

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/02/2010 11:50 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

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 15 Points)	15	13
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	_____
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	15
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	15
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
7. 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	1	1

Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students
(0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	105	62

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #1:

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the

proposed project.

Strengths

This project represents a major scaling up of a program that has solid research support working with high-need students in multiple contexts (48 states, rural, suburban, and urban settings) and from different backgrounds (Black, Latina, American Indian, Asian, Immigrant). While Success For All is over 20 years old and operates in 1000 schools, these are still a small fraction of the total number of schools nationally in corrective action or restructuring.

Success for All (SFA) has shown good resiliency to school and district-level churn (e.g., teacher, principal, and central office) (p. 7), with schools maintaining the model at a median rate of 10 years. Given that the particular districts that this project will target tend to be more chaotic, this is an important strength.

The model itself, with its use of classroom embedded support for teachers and on-going support/training for its coaching corps, is a robust approach in terms of ensuring fidelity of implementation and buy-in from schools over time. The use of data from formative and summative assessments to inform instruction and school intervention is excellent. The additional supports provided by the Solutions Team for schools to address school climate/student behavioral issues strengthens the utility of this model for use of struggling schools, since often these schools lack a cohesive plan to manage school climate and connect with community resources for the families of students needing more support than the school can provide.

The applicant provides a thorough description of why Goal 1 (reduce cost of SFA) addresses a major barrier this program has faced (and will face) to scaling. The strategy of localizing its coaching support staff makes sense both financially and in terms of fostering sustained district and schools' support and buy-in. It also should strengthen the fidelity of implementation because local coaches will be able to give much more intensive, tailored, and timely support to teachers/schools. Providing scholarships to the neediest schools while these local coach networks are being established seems a good strategy to ensure the rate of scale-up proposed stays on target. The additional rationale regarding the difficult financial outlook for districts over the next several years seems compelling and well aligned to the source of the i3 funding (e.g., ARRA).

The plan for reaching Goal 2 (reaching over 500,000 students) seems grounded in reasonable assumptions in terms of district interest and the capacity of SFA to scale-up at the proposed rate per year. The investment in marketing and awareness models (p. 12), the creation of media tools, and distance learning models for use by rural sites should all support SFA

reaching the number and diversity of schools it proposes.

Weaknesses

Success for All's laser-like focus on reading achievement and ensuring all students are on grade level by the time they transition to middle grades is also its weakness. It assumes that improved reading proficiency will translate into sufficient overall gains across the academic areas to close achievement gaps. While reading skills are critical to mastery of math and the other academic areas, skilled instruction in concepts and skills particular to those domains is still necessary to close gaps for high need students.

The proposed shift to having Districts hire groups of coaches could be problematic in terms of ensuring they are strong teachers in the first place. Districts are often bound by union agreements that require seniority act as the primary criteria in selecting teachers for advancement to coach or for any other position on the career lattice. It will be important for SFA to pay close attention to how the Districts will choose their coaches as part of the memorandum of understanding (MOU) process described on page 39.

It is not clear that SFA has fully accounted for in its scale-up plan the cliff most states (and districts) will be facing in the next couple years as ARRA funds dry up and the economy still continues to sag. More districts and schools may need the \$50,000 credits than what SFA is anticipating.

Reader's Score: 13

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant,

substantial, and important 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.

(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, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(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

SFA did grow at a rapid rate in the 1990's (p. 19, 29) and continues to grow and maintain a large and diverse network of schools. The proposed rate of growth for this project is similar with that of past performance. The SFA model is multifaceted and suggests the applicant has experience in implementing complex projects at scale as well. For instance, SFA includes:

extensive professional development for teachers and principals across a range of skills and knowledge (p. 4); an articulated K-6 reading program (p. 5); a system of formative and benchmark assessments (p. 5); tutoring for students (p. 5); and the Solutions Team to address non-academic issues that arise in schools (p.6)).

Strong evidence that this applicant has improved student outcomes and closed gaps is provided on page 17 and 18, with a sufficient number of effect sizes falling into the .40-.48 range.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.**
- (2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.**
- (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.**
- (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.**
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**
- (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.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(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 proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

The number and spread of students SFA proposes to reach via this grant is significant (500,000), and their strategy of focusing on empowerment or turnaround schools in both rural and urban settings is compelling. The applicant's plan for scale up is strong. SFA has the capacity to expand at a rapid rate, as evidenced by their scale-up in the 90's (p. 29). The fact that their network extends across 48 states and is large (1000 schools) demonstrates good capacity as well. The proposed change from a purely centralized coaching and new school support structure to a more localized model seems sensible and should improve SFA's capacity to scale up and also to sustain the work beyond the grant period. The resumes of the personnel to be assigned to this project are well aligned with the goals, with

all having significant prior experience cultivating and supporting new SFA schools.

