

Project Narrative

Table of Contents

Absolute and Competitive Priorities..... 1

A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design..... 3

B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect..... 14

C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant..... 18

D. Quality of Project Evaluation..... 20

E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale..... 29

F. Sustainability..... 36

G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel..... 37

References

Absolute Priority 4A: Innovations That Turn Around Persistently Low-Achieving Schools

The focus of the proposed project will be on Title I elementary schools that are in corrective action or restructuring. These schools will receive project services, and will be selected for the longitudinal evaluation.

Competitive Preference Priority 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

The Success for All elementary program is used in grades K-6, and there is a program for preschool that many schools use as well. The preschool program, Curiosity Corner, focuses on oral language, social, emotional, and cognitive readiness. It leads into phonemic awareness and other literacy skills, and makes effective transitions from preschool to kindergarten and beyond. The SFA kindergarten program continues these emphases (language, cognitive development, and

transitions), but adds an emphasis on phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension, which then build through the grades.

Competitive Preference Priority 7: Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students

Success for All uses an approach consistent with response to intervention (RTI) to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). That is, the program focuses on prevention by providing well-structured cooperative learning and instruction tailored to diverse needs in daily classroom instruction (Tier 1). Those children who are still found to be struggling receive small-group or one-to-one tutoring (Tier 2). The very few students who are still struggling receive more intensive one-to-one tutoring with unique adaptations, usually from tutors with special education backgrounds (Tier 3). Research has found strong impacts of Success for All for struggling readers (Slavin et al., 2009), as well as a halving of retentions in grade and special education placements (Borman & Hewes, 2002).

Success for All also has a strong emphasis on students who are limited English proficient. A version of the program exists in Spanish, with transition to English by second grade, and another version adapts the English program to meet the needs of LEPs by modifying instruction, providing constant opportunities to use English generatively, and using realia, pantomime, total physical response, and pictures to build English vocabulary. Research finds positive effects of Success for All on the achievement of LEP students and other language minority students (Slavin & Calderón, 2001). Some of our partner districts, including Philadelphia, Roosevelt (Arizona), and Garfield (Colorado), and our state partners, Pennsylvania and Colorado, serve substantial numbers of Hispanic students.

Competitive Preference Priority 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs

Success for All has long worked with schools in rural LEAs. Several of our “official” partner districts in this proposal, including Geary County, Kansas, Putnam County, Florida, Garfield, Colorado, and Bell and Knox Counties, Kentucky, serve small towns and rural areas. Some of the development for scale up proposed in this project will be of particular importance in rural areas. For example, we expect to develop distance education models for training and follow-up, including video demonstrations to enable isolated schools to see examples of good practice and give and receive comments on their implementations.

A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design

(1) The extent to which the project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Enhancing the reading performance of at-risk elementary students presents some of the thorniest problems in American education. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, fourth grade scores in 2009 are only slightly higher than they were in 1992 (NCES, 2010), and in fact have changed little since 1980. Further, reading problems are not evenly distributed. There remain substantial gaps according to social class and ethnicity. Among fourth graders not eligible for free lunch, 45% scored at or above proficient, in comparison to only 17% among fourth graders eligible for free lunch. The percent proficient rates were 42% for White fourth graders, but only 16% for African Americans, 17% for Hispanics, and 20% for American Indians. These conditions have remained virtually unchanged despite extraordinary investments in many initiatives intended to improve reading performance over the past thirty years.

Investing in Innovation (i3) provides an opportunity to take a new and promising approach to improving educational outcomes on a broad scale. Rather than setting policies in Washington or state capitals and hoping they will make a difference, the idea behind i3 scale-up grants is to identify proven, effective strategies that have shown success in large, rigorous experiments and take them to national scale. The i3 strategy does not promise overnight change at the national level, but if there are programs known to be effective at scale, then i3 would start a process of moving from success to success, building a solid foundation for policy and practice.

This proposal describes a plan for scaling up Success for All, a whole-school turnaround model for elementary schools that has the evidence base and the capacity to go to national scale that i3 envisions for its scale-up grants. Success for All and other proven, scalable approaches reach directly into the heart of practice, the interactions between teachers and students, to improve daily lessons and school functioning, and then scale up cost-effective means of supporting improved practices to help thousands of struggling schools.

Success for All

Success for All is perhaps the most rigorously evaluated and scale-up-ready approach to improving the success of students in high-poverty elementary schools. It is a whole-school turnaround program that focuses primarily on ensuring that every child succeeds in learning to read throughout the elementary grades (Slavin, Madden, Chambers, & Haxby, 2009). The main elements of Success for All are as follows:

- Extensive professional development for all school staff to help them understand and use research-proven approaches to reading instruction, cooperative learning, classroom management, motivation, teaching of metacognitive skills, and assessment.

- A K-6 reading program (KinderCorner (K), Reading Roots (1), and Reading Wings (grade 2-6+ reading levels)) that uses extensive cooperative learning in pairs and small groups to build phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency. In particular, the K-1 program emphasizes phonemic awareness, phonics, and language development, with direct teaching of letters, sounds, and sound blending, phonics, and application of these skills to phonetic mini-books, which students read to each other in pairs. Language development and vocabulary are emphasized at all levels, as students have constant opportunities to learn and use new vocabulary in their small groups, both orally and in writing. Comprehension strategies are taught at all levels. These include the use of clarification, summarization, prediction, graphic organizers, and other means of extracting and organizing meaning from all sorts of text, expository as well as narrative.
- Frequent criterion-referenced, instruction-based formative assessments to make sure that all students are on track toward success.
- Quarterly benchmark assessments to track progress toward grade level and above grade level expectations.
- One-to-one or small-group tutoring for students who are found to be falling behind grade-level expectations. Tutoring is closely coordinated with classroom teaching. Tutoring becomes a major focus of the school's Title I and special education programs, intended to ensure that struggling students get quickly on track.
- A Solutions Team, which works to prevent or solve problems that go beyond academics. This team focuses on issues such as parent involvement, attendance, behavior problems, and linkages with community agencies. The Solutions Team also helps teachers implement a schoolwide approach designed to improve social-emotional outcomes and

develop a common set of conflict resolution strategies to create a positive, achievement oriented school culture.

- A facilitator in each school (usually the Title I coordinator), who helps all teachers with program implementation, ongoing professional development, and schoolwide assessments. He or she helps coordinate classroom teaching with the Solutions Team, and works with the principal to ensure a coordinated schoolwide approach that progressively improves student outcomes, helps solve individual problems, and works with the staff to plan next steps.
- Leadership development that engages the principal and school leadership team in a continuous improvement process based on data analysis, goal-setting, and achievement monitoring using Success for All resources.
- Implementation self-assessment checklists for teachers and school leaders and implementation benchmarks, completed quarterly by coaches, which provide data for monitoring the quality of program implementation and formative outcomes.

Buy-in and Coaching Model

A key reason for the success and longevity of Success for All is the fact that we require a vote by secret ballot of the whole staff, to ensure that the staff are willing to give the program their best efforts. Schools that adopt SFA learn about it, hopefully send a delegation to visit a local exemplar, and ultimately vote to adopt the program by a supermajority of 75% of all teachers in favor. If the school is new or has been reconstituted, new teachers sign a form indicating their willingness to implement the program. After this takes place, the principal designates a full-time facilitator and Solutions Team leader, and all three participate in a week-

long training session. Program introduction workshops are then provided for the whole staff, usually during the summer before implementation begins.

In the first year, new SFA schools receive approximately 26 person-days of on-site professional development and coaching, as well as on-demand teleconference and email support. A larger number of days are provided if the school is in particular distress. After the program introduction workshops, coaching is provided in frequent visits to the school, with many telephone and email contacts between visits. An online resource center and professional community discussion board provide additional support.

After the first year, the number of coaching days diminishes to about 16 in the second year, 12 in the third, and then 5-10 in subsequent years. Coaching visits include classroom visits, reviews of student performance data, meetings with facilitators and principals, meetings with school teams such as the Solutions Team, and planning targets for next steps in achievement.

