANet model is used in ~100 schools nationwide, with more growth planned for each coming year independent of i3 funds. The model clearly meets the requirement of having been attempted previously.

Previous research on formative assessment in general indicates strong impacts (.4 to .7 sd)?clearly, there is a reasonable hypothesis that ANet's program would produce positive results.

ANet's model appears to be based on previous research about the components of high-quality and effective interim/formative assessment programs (p. e9), indicating that the intervention is theoretically grounded in the research literature.

The RFA study of interim assessment practices found small to moderate effect sizes of .1 to .2 for components of the ANet model and their impact on student learning gains, modest but consistently positive impacts. (p. e11)

Weaknesses

The matched study by Bain and Co. about the effectiveness of ANet showed small effects, just 2-3% more students proficient or advanced on the MCAS. (p. e10) Gains were somewhat larger for public only schools (4%-9%, p.

e15) The study did not appear to include random assignment, which makes it difficult to evaluate the validity of those findings. (p. e10)

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

There are randomly assigned treatment and control groups, which will allow for an unbiased impact estimate.

There are 60 schools per group, which should provide more than enough power to detect effects (rule of thumb is 30-40 schools).

Other outcome variables than just student achievement are being measured, including teacher behavior, school leader behavior, and school culture (p. e16), allowing for the examination of pathways through which ANet does or does not lead to achievement gains.

Implementation will be measured using ANet's implementation rubric for the treatment group, and there are plans to investigate the relationship between implementation and outcomes. Quantitative and qualitative methods will be used to evaluate implementation, which will help the research team understand the effective components of the program and enhance the ability to scale-up or refine moving forward.

The testing of the intervention in multiple districts will enhance the external validity of the research.

Weaknesses

There is little detail provided about the site visits, such as what kinds of data will be collected on the visits and how those data will be analyzed.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted**Last Updated:** 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/22/2010 7:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396D100771)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	24
TOTAL	25	24

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: The Achievement Network LTD -- , - , (U396D100771)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(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 proposers cite previous research indicating that the use of interim assessments produces substantial gains and effect sizes for student achievement. They provide a careful analysis of the literature related to the nature of the assessments and the conditions mediating improved performance.

ANet has been previously implemented over a 5-year period and the proposers report that in a matched comparison group study the ANeT schools produced significantly more students scoring at proficient and advanced levels on state test.

Some ANet schools have achieved impressive gains (e.g., Roosevelt School was able to move out of restructuring status and increased the percentage of students scoring advanced or proficient by 19% and 34% in RL in a single year).

Weaknesses

The overall gains of 3% and 2% for the number of students scoring in the proficient and advanced categories, while statistically significant, do not seem substantial given the numbers of students scoring below those levels.

Reader's Score: 9

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The proposers have contracted with CEPR at Harvard to plan and conduct the evaluation of the intervention. They report that the "excess demand for ANeT services will allow a school level random assignment design of 120 schools." 60 of the schools will receive services for 2 years before the 60 control schools. This will allow the researchers to draw strong causal conclusions.

The proposers have included the collection of implementation data that includes teacher surveys, principal/school leaders surveys, and ANeT implementation reports. These data are sufficient to provide performance feedback and fidelity of implementation data. They will also have sufficient data for further development and replication efforts.

The use of the existing network is an important strength of this project. The project has been implemented for approximately 5 years in each of the network sites. This means that strong implementation teams are in place and the likelihood of having an impact in the short time period of the grant is greatly enhanced.

The proposers have devoted 37% of USDOE funds to the implementation of the randomized trial and sharing best practices.

Weaknesses

none

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 7:20 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/28/2010 1:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 38: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

This project provides a strongly supported effort to create high-quality arts assessments and a community of support around them to not only improved the arts education experiences for students involved, but also create collaboration experiences for teachers and arts professionals to benefit NY students for years to come. The open-source model of digital dissemination is a strength. Teachers will be involved with the Arts Partners throughout from initial development of the assessments, to evaluation and revising the tools and associated curriculum, to ongoing PLCs to continue to promote Arts Education.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible

applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

This proposal is clearly a practice or program that has not already been widely adopted, as high-quality assessments, and even more so in the arts, are greatly needed in today's schools. The innovative nature is clear in that the proposal will integrate technology into arts education for a number of students and will make all materials (including assessments, units of study, pd materials, and toolkit) open and digitally available to all schools.