The proposed strategy of requiring MOU's with State (p. 32) and District (p. 39) leadership and a school-level super-majority vote (p. 6) to become an SFA school (p. to ensure strong buy-in and minimizing problems with implementation due to district churn is good. It should help protect the project against changes in strategy that often accompany changes in leadership at each of these levels.

The applicant's plan to localize coaching and thus significantly reduce costs to expansion going forward greatly strengthens the feasibility of replication for SFA after the i3 grant is over. Linking replication to Title 1 funds is also a good strategy since its unlikely those funds will dry up in the next 10 years. The diversity in the district partners identified (p. 30-33) is good from both the perspective of regional and district-type and in the large number of high need students and schools in the urban districts that are not SFA affiliated yet. This should give the applicant plenty of scale-up potential from the very start.

The fact that SFA has a Spanish version, as well as a track record with immigrant students speaking a wide variety of languages is a strength. (p. 34-35)

The fact that the median number of years the SFA schools have sustained implementation is 10 years is impressive and makes a strong argument for user satisfaction and sustainability.

The cost estimates per student for the proposed project seem reasonable (\$85)(p. 35). The applicants plan for matching is also reasonable, as it is a diversified approach that does not rely on any one source exclusively (p. 34). They are also organizations that SFA has prior relationship with, which in the case of foundations (Bowland) and vendors (Ptney, HBP Printing, and First Book) are an important factor in securing additional funds.

The dissemination plan (pp. 35-36) includes a mix of academic and practitioner audiences, as well as a diverse array of strategies (e.g., national and local conferences, word of mouth, local demonstrations, state department of education).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

The applicant's discussion of sustainability shows a strong understanding of district finances and the current and future challenges they face in this economic downturn. SFA's current network has been self-sustaining to date on Title 1 funds. The applicant's budget discussion suggests SFA is not expensive to maintain, and that it's been the start-up costs that have been prohibitive. This proposal addresses that issue directly through the shift to more localized coaching/new school support personnel. This capacity investment in SFA should be a one-time cost and tool the organization for continued aggressive expansion after the grant.

On pages 36-37, the applicant makes a strong case for how the changes in infrastructure this grant would support (e.g., the development of local coaching corps) would allow SFA to control start-up costs in a manner that should allow the program to both sustain its expanded network and continue to grow more rapidly than it has in has in the last 10 years.

The application includes information on a multi-year financial and operating model (pp. 35-36).

Weaknesses

The memoranda of understanding discussed on page 39 do not address the matter of sustainability for each district explicitly, thus it is unclear if they intend to continue SFA beyond the grant period.

The multi-year financial and operating model described in the application lacks specifics on costs.

Reader's Score: 9

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

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

(3) 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.

Strengths

The annual setting of objectives (p. 39) regarding coaching and program implementation, as part of the MOU with each district, is a good strategy for maintaining the district leadership's focus on the project and making midcourse corrections.

The SFA leadership team is well seasoned in scaling this model across many contexts.

SFA has a large corps of coaches (120) and trainers that should be able to support the rate of expansion proposed. The fact that the applicant has a strong in-house research and development division is also a strength to this application in providing capacity to adapt to new contexts/challenges and also to learn from and coordinate the Manpower Development Research Corporation (MDRC) evaluation.

MDRC has a strong track record of rigorous research in education (e.g., evaluation of Talent Development, Career Academies, First Things First).

Weaknesses

The assigned percentages (e.g., 25%) for this project for the Director of Partnership and the Director of Training seem low given that this proposed expansion would double the number of schools.

The application does not include clearly defined responsibilities for the management personnel. The timeline and milestones provided are not sufficiently detailed given the complexity of the project. More information on the expected flow of activities within each academic year is necessary to evaluate this aspect of the management plan.

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

SFA's ability to close gaps in reading achievement in grades K-3 is impressive (p. 18). The model provides schools with a consistent, comprehensive, and research-based approach to reading in the early grades that maximize student skill acquisition.

SFA's formative and benchmarking assessment system addresses developmental milestones in reading acquisition.