In the proposed project, we plan to substantially scale up Success for All, primarily by helping our district partners put in place coaches with expertise in Success for All, and by providing implementation grants to qualifying schools to reduce first-year professional development costs. These changes are described in the following sections.

Proposed Scale-Up Strategy

At present, Success for All is used in approximately 1,000 schools in 48 states across the US. These schools typically maintain the program for a very long time; the median SFA school has been implementing the program for more than ten years, meaning that the program in most schools has likely survived changes of principals and staff, several superintendents, funding cutbacks, changes in district, state, and federal policies, and so on.

While it is a significant accomplishment to reach so many schools and to remain with them for so long, 1,000 is less than 4% of the roughly 28,000 elementary schools with 50% or more of their students in poverty, our primary focus. Clearly, there remains much room for further growth.

To reach the next phase of scale-up, we believe we must significantly change our strategy for expansion. Currently, Success for All schools tend to be widely dispersed, with just a few SFA schools in each of many states and districts. As noted earlier, SFA coaches located around the US provide extensive services to schools, starting with at least 26 person-days in the first year. Trainers usually must travel to schools for coaching and meetings. This is an effective but expensive training model. SFA coaches spend a lot of time traveling, and the personal wear and tear of travel means that few coaches can provide more than 100 days of on-site service each year. In contrast, coaches who happen to live in the area where their schools are can typically spend 160 days per year in schools and can provide more flexible service depending on schools' needs. Further, as long as coaching is provided by an external non-profit organization, it does not fully belong to the schools, but always exists at a distance from district leadership.

In order to reach the next level of scale-up, we propose to use i3 funding to enable partner districts to hire their own SFA coaching staff. The Success for All Foundation will train and certify these local coaches, who will then provide coaching to schools adopting Success for All in their own districts and in neighboring districts. In their first operational year after training and certification, we expect these district-based coaches to provide approximately half of all coaching support to new SFA schools, with the rest provided by SFA staff. By the second year, we expect they will be doing 80% of the coaching in their areas.

We have experimented with a district-focused plan like the one we propose to scale up under i3 and have found it to have great potential. In Atlanta, school district staff provide about 80% of the support for SFA in a group of 34 high-poverty schools that have gone from scoring far below the state and district means to scoring above the district and near the state mean.

Providing district-based coaches will enable us to greatly reduce the costs of coaching, especially in the first year. In designated partnership regions, we will provide start-up credits of \$50,000 to cover most first-year professional development costs for schools that meet the “turnaround” definition (in corrective action or persistently low achieving). Since most coaching and nearly all materials are purchased in the first year of implementation, first-year costs are the main impediment to program adoption. We expect that the start-up credits will reduce the cost of SFA to schools from about \$100,000 in the first year for a school of 500 students to \$50,000.

In areas with many persistently low achieving schools in which we do not have official school district partners, we will establish local coaching teams composed of SFA employees, to reduce the costs of coaching and to increase sensitivity and adaptation to local needs. In these areas, we will also provide start-up credits.

The new coaching plan is only sustainable in areas in which there is a concentration of new SFA schools, in which our district partners or locally placed SFA coaches can provide some or all of the coaching support. However, our expectation is that with the participation of our local partners and the greatly reduced first-year cost, we will be able to recruit many schools in each area of focus. Where a concentration approach is feasible, we expect to be able to continue to offer Success for All professional development at much less cost indefinitely, not just during the period of the i3 grant. The economies of going to scale locally or regionally are so great that we

believe we can pass meaningful savings on to schools, and thereby significantly increase program adoptions in the areas in which we are able to make this offer.

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

Specific Goals

1. Reduce the cost of Success for All in regions in which district partners can provide local training and coaching.

As noted above, the main inhibitor to scale-up of Success for All has been its first-year cost, which is in turn driven by the costs of having SFA staff travel to distant locations. Adding many schools in areas with district-embedded or locally-based coaches and with many persistently low achieving elementary schools will significantly reduce the cost of professional development and coaching services and will enable the Success for All Foundation to provide the program at a lower cost. In the current economic climate, this reduction in cost is essential. We propose to offer elementary schools in corrective action or restructuring first-year start-up credits of \$50,000. These credits should cover most professional development costs, and will reduce the total first-year costs of Success for All from an average of \$100,000 to about \$50,000. As local coaches begin to provide most coaching, these costs will diminish further. In addition to increasing the attractiveness and affordability of adopting Success for All, the reduction in first-year professional development costs will enable Success for All schools to use their limited Title

I resources to do a better job of implementation, investing (for example) in increasing the number of tutors available to work with struggling students.

2. Substantially increase the numbers of Title 1 elementary schools making effective use of the Success for All turnaround strategy.

Working with our school district partners and building up the capacity of the Success for All Foundation, we expect to add to our network a total of 200 elementary schools in 2011-2012, 250 in 2012-2013, 300 in 2013-2014, and 350 in 2014-2015, for a total of 1,100 (in addition to the 1,000 schools we already serve). At 500 children in an average elementary school, this would be 550,000 additional children. Including schools already using SFA, the total would be 2,100 schools and 1,250,000 children by 2015. We project that about half of the additional students (275,000) will be in schools that will qualify for start-up credits because they are initially in corrective action or restructuring. The other half are likely to be high-poverty, low-achieving schools taking advantage of the lower training costs due to having coaches located nearby, and other high-poverty schools not in areas of concentration that adopt Success for All as they have done for many years, without start-up credits. Over time, both our district partners and our SFA coaches will build up capacity to serve larger numbers of schools, enabling us to add larger numbers of schools to our network each year.

3. Develop new coaching models for Success for All to take advantage of the new district partnership arrangements.

The concentrated regional approach to scale-up we propose to create will have important consequences for our professional development model. Instead of working with schools in a set number of whole-day sessions, coaches will be able to work more flexibly with neighboring schools, visiting schools more frequently than they can today. Models for how to do this kind of

support, emphasizing progress in implementation quality and student outcomes rather than centering around a limited number of full-day visits, will be developed, piloted, and deployed.

4. Develop new marketing and awareness models to take advantage of the new district partnership arrangements.

At present, marketing efforts for Success for All are designed to go wherever there is interest, and our awareness activities are the responsibility of SFA staff. In the district partnership model, we expect to expand within our partner districts, in other areas of concentration, and in neighboring districts, so awareness efforts will focus more intensely in targeted areas. Further, district partners and other experienced SFA schools will take a role in making their neighbors aware of Success for All, holding demonstrations at current schools achieving excellent outcomes with the program. We will need to develop new materials and procedures to support this type of intensive local awareness and marketing.

5. Adapt the Success for All Foundation's certification procedures for internal staff to the needs of district-housed coaches.

Success for All is a complex program to implement for greatest effectiveness, and local partner coaches will need significant support to provide the kind of outstanding coaching now provided by SFA staff. We will need to provide a training and certification process for these local coaches, in which coaches will receive basic training, provide coaching services in parallel with SFA coaches, and obtain certification of capacity to coach each program component.

6. Create additional media tools as models of high quality implementation.

We will need to develop additional video material for use in new SFA schools to illustrate each aspect of the program. These videos, some of which already exist, will model for teachers how each program element looks when it is implemented properly. The importance of

this is heightened by the delegation of coaching responsibilities to local district coaches, as we need to make sure that the program that has produced such positive outcomes in research is implemented with fidelity and understanding. For some program elements, such as cooperative learning and use of metacognitive strategies, we have developed video materials for classroom use, to show students what these elements look like when implemented properly, and we plan to develop many more student videos of this type to help facilitate high-quality implementations.

7. Develop distance education methods to help schools participate in professional development sessions.

In order to increase the quality and reliability of program implementations in areas served by district-housed coaches as well as those in other areas where it is not practical to send coaches so frequently, we plan to create distance education methods. Some of these will be podcasts or webinars in which SFA experts will make presentations and conduct discussions on issues of common concern, such as adaptations for English language learners, classroom management challenges, using Success for All strategies as response to intervention (RTI), or engaging parents in support of their children's reading. In each case, participants will be able to view video examples, ask questions of the presenter and of each other, present their own video examples, share data on student progress, and so on.