The need for keeping arts education in schools is critical. Creating high-quality assessments for the areas of the arts will guarantee that it remains a strong part of the curriculum.

The development of CAD teams (Curriculum and Assessment Teams) made up of Arts partners and teaching staff shows a strong first step to achieving the project goals of creating Arts Education Assessments. This team approach to creating curricular resources will strengthen the relevance and rigor of the arts education that will ensue. Forming PLCs in the treatment schools will allow for continued professional development and collaboration amongst teacher participants. Weekly on-site consulting by Arts Achieve will ensure ongoing, high-quality participation.

The project goals are specific and very-well laid out with steps to achieving outcomes listed by implementation year.

This project provides a strongly supported effort to create high-quality arts assessments and a community of support around them to not only improve the arts education experiences for students involved, but also create collaboration experiences for teachers and arts professionals to benefit NY students for years to come. The open-source model of digital dissemination is a strength. Teachers will be involved with the Arts Partners throughout from initial development of the assessments, to evaluation and revising the tools and associated curriculum, to ongoing PLCs to continue to promote Arts Education.

Page 15 illustrates some very current research findings that improved arts education improves graduation rates.

Weaknesses

Even more reimbursed time could be planned for teachers to work with the Arts experts to create a stronger partnership and continue the review and mentoring to a larger scale.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

Studio in a School has previously partnered with NYCDOE on numerous projects including creating local arts standards ("Blueprints") in 2003 and delivering related professional development to 2,400 arts teachers beyond that. This provides a strong case for past performance and knowledge in the same content area as the proposed grant project. The Arts Partners are highly qualified in the professional arts fields.

Weaknesses

Although the proposal claims that prior history has increased student participation in the arts, more professional development, improved teaching, and higher graduation rates, there is no hard core data to prove this correlation.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The proposal includes numerous examples of dissemination modes. The applicant's past history of scaling similar projects clearly shows the capacity to do with this proposed project as well. The digital nature of the content will allow for easy accessibility for others beyond the treatment schools. Funding is promising from external partners to assure successful scalability. Strong in-kind support is demonstrated through partners' funding. Page 25 shows a possible scaling potential beyond New York.

Weaknesses

The proposal does not mention scalability beyond the state of New York to the degree that could be discussed, although there is every evidence that this would be possible. An estimated cost of \$25 per student beyond the term of the grant is a bit unclear. Assessments, online pd, and other resources will

already be created and fully function-able.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

By creating PLCs and professional mentoring, the schools should be able to sustain the project beyond its term of implementation. The stakeholders show strong support from the areas of the arts and the NYCDOE and prior history. Prior history shows strong assumed support for this movement.

Weaknesses

Does not show any support from the teachers themselves, teachers' unions, etc., for desire to sustain the project into the future.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 Management Team is clearly identified as well as project evaluator and evidence exists that they will work closely together throughout the duration of the project. Retreats and inter-visitations should provide adequate management of carrying out the objectives of the project.

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

n/a

Weaknesses

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

n/a

Weaknesses

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

n/a

Weaknesses

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

n/a

Weaknesses

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 1:32 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 4:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 38: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>One of the unintentional consequences of NCLB - combined with state budget deficits - has been to narrow the curriculum. Applicant argues that the arts contribute to the English/Language Arts achievement, as well as graduation and strength of diploma, for those students who receive sufficient arts exposure. Applicant describes a population of culturally diverse, high-need students who, while surrounded by the cultural resources of New York City, may not benefit from these resources without tools and measures of the</p>

arts. If it's tested, it's taught. Project is well-defined, and has extremely clear goals, explicit strategies, and measurable outcomes.

Weaknesses

The link to English-Language Arts standards, rather than just arts standards, should be strengthened as schools will be more likely to invest in ELA because of its high-stakes status. Applicant should consider whether the arts also can and should impact mathematics.