SFA's reading program is aligned to support children's transition from pre-reading to fluency, and provides aligned instructional materials to support smooth transitions from kindergarten through third grade.

Weaknesses

SFA program does not target children from birth to age three, or preschool children.

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

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 impact of SFA on student retention and assignment to disability status (e.g., lowering those rates) is well evidenced and impressive, as is their data on closing gaps for these two populations. (p. 2) The fact that their approach is consistent with response to intervention guidelines is also a strength. The program has two versions to specifically address the needs of ELL students (p. 2)

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

The applicant provides information on its experience working with rural schools and includes scale-up strategies that are specific to rural schools. (p. 3)

Weaknesses

No particular adaptations of the SFA model are proposed for rural schools, such that one could describe the approach as being innovative for this particular competitive priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2010 11:50 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/06/2010 10:48 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

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 15 Points)	15	_____
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	20
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	_____
7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	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	1	_____

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____
TOTAL	105	34

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #2:

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important 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.

(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, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Success for All provides evidence that relates directly to each of the two factors related to the strength of research evidence.

Ample strong research evidence is provided of the efficacy of Success for All is provided including longitudinal studies using matched control groups. A number of well designed and well implemented experimental and quasi-experimental studies are summarized in the proposal.

High quality research designs have used standard measures such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and Woodcock Reading Mastery Test administered by testers not aware of treatment assignments. Demonstrated gains in multiple studies have been significant and notable(Proposal Pp. e13 to e18).

In addition to the evidence reported in the proposal, Success for All has been

considered by the What Works Clearinghouse which has recognized evidence of program impact.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 20

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.**
- (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

Weaknesses

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed**

quasi-experimental study.

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

(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.

(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.

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

(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.

Strengths

Success for all has provided a comprehensive program evaluation that addresses all of the major elements of the project.

1) The project evaluation to be conducted by MDRC is based on randomized controlled trials including 50 schools designated under NCLB for restructuring or corrective action that are randomly assigned to either treatment (SFA) or control groups.

2) Student growth will be assessed over four years and analysis will include subgroup impacts, cognitive and non-cognitive outcomes, and intensity of treatment for schools, and program implementation at the district level.

3) Comparison schools will be offered payments of \$20,000 to be used for any purpose.

4) Standard measures of reading ability will be used including the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Woodcock tests, and DIBELs as a reading fluency measure. Assessments will be administered by trained testers blind to the participation status of the students being tested.

5) A variety of proven non-cognitive measures will be used to assess implementation and track impacts as reported by teachers and school administrators. Annual impact evaluations will be provided and data files will be made available to other researchers.

Weaknesses

Much of the expansion and implementation will take place in Partner Districts where Success for All has already established programs in local schools. The expansion of the program in these districts may be to schools that might be considered as late adopter schools which may have desired to enter the program in the past but were unable to enter because they had lacked funds, lacked commitment to the program, or were given a lower priority for Success for All implementation by their school districts. The research design should take into account the fact that many of the participating districts and schools are already Success for All partners. Because of the scale-up nature of the program it is important to provide for exploration of the differences in implementation and success between districts and schools in Partner Districts and in districts and schools new to Success for All.

Success for All is a complicated program that requires substantial commitment and activity on the part of partner schools and districts. More detail is needed in the exploration of the fidelity of the program implementation and the relation of fidelity of implementation to program success. Fidelity is mentioned in the research design but it is not treated in depth.

Reader's Score: 14

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.**
- (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 proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

Weaknesses

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

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

(3) 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.

Strengths

Weaknesses

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: 07/06/2010 10:48 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/03/2010 0:21 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

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 15 Points)	15	_____
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	19
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	_____
7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	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	1	_____

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____
TOTAL	105	34

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #3:

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important 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.

(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, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

An impressive array of large well constructed, rigorous studies, both experimental and quasi-experimental with excellent internal and external validity, has consistently demonstrated robust, positive results. The intervention has been particularly successful with at risk students. Success has been demonstrated through reading scores, retention rates, and assignment to special education.

Weaknesses

Reported effect sizes, while consistently positive, have varied considerably. However, the consensus indicates a robust effect which is somewhat modest in magnitude.

Reader's Score: 19

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(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

Weaknesses

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

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

(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.

(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.

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

(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.

Strengths

A highly credible, independent external evaluation of outcomes is planned. It will be a randomized control trial with a substantial sample of schools in corrective active or restructuring followed for a substantial term (4 years) serving about 3,000 students. It includes a strong HLM design with an appropriate selection of covariates. The accompanying process/implementation evaluation plan is rigorous.