Another use of distance technology will be to enable SFA or district partner coaches to provide tailored feedback to individual teachers, by having teachers send videos of themselves implementing various aspects of Success for All. Such video coaching may be one-to-one or may be in small groups, with teachers at a given level (e.g., teachers of grades 3-5) participating in sessions in which they can exchange video and provide helpful comments on each others' lessons or procedures.

B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there is strong evidence that its implementation of the proposed program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important effect on improving student achievement.

Success for All clearly meets the i3 standards for strong evidence of effectiveness. It has been evaluated in a large-scale longitudinal cluster randomized experiment (Borman et al., 2007). This study found positive effects of Success for All in comparison to control groups, using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). The study, published in the *American Educational Research Journal*, received the Palmer O. Johnson Award for the best article in an AERA journal in 2008. In addition, there have been many high-quality, large, and longitudinal quasi-experiments, in which Success for All has been compared to matched control schools. The largest multi-school evaluations of SFA are described in this section.

The most important evaluation of Success for All was a three-year longitudinal cluster randomized experiment (Borman, Slavin, Cheung, Chamberlain, Madden, & Chambers, 2007). In this study, 35 Title I schools throughout the US were randomly assigned to use Success for All either in grades K-2 or 3-5. The 3-5 group served as a control group for the K-2 schools. A total of 2,108 K-2 children (1,085 E, 1,023 C) remained in the study schools all three years. Attrition was equal in the two treatment groups. Among the final sample, 72% of students received free lunches, and 57% of students were African American, 31% were White, and 10% were Hispanic.

Children were pretested on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) and then individually tested on scales from the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test each spring for three years. Testers were not aware of the treatment assignments of each school. Data were analyzed

using HLM, with children nested within schools. Using individual posttests adjusted for pretests, effect sizes were +0.22 ($p < .05$) for Word Identification, +0.33 ($p < .01$) for Word Attack, and +0.21 ($p < .05$) for Passage Comprehension, for a mean of +0.25.

Other than the Borman et al. study, all studies of Success for All have used matched designs. Correnti (2009) and his colleagues at the University of Michigan carried out the largest matched evaluation of Success for All over a 4-year period (also see Rowan, Correnti, Miller, & Camburn, 2009). The study compared three comprehensive school reform models, SFA (30 schools), America's Choice (28 schools), and Accelerated Schools (31 schools). These were compared to 26 control schools. The schools were located throughout the U.S. The schools were relatively disadvantaged, with 69% receiving free lunch, 52% African American, 22% White, 19% Hispanic, and 6% Asian. Two cohorts of students were followed from kindergarten to grade 3. A total of 831 students were in the SFA schools one or more years, and they were compared to a total of 2,932 students in the other CSR and comparison schools, analyzed together. Students were pretested and then posttested each year on the Terra Nova. Propensity matching was used to ensure a close match between SFA and other students. Adjusting for covariates and mobility, the effect size for SFA students compared to all others was +0.43. The authors estimated that the implementation of Success for All moved the average student from the 30th percentile to the 50th.

A large, longitudinal matched study in Baltimore was reported by Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik (1993; Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1993). In this study, students in five inner-city Baltimore schools were individually matched with those in similar control schools. Individual matching was based on spring kindergarten CTBS or CAT scores administered by the district, and school matching was based on free lunch and historical

achievement levels on district standardized tests. All children were African American, and approximately 95% of children qualified for free lunches.

Each spring, children in all SFA and control schools who had begun in their schools by first grade were individually assessed on the Woodcock Word Identification, Word Attack, and Passage Comprehension tests. Students in grades 1-3 were also given the Durrell Oral Reading Test, while those in grades 4-5 were given the Gray Oral Reading Test. Testers were not made aware of the schools' treatment assignments. Children were followed and tested as long as they remained in their schools, even if they were retained or assigned to special education. Each year, an additional cohort was added.

Data collected when the oldest cohort was in fifth grade revealed substantial positive effects (Madden et al., 1993; Slavin et al., 1993). Averaging across the three Woodcock measures, the two Gray measures, and district-administered CTBS scores, the mean effect size for fifth graders, who were in their fifth year in SFA, was +0.48 (n=128E, 159C), and ES=+0.45 for fourth graders (n=151E, 155C). Averaging across three Woodcock scales, the Durrell, and CTBS, effect sizes were +0.49 for third graders (n=151E, 187C), +0.32 for second graders (n=204E, 233C), and +0.55 for first graders (n=256E, 301C). All comparisons were statistically significant ($p < .001$). Effect sizes were larger for students in the lowest 25% at pretest: ES=+1.03 for fifth graders, +0.80 for fourth graders, +1.32 for third graders, +0.92 for second graders, and +1.18 for first graders. Averaging across all grades, the mean effect size was +0.46 for all students and +1.05 for low achievers.

Beyond the achievement effects, Slavin et al. (1993) also reported a substantial difference in retention rates between SFA and control schools. By fifth grade, 34.9% of control students but only 11.2% of SFA students had been held back ($p < .001$). According to state data, third

grade absences in 1993 were 8.8% in SFA schools and 13.5% in control, and among fifth graders the rates were 6.4% in SFA, 13.7% in control.

Borman & Hewes (2002) carried out a follow-up assessment of children in the first four Baltimore cohorts when they were in the eighth grade (if they had been promoted each year). Since SFA schools only went to the fifth grade, these students would have been out of the SFA program for at least 3 years. Analyses showed that former SFA students still scored better on CTBS than controls ($ES=+0.29$, $p<.001$). Effect sizes were similar for the lowest achievers ($ES=+0.34$). The SFA students were also significantly less likely to have been retained or assigned to special education.

Many other studies of Success for All have been carried out by researchers throughout the US. Several reviews of comprehensive school reform models, by Herman (1999), Borman et al. (2003), CSRQ (2006), and Social Programs that Work (2008), all concluded that Success for All is one of the two or three most effective whole-school reform models. In Social Programs that Work, in fact, Success for All was the only whole-school educational program that was found to have methodologically adequate positive effects.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth or close achievement gaps.

As is apparent from the summary of research above, the effects seen in studies of Success for All are almost always significantly positive, but they vary considerably in magnitude. The best estimates are those from the large-scale Borman et al. (2007) randomized study, which found an average effect size of $+0.25$ on reading measures, the even larger longitudinal matched

study by Correnti et al. (2009), which reported an effect size of +0.43, and the six-year longitudinal study by Slavin et al. (1993), which found an effect size of +0.48. These are evaluations of the fully developed model as used on a significant scale. Averaging across 23 methodologically adequate studies synthesized in a Best Evidence Encyclopedia review by Slavin et al. (2009b), the sample size-weighted mean effect size was +0.29. The mean was +0.33 for decoding measures and +0.27 for comprehension/total reading measures. Effects of this size for widely replicated models, especially in studies by third-party evaluators, indicate a robust impact of practical and policy importance. To give a sense of perspective, the difference between African-American or Hispanic and White reading scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress is equal to an effect size of about 0.50. Success for All effect sizes are more than half of this gap, and in several studies the outcomes achieved would completely close the gap.

C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.**
- (2) The extent to which the eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that it has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

The Success for All Foundation (SFAF), the nonprofit organization that will lead the proposed project, has an exceptional record in carrying out projects of the size and scope of this one, and achieving positive student outcomes in urban and rural schools serving many children in poverty. SFAF spun off from Johns Hopkins University in 1998 in order to carry on the

development, evaluation, and dissemination of Success for All that had been under way at Johns Hopkins since 1987. SFAF has a total staff of 220, of whom about 120 are coaches located in various parts of the US and 100 are developers, researchers, and experts on finance, human resources, marketing, information technology, and so on. The total annual budget of SFAF is about \$30 million, and comes mostly from fees for service and materials that schools usually pay from their Title I budgets. SFAF also receives grants to develop and evaluate new programs, usually from the U.S. Department of Education. This research work is carried out in collaboration with researchers at the Center for Research and Reform in Education (CRRE), part of the Johns Hopkins University School of Education.