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Applicant has substantial experience with similar projects and the project partners have worked together for sufficient time that organizational structure should be no barrier. Applicant presents two separate studies demonstrating notable achievements: (1) findings that students who complete an arts sequence are more likely to graduate, and to graduate with a regents diploma; and (2) a study of an early childhood program by applicant

that showed positive effects on language and learning of children.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Applicant states an intent to directly impact 14,400 students in 24 schools. This represents a relatively small segment of the NYC school system, with its more than 1.1 million children. Applicant intends to create substantial resources through the proposed project (3 levels of assessments, exemplar

lessons, professional development) and has established an ongoing relationship with the NYC DOE (also a partner) sufficient to enable the project's expansion to the entire system. Although not discussed at length, project could potentially impact many other school systems through available resources. One partner, Cooper-Hewitt, will contribute to this wider dissemination. Cost estimates of scale-up are modest and manageable. Dissemination appears largely standard, but the involvement of NYC DOE should ensure that the program will be scaled up.

Weaknesses

Applicant should consider targeting a larger audience, particularly the ELA and mathematics communities, if results show positive impact on ELA and/or mathematics. Given the high stakes status of these two subjects, applicant should further collaboration with core content areas wherever possible.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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

Applicant (including all partners) has been engaged in work in this area for a number of years and demonstrates a thorough commitment to arts education. Based on the iterative development of past projects, it is anticipated that applicant will continue to develop and grow the proposed project beyond the life of the grant. Partners have committed funding to the proposed project, and have further committed to pursue funding. More importantly, "it is the intent of this project to embed the required skills, knowledge, and ability in the school team so that the project activities are sustainable beyond the term of the grant." (p. 27)

Weaknesses

None significant noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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

Management plan is explicit and detailed, reflecting applicant's substantial experience with this type of project. Qualifications are exceptional.

Weaknesses

None significant noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 4:34 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 4:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	19
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 38: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposed project appears to be an innovative project that focuses on developing and implementing benchmark arts assessments for visual arts, music, dance and theater for students in 5-8th grade (p. 3) . This appears to innovative because due to recent economic hardships, art and music classes are some of the first departments to lose funding or even be eliminated because they are not directly tied to state achievement standards.

The applicant provided several statistics (p. 3) demonstrating that a significant number of students in their targeted population live in poverty, are minority students, live in foster care, are homeless or has been incarcerated. Often students living in such environments are not exposed to the arts outside of school; therefore they are deprived of the educational benefits of visiting a museum or attending a dance recital. However, the applicant indicated that current art programs are unable to demonstrate a connection between achievement in the arts to student academic growth; therefore it is difficult for educators and policy makers to continue to support and advocate for arts programs (p. 5). After reviewing this information, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated various reasons why benchmark art assessments need to be created to help high-need students in their proposed project. The applicant also indicated that an art-performance based tool does not currently exist, providing a sound argument for how this project is innovative. It appears that this model may be attractive to schools because it aligns with state benchmark standards.

The project established a clear set of goals and provided a table (p. e6-e12) that outlined project objectives and outcomes related to each goal, and the time when each objective/outcome would be implemented. After reviewing this table, it appears that the applicant has clearly identified their project goals and has established objectives and measurable outcomes that will ensure that project goals are met on time

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for**

all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant did an excellent job of demonstrating that they and their partnerships have been able to sustain a project with the NYCDOE focused on creating standards for visual arts education tied to state and national standards, which has reached a significant number of students in grades K-12 (p. 16). This suggests that the applicant has had previous experience implementing and sustaining a project of similar size and scope; therefore they should be able to successfully implement their proposed project.

The applicant also reported a recent and similar project, in which results from the first year indicated that students understanding and art achievement and performance significantly increased.

The applicant also demonstrated that results from this collaborative project indicated that teachers felt the program helped increase students learning, thinking and performance related to art (p. 19). This indicates that teachers perceive their previous projects to be beneficial to student learning, and suggests that their proposed project will also be appealing to teachers.

Weaknesses

Although results from previous projects suggested improved student achievement, pre and post data was not provided to support this statement/conclusion (p e.18).

Also, previous projects increased teacher's knowledge and understanding of art concepts; however meaningful data was not presented to support the effects of this strategy for students or for the schools. In general, the applicant did not include data to demonstrate the effects that their previous projects have had on improving student achievement.

Reader's Score: 19

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) 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.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant stated the number of students their proposed projects intends to reach and provided a scale that the partners have previously used to ensure that the project will reach the proposed number of students (p. 24). Additionally, the applicant noted that their previous project required a large-scale replication and that they succeeded at this aspect. Since the applicant is drawing on strategies from their previous projects which allowed them to successfully bring the project to scale, it appears that these strategies should help them accomplish the same for their proposed project.