The budget for the proposed evaluation is appropriate.

The prioritization of research questions is well done, minimizing the possibility of selective reporting of mixed results.

There is a strong array of exploratory research questions to be answered.

Evaluation of outcomes will employ standard measures of reading readiness and achievement (PPVY & WJIII) with strong established psychometric characteristics.

A reasonable plan for dissemination of results is in place with a restricted use data file to be made available to the research community.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(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 proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

Weaknesses

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

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

(3) 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.

Strengths

Weaknesses

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: 07/03/2010 0:21 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/07/2010 1:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

Reader #4:

	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 15 Points)	15	9
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	0
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	12
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	12
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	5
7. 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	1	1

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1
TOTAL	105	48

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #4:

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

The application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

The unmet need presented in the application is to create partnerships with districts to hire local Success for All training staff so that by Year 2 of the project and into the future, program training can be conducted by district and school-based coaches.

Clear goals and strategies are stated for scale-up. The goals are simple, straightforward, and related to the project's priorities. The plan for accomplishing the goals is well-designed to achieve the outcomes of the project.

Weaknesses

The project is not a new innovation. According to the application, it is used in one thousand schools in 45 states and has been in operation since 1987. As a result, the "not already widely adopted" standard has not been met.

In spite of clear goals and strategies stated in the application, it is unclear how the partnership structure will develop district-to-district and school-to-school partnerships for sharing coaches. Information on the system or guidelines that will be used to insure equitable distribution of coaches between districts and, within districts, between and among schools would be helpful because the amount of coaching time available to schools and districts would affect project outcomes. Since this is at the heart of the scale-up effort, it should be spelled out in more detail.

Reader's Score: 9

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important 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.

(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, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Not assigned to score Selection Criterion B.

Weaknesses

Not assigned to score Selection Criterion B.

Reader's Score: 0

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(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 long history of experience with managing large, complex projects beginning in 1987. According to the application narrative, 100 Success for All schools are added every year and the program had a 50 percent annual growth rate in its first years of operation.

The program has expanded across grade levels and now goes from pre-school to middle school. In addition, a high school program is currently being piloted. The program also expanded from a focus on reading only to mathematics and writing.

The applicant has developed and managed an impressive and integrated infrastructure of support for schools and districts that is extensive and complex.

Data provided by the applicant supports its claim that use of the program has produced positive trends in student achievement. Studies ranging from 1993 to 2007 using a variety of reading tests consistently showed more gains for students using Success For All than for students not involved in the program. In addition, students in the program were less likely to be held back a grade or referred for special education services.

Weaknesses

In certain aspects of implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects, the applicant's past performance is not well established. These aspects include:

- a) The experience of the applicant in creating successful across district partnerships.
- b) The experience of the applicant in coordinating local coaching services across schools and districts. The example used in the narrative - schools in Atlanta, Georgia - does not indicate the number of schools involved nor how the budget and cost is shared among schools.
- c) The applicant's track record for building local supports at each site with speed and efficiency.

Reader's Score: 12

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.**
- (2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.**
- (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.**
- (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.**
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**
- (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.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.**
- (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 proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

The number of schools that will be added to the network of Success for All schools through the scale-up project is impressive and was reported in the narrative - 1100 schools. According to the application, all are high-poverty Title I-eligible schools with school wide status. The applicant estimates that one-half will be in corrective action under the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Good detail on the districts to be served by the project was provided in the narrative. The departments of education of two states that will consider Success for All as a turnaround model for their lowest performing elementary schools were also named. In addition, the applicant reports successful implementation in urban, rural, and public schools including public charter schools. This is useful information for determining feasibility and replicability.

The applicant indicates that some foundation-based funding has been secured for some of the districts and schools involved in the scale-up so that funding is available to assist with replication.

The cost per pupil was provided and seems to be reasonable and is borne out by budget calculations.

Dissemination is planned and will be accomplished through ads in education magazines, Education Week, and online education sites. In addition, purchasing booths at conferences, conducting local demonstrations of the program, hosting press conferences on results, and publishing blogs will also be used.

Weaknesses

Calculation of the numbers of students in the 1100 elementary schools to be served by the project could be overstated, especially in rural LEAs. The calculation is based on 500 students per elementary school which may be too high a figure.