SFAF has extensive experience in implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects. Throughout the 1990's, the core Success for All program was growing its network of schools by about 50% each year. In more recent years, Success for All turnaround has continued to grow, adding approximately 100 schools per year to its network. We have developed, evaluated, and scaled up programs in middle school reading, preschool, elementary and middle school math, elementary writing, and reading for English language learners, and we are currently piloting a high school reading program under a grant from the US Department of Education. We are developing, evaluating, and disseminating tutoring and beginning reading models that make extensive use of technology. Each of these projects is large, complex, and rapidly growing, but we have developed a talented staff and extensive infrastructure to enable us to successfully carry out these projects.

The evidence that the Success for All Foundation has significantly improved student achievement is presented in Section B, above. In addition to our elementary turnaround model, we have also created programs that have demonstrated positive effects on student learning

outcomes in preschool (Chambers, 2009), middle school reading (Slavin, Chamberlain, Daniels, & Madden, 2009), elementary writing (Madden, Slavin, & Logan, 2010), and elementary and middle school math (Slavin & Lake, 2008; Slavin, Lake, & Groff, 2009).

D. Quality of Project Evaluation

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed experimental study.

An independent third-party evaluation, conducted by MDRC, will include a rigorous cluster Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) to measure program impacts. A total of 50 Title I elementary schools that have been designated by their respective states as either in corrective action or restructuring under NCLB will be recruited from geographically diverse districts and randomly assigned to either a treatment group implementing SFA or a control group continuing with business as usual. Students will be followed over four years and assessed on reading skills at baseline and each spring. The implementation research, discussed below, will assess treatment fidelity and the treatment-control instructional contrast.

Research Questions: To reduce concerns about multiple hypotheses testing producing statistically significant impact by chance, we will follow IES guidelines (See NCEE- 2008-4081) by pre-specifying a small number of primary – confirmatory – research questions and by conducting a composite statistical test to “qualify” or call into question multiple hypothesis tests that are statistically significant individually but that may be due to chance in the context of mixed results.

The main **confirmatory** research question guiding the study design is: ***What is the impact of SFA on elementary school students’ reading achievement, compared to students in***

non-SFA schools? An answer to this question will determine our assessment of whether SFA is successful at turning around low-performing schools.

In addition to the main confirmatory question, this evaluation will address **exploratory questions** intended to deepen our understanding of the overall average impact of SFA:

1. ***Subgroup impacts (experimental)***: How do impacts of SFA differ for students at high, average, and low levels of reading readiness (measured at baseline)? For students of various ethnic backgrounds? For boys and girls? For English language learners (also measured at baseline)?
2. ***Impacts on non-cognitive outcomes (experimental)***: What is the impact of SFA on school-level measures of attendance, special education assignments, and retention rates?
3. ***Dosage (non-experimental)***: Does SFA produce greater impacts for students who receive a greater amount of SFA services: that is, a “stable sample” of students who remain in the SFA schools over several years?
4. ***Program Implementation (correlational)***: Are impacts on reading achievement higher in districts with stronger implementation of the SFA treatment?

Site Recruitment and Random Assignment: During the 2010-11 school year, districts will be recruited for the study. Within each district, we will offer eligible elementary schools an opportunity to participate in SFA at no cost for staff training or instructional materials. School staffs will receive information about SFA and will vote to participate in the study (as is done in all SFA scale-up schools). Only schools in which 75% of teachers vote in favor of participating will be included. Schools will be randomly assigned to either the SFA treatment or the control condition. To gain their cooperation for the study and data collection activities, the control schools will be offered payments of up to \$20,000 to use for any purpose. (We decided against a

research design that would delay implementation in the control schools because of the 4-year study period.)

Student Study Sample: Fall 2011 kindergarten students in the randomly assigned schools will comprise the student study sample. Assuming an average of 60 kindergarten students per school, this will result in a total baseline sample of about 3,000 children (1,500 in the SFA schools and 1,500 in the control schools). These students will be followed for four years, through the end of the 2014-15 school year when they will reach third grade. Since the analysis focuses on the schools in the sample, we will not follow students who move away from their original study school, but will include “in movers” who join the target grades over time. We will collect annual data on the composition of students in both the treatment and control schools to check for any unexpected effects on student mobility and, if there are none, we will also be able to examine impacts for a “stable sample” of students who remain in the SFA and control schools over time.

Key Outcome Measures: The primary student outcome is students’ achievement in reading. In the fall of 2011, kindergarten students will be individually pretested on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) and on Woodcock-Johnson III Letter-Word Identification. In the spring of 2012, we will field individually-administered follow-up tests using the Woodcock Letter-Word Identification and Word Attack scales. In the spring of 2013 (when students are completing first grade) and 2014 (when they are completing second grade) and 2015 (when they are completing third grade), we will field individually-administered Woodcock Letter-Word Identification, Word Attack, and Passage Comprehension assessments, and the DIBELs, a reading fluency measure. Each wave of testing will be completed within a 4-5 week window to reduce growth-related differences, and the treatment-control schools within districts will be tested concurrently to reduce the possible introduction of bias from test timing differences.

Because of the policy importance of state assessments, we will also make arrangements with the study districts to obtain state reading test data for students, which will be analyzed as a *sensitivity test* of the confirmatory findings, as discussed below. We anticipate that state test data will only be available for students in grade 3, though testing regimes may include lower grades by 2015. To deal with the variation in tests across states we will place the different tests on the same metric by converting them to z scores, as suggested by May (2009). In addition, we will collect attendance rates, special education assignment rates, and retention rates from school records for individual students, which will allow us to estimate impacts on these exploratory outcomes for students at all grade levels in the study.

Impact Analysis: Our basic impact estimate will be a two-level HLM model with students nested in schools. (Students cannot be nested in classrooms as students are regrouped every quarter, and may have several reading teachers in a year.) Blocking will account for any stratification in the school lotteries should districts request this. Covariates in the impact model will include key student characteristics such as percentages of ELL, special education, and free/reduced price lunch students, and baseline student reading achievement test score. This model will provide an intent-to-treat estimate of providing access to the intervention on students in the average school in the sample.

We estimate minimum detectable effect sizes (the smallest true effect that can be detected for a specified level of power and significance level for any given sample size) of .19 for reading achievement test scores for students. These calculations are based on a sample of 50 schools split evenly between treatment and control, 60 students per grade per school, 80 percent power, an R^2 of covariates in predicting outcomes of 0.50, a statistical significance level of .05 with a two-tailed test, and between-school variation in test scores of .09 and between-teacher variation

in test scores of .14, and covariates explain 53 percent of between-school variation and 76 percent of between-teacher variation. Analysis of student subgroups constituting approximately half the sample (30 students per grade per school) would have MDESs of approximately .21 for reading outcomes.

Exploratory Analyses: As mentioned above, our analysis of exploratory questions will be conducted to interpret the finding on the confirmatory research question. We will use the same impact model in estimating impacts on other outcomes and for other groups. However, we will present these findings to help readers understand the source of findings on the confirmatory question and as a source of hypotheses about explanations.

(2) The extent to which the experimental study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.

The experimental study will evaluate Success for All under precisely the conditions that exist in scale-up. That is, schools randomly assigned to use Success for All will receive the same amount of training and coaching and the same materials as schools in being added to the national network of schools. They will go through the same buy-in procedure, with staff voting to participate if selected.

(3) 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.

Our planned evaluation will address four key topics related to the implementation of SFA in the study schools: 1) How did SFA staff work with schools to implement the SFA program?

What resources, training, materials, and ongoing technical assistance were needed? 2) Was the SFA model implemented with reasonable fidelity in the study schools? 3) What was the contrast in the education experience, especially related to reading instruction, between the SFA schools and the control schools? and 4) What are the implementation lessons both as the study unfolds and for future replication efforts? Our analysis will draw on information collected through four methods, as discussed below in order of the key topics listed above.

SFA Implementation Experience: Our analysis will rest on structured interviews and brief surveys with SFA staff and school administrators and teachers. Experienced MDRC qualitative researchers will visit the 25 program schools (and, as discussed below) a sample of control schools in the spring of 2012 and 2013. During the visits to the program schools, they will interview the principal and teachers providing reading instruction to understand their perspectives on SFA and its implementation, the support they received, challenges that arose, and responses that were developed to address them. In addition, a teacher survey will be the source of information about teachers' background and experience, knowledge of reading instruction, relationships with students, and perceptions of the school environment. MDRC staff will administer the surveys at the SFA schools during the course of site visits conducted during the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years. These data, in conjunction with the School Achievement Snapshots, discussed below, will provide valuable insights into the conditions under which effective and faithful implementation of the program model is most likely to occur.