Interestingly, the project is designed with multiple layers of feedback, which appear to assist in making the project user friendly, thus making the project easy to replicate in a variety of settings. Additionally, the assessments are proposed to be available online, which will allow effortless access for other schools (p. 25).

It appears that the applicant should be able to successfully disseminate information and data from their proposed project because they noted a variety of mediums in which they share the results of their project at the state

and national level (p. 26).

It appears that after the initial development and implementation of the proposed project that the cost per student per school year is relatively low, i.e. \$25 (p. 25); therefore it appears that other school districts would be able support and implement this project as well.

Weaknesses

Although the applicant stated a specific monetary amount they are requesting as part of the i3 grant, they also noted monetary contributions from other sectors, making it unclear as to whether or not, the total amount needed for the project is beyond what they are requesting from the i3 grant (p. 25).

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) 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 applicant successfully demonstrated that they have the resources and support from stakeholders to operate the project beyond the length of development. They documented previous grant funding they have obtained, as well as noting that all of the project partners have committed to contribute to the match (p. 26); therefore it appears that they have the previous experience and commitment to financially sustain the project beyond the Development grant. Additionally, the applicant demonstrated that project partners have continued to advance the project over the past 7 years; therefore they have the experience and ability to continue developing the project.

It also appears that the project will be able to be sustained as a result of the skills and knowledge that teachers within the schools are taught as part of the project and will be able to continue to utilize once the grant period is over (p.

27).

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(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.

(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 indicated that the management team will have monthly scheduled meetings, which appears to be a promising way for the management team to ensure that the project is being implemented appropriately and that they stay within their proposed budget.

Additionally, the applicant included a specific outline of the project strategies and a timeline for each strategy (p. 28-29). It appears that the applicant has developed a thorough plan to ensure that the project will be implemented appropriately and on time, while simultaneously reaching the project objectives.

The applicant provided supporting evidence to suggest that the key project personnel have a vast amount of experience that is directly and indirectly related to the requirements to successfully conduct this project (p. 30-31); therefore the management team should be able to effectively implement a project of this size and scope

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 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

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 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

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 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

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 4:58 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:35 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396D100448)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	6
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
TOTAL	25	18

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396D100448)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

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

Strengths

1 STRENGTH OF RESEARCH-BASED FINDINGS OR REASONABLE HYPOTHESES

STRENGTHS

1. On page 13 the applicant states its hypothesis to develop standards for evaluating arts program teaching and student outcomes in New York City School District. This is important given on page 14 that there are no school district or statewide standards for the school district or other districts in New York to follow.
2. On page 13 the applicant lists several studies that reinforce the need for standards which helps to improve student achievement.

2 PROPOSED PROJECT ATTEMPTED PREVIOUSLY WITH PROMISING RESULTS

STRENGTHS

1. On page 15 the applicant cites a study of a high school exit test for students in New York City who completed a major arts sequence were found to show meaningful increases in specific outcomes desired by this grant program (i.e. graduation rates and at a high achievement level).

3 PROJECT LIKELY TO HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT AS MEASURED

BY THE EFFECT, ON IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, CLOSING GAPS, DROPOUT RATES, GRADUATION RATES, COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS, COLLEGE GRADUATION.

STRENGTHS

1. On page 14 the applicant lists a study that documents that completion of art courses correlate with higher level of achievement and college attainment. The completion of arts courses indicate positive impact on the funding agency's desired outcomes.

Weaknesses

1 STRENGTH OF RESEARCH-BASED FINDINGS OR REASONABLE HYPOTHESES

WEAKNESSES

1. There were no studies which addressed how setting standards in other states improved student achievement. The studies cited reference only the significance of setting standards but do not address how standards in other states provided statistical data documenting achievement gains.

2 PROPOSED PROJECT ATTEMPTED PREVIOUSLY WITH PROMISING RESULTS

WEAKNESSES

1. There were no weaknesses noted.

3 PROJECT LIKELY TO HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT AS MEASURED BY THE EFFECT, ON IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, CLOSING GAPS, DROPOUT RATES, GRADUATION RATES, COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS, COLLEGE GRADUATION.

WEAKNESSES

1. On page 16 there is no discussion of the relationship between the course offered in the Los Angeles study and the courses or sequencing of courses offered in the existing New York City School District. Without this information, it is difficult to correlate the findings in Los Angeles will be replicated in New York. The applicant makes implied assumptions that are not documented. This presents significant concerns regarding the appropriate documentation of impacts as measured by the effect on student outcomes.

Reader's Score: 6

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

1 METHODS OF EVALUATION ARE APPROPRIATE TO THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

STRENGTHS

1. On page 20 the applicant will conduct an experimental design including 24 treatment and 24 control school sites at the elementary, middle and high school levels and will include an overall total of 7,200 students over the life of the grant. This combined with the research questions listed on page 21 will provide useful and meaningful outcome data.
2. In the budget narrative the applicant listed funding for focus group participants and \$1,000 for each control school site to encourage participation. This seems appropriate and will be helpful in the data collection efforts.

2 METHODS OF EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION DATA AND PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK, AND PERIODIC ASSESSMENT

STRENGTHS

1. On page 21 the applicant lists numerous periodic and year end data collection and feedback. This is a significant strength of the evaluation process.

3 THE EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE KEY ELEMENTS AND APPROACH FOR REPLICATION OR TESTING

STRENGTHS

1. On page 22 the applicant notes that the evaluation will collect data including data from surveys, focus groups, and observations. These will be

beneficial in providing information regarding the mode of instruction and student achievement.

2. On page 22 the applicant will use multiple regression analysis which could be valuable in determining the level of impact of the multiple variables in the analysis.

3. On page 22 the applicant addresses fidelity which is important to the replication of the model.

4 THE PROJECT INCLUDES SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION EFFECTIVELY STRENGTHS

1. On pages 23 and 24 the applicant indicates it has allocated personnel and resources for the evaluation including description of the evaluator and the funding levels for the evaluation.

Weaknesses

1 METHODS OF EVALUATION ARE APPROPRIATE TO THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE PROJECT WEAKNESSES

1. There does not seem to be any significant weaknesses noted.

2 METHODS OF EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION DATA AND PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK, AND PERIODIC ASSESSMENT WEAKNESSES

1. There were not significant weaknesses noted.

3 THE EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE KEY ELEMENTS AND APPROACH FOR REPLICATION OR TESTING WEAKNESSES

1. On page 14 the applicant noted the positive outcomes that students taking art courses had on math, reading and writing. On page 22 the applicant does not address any data collection or inferential data analysis of these test scores with the number of art courses taken or specific art courses. This oversight lessons the ability of the applicant to answer meaningful, in depth research questions regarding whether these art courses incorporate state standards for math, reading, and writing. The analysis misses significant outcomes to address how and why there is a correlation among these outcomes

4 THE PROJECT INCLUDES SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR THE EVALUATION EFFECTIVELY

WEAKNESSES

1. There were no significant weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:35 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 10:33 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396D100448)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	3
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
TOTAL	25	18

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396D100448)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.
- (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

Strengths: The applicant cites research to support the core components of the program: the use of assessments to guide curriculum development, professional development, and data feedback through the use of technology (pg 13).

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: The applicant includes a section on previous attempts and promising results, but fails to demonstrate that the proposed project, or a similar project, has been attempted previously (pgs 14-15). They make the case that students completing more arts credits are more likely to graduate, but this is unrelated to improving the arts program as proposed.

On page 15 the applicant cites evidence that intensive arts involvement during middle and high school is associated with higher levels of achievement and college attainment. The program is designed to improve arts education, not to intensify student arts involvement. Therefore, this argument fails to support implementation of the program components or the specific program design.

Reader's Score: 3

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

Strengths: The use of random assignment of schools to treatment and control, and stratified by school level strengthens the evaluation (pg 20). The design is further strengthened by the use of propensity score matching to select matched comparison students where student-level comparisons are possible.

The evaluation design includes both formative and summative questions, and will employ qualitative and quantitative methods to obtain data. The evaluation plan is fairly comprehensive, including a brief description of data sources, procedures, and a plan for data analysis. (pgs 22-23).

The proposal includes a clear plan for further development and to provide sufficient information about key elements and approach to facilitate replication or testing in other settings. The evaluators will prepare a variety of reports tailored to the needs of specific stakeholders (pg 23).

The applicants planned the evaluation resources with the evaluators (pg 23). The evaluators have the appropriate experience and credentials to conduct the evaluation, and are sufficiently experienced to know the extent of resources required for such an evaluation (Appendix C).

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: There were no weaknesses noted for the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 10:33 AM