Fidelity of Implementation: SFA is a complex program which has developed detailed rubrics, known as the School Achievement Snapshot, that trained SFA coaches use in the course of regular site visits to rate each school on the extent to which it has implemented the key structures and instructional processes associated with the program and to guide ongoing technical

assistance efforts. Given the extensive knowledge of SFA needed to rate its fidelity and the investment SFA has made in the design and fielding of the Snapshot, MDRC intends to capitalize on this instrument to develop measures of the extent to which the 25 program schools exhibit fidelity to the SFA model. MDRC staff will then use these data to identify key constructs that summarize the extent to which key elements of SFA are implemented with fidelity in the treatment schools. This strategy will provide much more reliable measures of fidelity than any effort by evaluators to rate program services.

Service Contrast between SFA and Control Schools: The service contrast produced by implementing SFA is the driver of observed impacts on student outcomes, so it is important to measure the extent and dimensions of the service difference between the SFA and control schools. In our field research, we will interview control school administrators to learn about improvement efforts. As a quantitative measure of the key service contrast related to reading and literacy instruction, we will field in both SFA and control schools the teacher instructional logs developed by Brian Rowan and his colleagues (n.d.) at the University of Michigan for the Study of Instructional Improvement. The log is a close-ended instrument that has been shown in prior research to differentiate effectively between instruction in SFA schools and in schools that adopted two other special reading programs (as well as schools where no special reading intervention was in place). We plan to collect logs from each reading teacher in each of the 50 study schools in the winter and spring of 2012, 2013, and 2014, with an expected sample of approximately 20 logs per school or 500 for the SFA schools and 500 for the control schools each year, which is sufficient to identify differences in instruction between the two groups of schools.

Feedback on Lessons for Scale up and Replication: At the end of each of the first three study years, we will produce an annual interim report that will provide both periodic assessments of the impact of SFA on student’s achievement outcomes, as well as of the fidelity of implementation, and the treatment-control contrasts. These will be relatively short reports intended to examine the extent to which progress is being made. The final summative evaluation report will report all of the annual impact estimates, as well as the planned sensitivity and exploratory analyses, the analysis of the treatment fidelity data, and the longitudinal treatment-control instructional contrasts.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

The data described above will also allow us to describe in project reports the effort needed to implement the intervention and the lessons learned for successful operation. We will be able to document the nature of the services provided, the staffing arrangements, types of training provided staff, and the challenges encountered in implementation and promising responses.

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

Our evaluation budget of approximately \$6,000,000, plus extensive support for schools randomly assigned to implement SFA, will allow us to conduct a high quality, rigorous study and share findings widely. Because the program will be offered to schools free of charge, recruitment should be relatively easy, and we can insist on clear buy-in from prospective schools

and on their full participation in the evaluation, either as Success for All or as control schools. For measuring program impacts, we have budgeted for individually-administered measures, which, although expensive, are far more sensitive than group reading measures, and will provide accurate and valid measures of key outcomes. Routine state assessments will also be analyzed in grade 3. Resources for training and coaching will be the same as those used in all Success for All schools, but these are extensive and should ensure high-quality implementations.

(6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.

The evaluation of the implementation and impact of SFA will be conducted by MDRC, which is completely independent of the SFA Foundation. MDRC will be solely responsible for random assignment of schools to treatment conditions and will inform both the schools and SFA of the final outcome. MDRC will collect all measures of student outcomes and be solely responsible for the analysis and interpretation of findings. MDRC will seek comments and suggestions from the program developer on draft reports but its technical review process and quality control systems will provide the final review of evaluation products. Further, the team will seek out venues for the dissemination of study findings both at the end of the annual impact assessments and at the end of the entire study. These will include presentations at professional conferences and meetings, and submissions to peer-reviewed journals. Finally, we will prepare a restricted use file that will be made available to other researchers who can conduct further analysis to verify and extend the findings.

Required Evaluator Collaboration and Dissemination: As specified in the grant application, the evaluation team will comply with the requirements of any program evaluation conducted by ED, and with any technical assistance provided by the Department.

E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale

We are confident that the scale-up strategy described in Section A will greatly expand the numbers of students who will benefit from the proven Success for All model. With the active involvement of district partners, concentration of scale-up efforts in local areas with large numbers of eligible schools, and reductions in first-year program costs, we expect to be able to substantially increase the reach and impact of our program.

(1) The number of students to be reached.

As noted in Section A, we expect to add 200 additional schools in 2011-2012, 250 in 2012-2013, 300 in 2013-2014, and 350 in 2014-2015, for a total of 1100 schools, or roughly 550,000 students. These schools will be in our partner districts, in local areas near our partner districts, in additional partner districts we plan to add over the course of the project, in states whose state departments of education have agreed to partner with us, and in other areas. All will be high-poverty Title I schoolwide projects, and about half will be schools initially in corrective action or restructuring.

(2) Capacity to bring the project to scale.

Working with our district and state partners, we are confident that we have the capacity to bring the project to scale. As noted in Section D, we have many years of experience in scaling up proven programs, especially the Success for All turnaround model that we are proposing to further scale up through the development of local sustainability supports.

School District Partners

Our official partners in the scale-up of Success for All represent a broad range of outstanding school districts primarily serving high-poverty schools. They range from large urban districts to smaller rural ones, from Pennsylvania to Arizona. Some have long and successful experience with Success for All, and will primarily work with SFA to expand the program in neighboring districts, while others will primarily be building capacity to establish Success for All in schools in their own districts. Characteristics of our partners are as follows.

Atlanta Public Schools is a real Success for All success story. In collaboration with a national program called Project GRAD, 26 elementary schools have used SFA for up to 10 years. These schools started off scoring 25 percentage points below the state mean, and now score near the state mean state reading tests, gaining 45 points since 2001 while the state gained 24. The Atlanta Public Schools serve about 57,000 students. 79% of Atlanta students qualify for free lunch, 78% are African American, 17% White, and 4% Hispanic.

The School District of Philadelphia primarily expects to use Success for All to help accelerate achievement in its struggling elementary schools. Philadelphia serves 178,000 students, 52% African American, 32% White, and 13% Hispanic, and 76% of students qualify for free lunch. Philadelphia's superintendent has a long association with SFA in previous districts.

Detroit Public Schools is a district that is in considerable financial difficulty and is rapidly losing population and closing schools. It currently has about 110,000 students, of whom 74% receive free lunches, 90% are African American, and 7% are Hispanic. Two Detroit charter schools have had great success with SFA. The district plans to create a special subdistrict for struggling schools, and to use Success for All in the elementary schools in this subdistrict. The

district leadership has verbally indicated its intent to partner and will complete a full partnership agreement in the coming weeks.

Prince George's County (MD) is a large suburban county with 131,000 students, located just outside of Washington, DC. Its students are 70% African American, 19% White, and 8% Hispanic, and 59% of students qualify for free lunches. Our Prince George's partners will seek to scale up Success for All within the district and in the Maryland/DC region.

Steubenville, Ohio is a small city in southeastern Ohio. The Steubenville Public Schools have been using Success for All in all five of its elementary schools for more than ten years, and the district has received national recognition for its outstanding success over many years in advancing the performance of all students. In the three original SFA schools, 94% of students passed the 2009 Ohio reading test, compared to 77% in the rest of Ohio. Steubenville serves 2340 students, of whom 66% are White, 28% African American, and 1% Hispanic, and 62% qualify for free lunch. Steubenville partners will work with districts in Ohio and West Virginia.

Geary County, Kansas serves about 6900 students, including those at the Fort Riley army base. The district has six very successful elementary schools using Success for All. The four original schools scored 15 percentage points below the state reading mean in 2000, but now score five points above the state mean, at 91% passing. The district plans to help scale up Success for All in its own district and elsewhere in Kansas. The district is 54% White, 27% African American, and 12% Hispanic.

The Roosevelt School District in Phoenix, Arizona, is an urban district serving 12,500 students, of whom 74% are Hispanic, 18% African American, and 4% White. The new superintendent in Roosevelt came from Alhambra, a similar neighboring district that has had

exceptional success with SFA. Roosevelt will scale up Success for All in its own district and elsewhere in Arizona.

Bell County and Knox County are rural Appalachian districts in Kentucky. Bell County has five and Knox County three highly successful Success for All schools. Since 2001, the Bell County SFA schools have gained 32 percentage points on the Kentucky reading test, and are now well above the state average. The Knox County schools gained 28%, while the state gained 15%. Both districts plan to work in Eastern Kentucky and Tennessee to help scale up the program. Bell County has 86% of its students receiving free lunches, and Knox County has 72%; both are overwhelmingly White.

Lorain City, Ohio serves about 8,900 students in an inner suburb of Cleveland. It has ten schools using Success for All, and plans to help disseminate the program in Northern Ohio. 53% of Lorain students are White, 30% Hispanic, and 24% African American, and 60% qualify for free lunch. Lorain's superintendent was an SFA principal and has a long association with the program.

Putnam County, Florida is a rural district in North Florida that serves 11,800 students, of whom 79% receive free lunches, 68% are White, 24% are African American, and 10% are Hispanic. Putnam has 10 schools using Success for All, and the district leadership plans to help other North Florida districts adopt the program.

Garfield, Colorado is a rural district on the Western Slope of the Rockies. The district serves 4900 students, of whom 38% receive free lunch, 56% are White, and 42% are Hispanic. It has three current Success for All schools.

Harrisburg, the capital of Pennsylvania, is one of the lowest achieving districts in the state. It serves 8,400 students, of whom 62% receive free lunch, 67% are African American, 17%

Hispanic, and 15% White. Harrisburg plans to build capacity to scale up Success for All in its own district and then disseminate it in Central Pennsylvania.

The William Penn district outside of Philadelphia plans to scale up Success for All within its district and to work with other districts in Eastern Pennsylvania. 53% of its students qualify for free lunch, 58% are African American, 36% White, and 2% Hispanic. William Penn's associate superintendent was an SFA principal and then worked as a trainer and area manager for SFAF.

An additional district in northeast Pennsylvania has indicated an intent to partner. The district includes 17,892 students. Of whom 77% qualify for free lunch and 17% are African American, 20% are White, and 62% are Hispanic.

Beyond the partners we have identified so far, we expect to add 3 additional official partners by September, 2010. We are conducting discussions with several districts, all of which are high-poverty and ethnically diverse. Some will be planning primarily to scale up Success for All internally and some to primarily work in neighboring districts, because most or all of their eligible elementary schools are already using the program. We will choose our partners based on their capacity to support scale-up of Success for All in their district or in their region.

State Partners

In addition to district partners, we have letters of support from the State Departments of Education in Pennsylvania and Colorado, as "other" partners for this i3 proposal. They will help us with access to qualifying schools and districts, integration with state plans for turning around low-achieving schools, and sharing of information. We expect to add additional state departments as "other partners" over the course of the grant period.

Matching Organizations

As a key part of our scale-up plans, we have obtained commitments from several private-sector organizations to provide matching funds of at least 20% of the amount of our request for federal funding (\$10 million). The Bowland Charitable Trust, a UK foundation, has promised \$1 to \$2 million. The Pitney Bowes Company has committed about \$1 million in direct grants and discounts, and the HBP Printing Company has also committed about \$1 million in grants and discounts. We are discussing discounts on books and direct donations of books from First Book. The Success for All Foundation will contribute funds in the form of discounts to schools. Details of these matching sources will be finalized before a grant award is made, but we are confident that we will obtain the required match.

(3) The feasibility of the project to be replicated in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations.

The experience of the Success for All Foundation extends to every type of school in all parts of the US, and with all types of students. Current Success for All schools exist in 48 states. They include many large urban districts such as Atlanta, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Honolulu, smaller cities such as Long Branch, New Jersey; Bessemer, Alabama; Roosevelt, Arizona, Steubenville, Ohio; and Victoria, Texas., inner-suburban districts such as Lorain, Ohio and Dolton, Illinois; and rural districts such as Geary County, Kansas; Putnam County, Florida, the Bering Straits in Alaska, Appalachian Kentucky, and Indian reservations in several states. In all of these places, we have evidence over many years that SFA schools are gaining on state assessments more rapidly than are other schools in the state. About 50 of our schools are charter schools, such as The Commonwealth Community Development Academy in Detroit and the Detroit Edison Public School Academy, Pacoima Elementary Charter in Los Angeles, and

Milestones Charter in Florida. We serve African American, Hispanic, White, Indian, and Inuit students, and have evidence of positive outcomes for each of these groups. The Success for All program exists in Spanish and has an adaptation for English language learners being taught in English.

The Success for All Foundation has the resources and expertise to scale up its program, as documented in Section C, above.

Surveys of teachers using Success for All have found uniformly positive attitudes toward the program (Slavin, Madden, Chambers, & Haxby, 2009). For example, in San Antonio, Texas, a superintendent several years ago asked teachers implementing several comprehensive reform models to vote on whether they would want to maintain or drop the program. More than 80% of teachers in the Success for All schools voted to continue, far more than for any other program.

(4) Estimated Cost of the Proposed Project

The cost per student of Success for All at scale is approximately \$85 per student per year over 4 years. In schools that qualify for start-up credits to help with first-year professional development costs, the cost will be \$60 per student per year, but these grants greatly reduce first-year school-level costs (from \$100,000 to \$50,000), facilitating program adoption. We do not expect a significant difference in per-pupil cost above a total of 500,000 students.

(5) Mechanisms to be used to broadly disseminate information to support replication

We propose to disseminate information on the project in many ways. First, we will purchase advertising space in popular magazines, such as *Educational Leadership* and *Education Week*, and in on-line outlets such as the *ASCD SmartBrief* and *Google Adwords*. We will attempt to take advantage of free media by talking with journalists, bloggers, and others about

newsworthy developments with Success for All and the scale-up project, especially research findings. We will purchase booth space at major national conferences, such as Title I, ASCD, AASA, and NAFEPA, and local conferences in areas where our district partners are located.

Perhaps the most effective form of dissemination is word of mouth from principal to principal and teacher to teacher. We propose to hold local demonstrations to invite principals and teachers to visit existing Success for All schools, speak with their counterparts, and form their own opinions.

In addition, our district partners and state department of education partners in several states will disseminate information about Success for All and will encourage districts and coalitions of schools to become additional partners over time.

F. Sustainability

For twenty years, the dissemination of Success for All has sustained itself almost entirely on revenues from school districts receiving SFA services and materials, which they pay from their Title I allocations. We have had federal and private foundation funding from time to time to support research and development and creation of infrastructure, but we have always been careful to ensure that the dissemination is financially self-supporting, so that we do not become dependent on external funding.

After the i3 grant period is over, we are confident that the gains we expect to make in numbers of schools making effective use of Success for All will be sustained, and that our network will continue to grow. The scale-up project will invest in infrastructure, particularly district-based coaches responsible for schools in their areas, as well as the development of materials and procedures to support high-quality implementations of Success for All in the new,

locally-focused scale-up strategy. If all works as planned, we expect most or all districts to maintain these trainers at the end of the project with their own Title I resources, because as long as the districts continue to implement Success for All, a local coach will always be their most cost-effective means of providing high-quality coaching. These coaches will already be trained and fully capable. If districts do continue to support their coaches, the scale-up strategy can continue indefinitely after project funding has ended. In situations in which they do not, the Success for All Foundation will, wherever possible, locate trainers in the local area. In either case, the schools that have adopted Success for All will, based on our past experience, be likely to continue to use it for many years without additional grant funding beyond ordinary Title I funding, ensuring that the investment made by i3 in the scaling up of Success for All will continue to benefit hundreds of thousands of vulnerable children.

Partnerships with state departments of education, intermediate units, and other cross-district organizations, will also contribute to the sustainability of scale-up. State departments are charged with helping schools and districts meet national standards under ESEA. If they have good experiences with Success for All in their struggling schools, they are likely to continue to support schools and districts in adopting and maintaining the program.

G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

Management Plan

The project will be managed by the leadership of the Success for All Foundation (SFAF) which has long experience in scaling up proven whole-school reform designs in a wide range of school settings and locations.

Partners and Coordination

The scale-up of Success for All will involve close partnerships with school districts throughout the US. Each partner district will hire one or more persons to serve as local coaches for Success for All, and SFA staff will provide extensive training and follow-up to ensure that these district-based coaches are fully prepared to provide outstanding services to local schools. Coordination between SFA and district partners will be critical to the success of this initiative. We will have regular meetings of district partner coaches and their SFA counterparts approximately 6 times during 2010-2011, and 4 times a year in 2011 and beyond. The initial group of coaches will spend the 2010-2011 school year undergoing the same training process experienced by all SFA coaches, including training in each program component, goal-focused continuous improvement strategies, and coaching approaches. Each district partner coach will be assigned to a regional SFA mentor. SFA mentors will frequently visit district partners, observe them doing coaching, and exchange feedback and new ideas. District partner coaches will participate in learning communities of SFA coaches in their region, whose members will support them in reflection on their practice as coaches, share solutions to problems, and discuss common challenges. District-based coaches will participate along with SFA coaching staff in ongoing workshops for experienced coaches and experienced schools. In addition, electronic

communications including email, webcasts, webinars, and conference calls, will be used to connect district-based coaches with SFA coaches.

SFA leaders will maintain regular contact with district leaders, such as superintendents, directors of elementary schools, and principals. SFA staff will meet regularly on site with these leaders, to review outcome and implementation data and plan for goal-focused continuous improvement. We will also meet with district leaders and coaches as a group at our annual experienced sites conferences.

District leaders, district coaches, and SFA staff will jointly agree on annual objectives in terms of amounts and quality of coaching, program adoption, and student outcomes. We will then jointly develop a goal-focused plan and monitor progress toward agreed-upon goals, recommending changes intended to improve outcomes.

SFA staff will also coordinate with “other partners,” such as state departments of education and intermediate units. Memoranda of Understanding will be negotiated individually with all partners to specify precisely what each is expected to do and to agree to time scales.

<u>Timeline</u>		
<u>Dates</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Annual Milestones</u>
October 2010- August 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruit additional partners, 200 schools, plus 50 study schools • Train district coaches • Engage in planning with partner districts • Enhance scale-up materials, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lists of partners, schools • Manuals, videos • Marketing collateral

	<p>procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance marketing materials, procedures • Hold meetings among partners 	
September 2011- August 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin randomized evaluation, pre- and post-test. Analyze data. • Recruit 250 schools • Support district coaches • Monitor quality of coaching, implementation • Hold meetings among partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First-year report on outcomes • Lists of partners, schools • Implementation reports
September 2012- August 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue randomized evaluation • Recruit 300 additional schools • Support district coaches • Monitor quality of coaching, implementation • Hold meetings among partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second-year report on outcomes • List of schools • Implementation reports
September 2013- August 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue randomized evaluation • Recruit 350 additional schools • Monitor quality of coaching, implementation • Hold meetings among partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third-year report on outcomes • List of schools • Implementation reports

September 2014- September 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze final data, write final report • Plan with partners for sustaining project after grant period • Disseminate outcomes, reports of project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report on outcomes • Sustainability report • Reports, press releases, articles
-----------------------------------	--	--

Institutional Capabilities

Success for All Foundation (SFAF) is a nonprofit organization in Baltimore that spun off from Johns Hopkins University in 1998. It has a total staff of approximately 220, including 120 field coaches who work full-time with Success for All schools and districts. SFAF develops, evaluates, and disseminates programs for high-poverty schools from prekindergarten to high school, and has considerable experience with both elementary and middle school reading reform. The Foundation has a small, active Board of Directors led by Dr. Robert Slavin. It includes Kent McGuire, Dean of the School of Education at Temple University and former Assistant Secretary of Education; Myra Williams, former CIO of Merck; and John Arnholz, an attorney at Bingham McCutchen.

(1) SFAF Facilities. SFAF’s headquarters in Baltimore houses the Foundation’s executive management as well as administrative functions including Contracts, Accounting, Outreach, Information Systems, Human Resources, and Customer Service. The facility also contains SFAF’s curriculum development groups, research staff, and several trainer support functions, including conferences, training materials, and the training institute. State-of-the-art

computers and communications systems, with technical support staff, will be available for the project.

(2) Professional Development and Curriculum Development Resources. With a professional development and coaching staff of approximately 120, SFAF has the resources to support principals, teachers, assistants, and central administrators. Currently, Success for All schools are located in more than 400 school districts in 48 states throughout the US. SFAF also has a staff of about 40 program developers working in reading, writing, math, social studies, and science, in grades prekindergarten to 10.

(3) Video Production Facilities. SFAF has an award-winning video production team that is experienced in creating television-quality content cost effectively. In addition to a producer, assistant producer, and support staff, SFAF regularly uses studios, actors, and other contractors to create educational videos.

(4) Publication and Support Services. SFAF has the publications and distribution capabilities to provide the curricular materials necessary to implement innovative programs. There is a staff of 22 publications professionals who do project management, artwork, design and layout, printing, and inventory control.

MDRC

In its 35-year history, MDRC has earned a reputation as a trusted and authoritative source of information about what works and what doesn't work in education and social policy. MDRC is known for the rigor of its research and for its commitment to building evidence and improving practice in partnership with school districts, community colleges, state and local governments, and community-based organizations. Working in fields where emotion and ideology often

dominate public debates, MDRC is a source of objective and unbiased evidence about cost-effective solutions that can be replicated and expanded to scale. With staff of more than 200 in New York and California, MDRC is engaged in close to 80 projects in five policy areas.

At a time of growing national and state interest in improving low-performing schools and better preparing students for college and work, a commitment to rigorous evaluations and demonstration programs has established MDRC as a respected voice in education research and policy. To date, MDRC has managed 20 major education studies representing a range of both structural and instructional reforms at both the secondary school and elementary school levels. At the high school level, these have included several prominent comprehensive reform interventions as well as specialized literacy programs aimed at students who enter ninth grade reading below grade level. As MDRC continues to build a body of knowledge on high school reform, it is examining school-based interventions in the elementary grades and middle school that seek to give children a strong start in developing reading and math skills as well as after-school programs that extend children's learning beyond the school day. Across the entire span of its work, MDRC has concentrated on key elements of students' instructional experiences: the skills of teachers, the content of what they teach, the duration of instruction, and the organizational setting in which teaching is done, which affects the relationship between adults and students in the schools and in the classrooms.

Central to MDRC's mission in education research is facilitating dialogue among researchers, policymakers, funder, and educators – building a shared learning community in which researchers are responsive to the needs of practitioners and practitioners are committed to taking lessons from research as they innovate.

District Partners

The identities and characteristics of our district partners were described in Section E(2).

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

The proposed staff of the Success for All scale-up project have been working for many years on development, evaluation, dissemination, and scale-up of complex school and classroom reforms. We have designed and carried out many large-scale randomized and quasi-experimental evaluations. Our school district partners also have extensive experience in educational innovation, management, and reform. Our qualifications and roles in the project are as follows.

Robert E. Slavin, Ph.D., Project Director. Dr. Slavin is Chairman of the Success for All Foundation, Director of the Johns Hopkins University Center for Research and Reform in Education, and Professor at the Institute for Effective Education at the University of York (England). Dr. Slavin has carried out many rigorous field experiments, including randomized studies of Success for All, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, bilingual education, and quasi-experimental studies of Success for All, mastery learning, individualized instruction, and other interventions. He has published more than 200 articles and 20 books on these and other topics, including educational psychology and research methods textbooks. Dr. Slavin was the PI on an IES-funded randomized evaluation of the Success for All program. He will serve as the main link to the independent evaluation and will be responsible for reports to the US Department of Education.

Nancy A. Madden, Ph.D., Project Co-Director. Dr. Madden is the President and CEO of the Success for All Foundation, which provides the training and implementation support for 1000

Success for All schools, and will provide the support for schools in this study. Dr. Madden has been President of the Foundation since it was established in 1997. Dr. Madden is also a professor at Johns Hopkins University and the University of York's Institute for Effective Education in the UK. Dr. Madden will be responsible for overseeing the provision of implementation support for schools in the study.

GwenCarol Holmes, Ed.D., Director of Partnerships. Dr. Holmes, Chief Operating Officer of SFAF, has been an elementary principal, Title I director, and director of training for Edison Schools. In her current position with the Foundation she has been responsible for coordinating services between SFAF headquarters, field operations, and SFA schools, as well as statewide initiatives. She will take primary responsibility for forming and managing partnerships with school districts.

Lynsey Seabrook, Director of Field Operations. Ms. Seabrook, Vice President for Field Operations of SFAF, will work with Dr. Madden to oversee the coaching, mentoring, and monitoring of district partner coaches.

Dan Anderson, Dissemination Director. Dan Anderson, Outreach Manager for the Success for All Foundation, has more than 13 years of experience at SFAF. He developed and executes the sales and marketing plan adopted by the Foundation. In his earlier work as an area manager he oversaw the implementation of SFA in Mid-Atlantic schools. He will be responsible for developing and then leading an outreach plan to recruit additional partners and schools and disseminate information about Success for All broadly.

(1) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Fred Doolittle, MDRC, Vice President and Director of Policy Research and Evaluation Department and Acting Director of K-12 Policy Area. Dr. Doolittle has focused on implementation and impact evaluations of programs for low-income children and youth. When he joined MDRC in 1986, he led evaluations employment programs for youth who have dropped out of high school. Starting in the mid-1990s, he began working on evaluations of elementary and secondary school reforms. He has served as leader or senior reviewer of more than 20 national, multi-site randomized field trials and other evaluations at MDRC. Recently, Dr. Doolittle completed two IES projects on which he served as project director or co-director: IES's Reading Professional Development Evaluation and the Evaluation of Enhanced Academic Instruction in After-School Programs, which both were randomized control trials. He has also served as the Co-Project Director of the Math Professional Development Evaluation (another experimental study) and is currently leading the Impact Evaluation of Response to Intervention in Early Reading, which will involve nonexperimental methods. He is also a senior reviewer on MDRC's evaluations of employment programs for individuals with substantial barriers to employment (high school dropouts, those with disabilities, and those with criminal records and of innovations in community colleges. The author of many publications, Dr. Doolittle is heavily involved in developing and reviewing research designs for projects, and reviewing reports and other products.

Dr. Doolittle has served on the faculty of the Summer Institute of Education Sciences Training on Randomized Clinical Trials and is an advisor to grantees of the W.T. Grant Foundation on research design and implementation. Prior to joining MDRC, Doolittle was on the faculty of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, where he taught graduate public policy analysis and during his tenure at MDRC he has taught program evaluation at the Yale

School of Management. He holds a law degree and Ph.D. in economics from the University of California, Berkeley Campus.

Janet Quint, MDRC Senior Associate, K - 12 Education Policy Area. Dr. Quint has led or participated in a number of mixed-methods studies of education reform initiatives. She currently leads a team examining the implementation of small high schools in New York City that were established with funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. She recently directed an evaluation of the impacts of FAST-R, a Boston-based initiative to help teachers use data to improve students' reading comprehension. She was project manager for MDRC's Scaling Up First Things First evaluation and is the author of a report synthesizing the findings of that study and of two other MDRC evaluations of high school reform initiatives. She was also principal investigator for a study of a theory of instructional change enunciated by the Institute for Learning at the University of Pittsburgh; the study used survey and observational data to develop statistical indicators of the stages in the theory and to develop quantitative estimates of the links between these stages. Before joining MDRC's K-12 policy area, she played major roles in the organization's evaluations of programs for welfare recipients and young mothers. A graduate of Harvard University, she received a Master of Arts in Teaching degree from the University of Chicago and a Ph.D. in sociology from the City University of New York.

Pei Zhu, MDRC Senior Associate, K - 12 Education Policy Area. Dr. Zhu is an economist in MDRC's K-12 Education policy area whose current work focuses on experimental and quasi-experimental impact analyses, evaluation design, and related methodological issues. She is leading the student achievement impact analysis for several federally funded group-level randomized experiment projects, including evaluations of professional development programs for second-grade reading teachers and seventh-grade math teachers, as well as the evaluation of

the Response to Intervention program for struggling readers in early elementary grades. In addition, she has worked on the impact analysis on student outcomes in the National Reading First Impact Study and the evaluation of enhanced academic instruction in after-school programs for second- through fifth-graders. Her work at MDRC also includes several methodological studies on empirical issues related to group randomized experiments and on reliability of measurements for group settings. She received her Ph.D. in economics from Princeton University.

References

- Borman, G., & Hewes, G. (2002). Long-term effects and cost effectiveness of Success for All. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24* (2), 243-266.
- Borman, G., Slavin, R.E., Cheung, A., Chamberlain, A., Madden, N.A., & Chambers, B. (2007). Final reading outcomes of the national randomized field trial of Success for All. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(3) 701-703. Winner of the 2008 Palmer O. Johnson Award, AERA.
- Bryk, T., & Raudenbush, S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (Second Edition). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Chambers, B., Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Cheung, A., & Gifford, R. (2005). *Effects of Success for All with embedded video on the beginning reading achievement of Hispanic children*. Baltimore, MD: Success for All Foundation.
- Chambers, B. (2009). Curiosity Corner: Getting All Children Ready for School, *Early Childhood Services, 3*(3), 227-243.
- Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center (2006). *CSRQ center report on elementary comprehensive school reform models*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Correnti, R. (2009, March). *Examining CSR program effects on student achievement: Causal explanation through examination of implementation rates and student mobility*. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness, Crystal City, VA.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L.S. (2006). Introduction to response to intervention: What, why, and how valid is it? *Reading Research Quarterly, 41* (1), 92-128.

- Herman, R. (1999). *An educator's guide to schoolwide reform*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L.J., & Wasik, B.A. (1993). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30, 123-148.
- Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., & Logan, M. (2010). *Effects of cooperative writing with embedded multimedia: A randomized experiment*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- May, H. (2009). *Using state tests in educational experiments: A discussion of the issues*. Revised Draft Report: June 2009. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2010). *The nation's report card: Reading 2009*. (NCES 2010-458). Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Rowan, B., Camburn, E., & Correnti, R. (n.d.). *Using teacher logs to measure the enacted curriculum: A study of literacy teaching in third grade classrooms*. Unpublished paper, University of Michigan.
- Rowan, B. & R. Correnti (2009). Studying reading instruction with teacher logs: Lessons from the study of instructional improvement. *Educational Reseracher*, 38, 2, 120-131.
- Rowan, B., R. Correnti, R. Miller, & E. Camburn (2009). *School improvement by design: Lessons from a study of comprehensive school reform programs*. Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Schochet, P. (2008). *Guidelines for multiple testing in experimental evaluations of educational interventions*. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education.

- Slavin, R.E., & Calderón, M. (Eds.) (2001), *Effective programs for Latino students*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Slavin, R. E., Chamberlain, A., Daniels, C., & Madden, N.A. (2009). The Reading Edge: A randomized evaluation of a middle school cooperative reading program. *Effective Education, 1* (1), 13-26.
- Slavin, R., & Lake, C. (2008). Effective programs in elementary mathematics; A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 78* (3), 427-515. Winner of the 2009 AERA Review of Research Award.
- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Chambers, B., Cheung, A., & Davis, S. (2009). Effective reading programs for the elementary grades: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(4), 1391-1465.
- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Davis, S., & Madden, N. (2009). *Effective programs for struggling readers: A best-evidence synthesis*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Slavin, R.E., Lake, C., & Groff, C. (2009). Effective programs in middle and high school mathematics: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 79* (2), 839-911.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Chambers, B., & Haxby, B. (2009). *Two million children: Success for All*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J., & Wasik, B.A. (1993). *Success for All in the Baltimore City Public Schools: Year 6 report*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.
- Social Programs that Work (2008). *Success for All*. Retrieved 12/12/08 from www.evidencebasedprograms.org.