Reader's Score: 12

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

The main funding source for Success for All has been Title I funds because of the program's focus on reading and intensive remediation for at-risk learners. Title I funds are a more stable funding source than foundation funds. As a result, Success for All will continue to identify and recommend Title I funds, rather than foundation dollars, for program continuance.

Success for All will add the new schools to its already existing network of schools thus incorporating them into the ongoing work of the organization.

Weaknesses

Title I funding is seen by many school districts as external to local school budgets contrary to the applicant's claim that the project is not dependent on external funding. As a result, if a district experiences cuts in Title I funds or schools become ineligible to receive Title I funds, problems with sustainability will occur.

No mention of the provision of training for local coaches beyond certification is made in the application. It is unclear how quality control and fidelity of implementation can be assured as part of the sustainability effort if

training does not continue after certification.

While the applicant cites partnerships with other states as an indication that the project will continue into the future, partnerships have only been secured with two departments of education in two states - Colorado and Pennsylvania - and letters of support from state officials indicate that these two states will use the partnership with Success for All as a possible turnaround model for their lowest-achieving elementary schools. No firm commitments are contained in the letters.

Letters of agreement from partnering districts are contractual and indicate that Success for All will provide funding for coaches through the 5 years of the project. No mention is made in the letters of the districts' continuing funding on their own when the project is over.

While the applicant included a multi-year financial plan in the budget narrative to scale up the program over the five years of the grant cycle, the plan did not provide evidence that the applicant has the financial resources to continue the program for schools and districts after the funding period.

Reader's Score: 5

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.**
- (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.**
- (3) 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.**

Strengths

A timeline with dates, activities, milestones, and deliverables is provided in the narrative on pages 39-40. Since this timeline will be incorporated into Memoranda of Understanding with districts, clear expectations for

performance and accountability are spelled out. This increases the likelihood that performance targets will be met.

The management plan is comprehensive. Key project personnel include a Project Director, a Co-Director, a Director of Partnerships, a Director of Field Operations, and a Dissemination Director. Personnel appear to have range of project management experiences with complex and growing projects as well as knowledge of the Success for All program. In addition, members of the central Success for All executive management staff who will support the project have extensive operational expertise, including budgeting, accounting, human resources, customer service, information technology, and marketing. A large coaching and training staff will also be used.

The independent evaluator appears to have the required qualifications for designing and conducting large scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies.

Weaknesses

Although, the narrative outlines coordination activities of the Success for All leaders, persons (or positions) responsible for project activities, milestones, and deliverables are not yet specified in the project's timeline. Clear assignment of duties and responsibilities is needed to insure that sustainability and scalability goals are adhered to and met.

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 project focuses on readiness in core academic subjects, developmental milestones are included in program outcomes for early learners, and alignment and articulation with the elementary program is part of the program.

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

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 program focuses on the identification and remediation of struggling learners through one-on-one and small group instruction. It is a preventative approach to early learning difficulties experienced by special needs and limited English proficient learners.

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

Some rural LEAs are included in the project scale-up plan and a distance learning effort is proposed.

Weaknesses

It is unclear from the project narrative that all the schools involved in the scale-up effort are rural LEAs.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/07/2010 1:38 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/08/2010 3:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

Reader #5:

	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 15 Points)	15	14
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	0
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	15
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	0
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	15
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
7. 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	1	1

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1
TOTAL	105	65

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #5:

Applicant: Success for All Foundation -- , - , (U396A100050)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

The project addresses serving Limited English Proficient students. The program also addresses benefits for students with vision, hearing, emotional, and learning disabilities. In addition, Success For All includes a Spanish version that provides solid evidence that the program focuses on English Language Learners. Many of the partner school districts that the project serves also have high numbers of LEP student populations.

Pages e9-e12 provide a detailed listing of 7 project goals. All of the goals are clearly stated and each goal is supported by strategies that are explicitly aligned with meeting all of the goals and objectives. The goals are listed in the abstract and then followed through in a separate section dedicated to the goals. The strategies that support the project are listed under each goal. As strategies are described under each goal, each strategy is described and connected to activities which support the goals and align with the outcomes of the project

Weaknesses

Success For All is not a new program. It has been widely adopted in a variety of schools throughout the United States for the last 2 decades.

Reader's Score: 14

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important 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.

(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, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Not assigned to score Selection Criterion B.

Weaknesses

Not assigned to score Selection Criterion B.

Reader's Score: 0

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(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 provides evidence of the applicant's past performance for implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects on page e17 and e18 where it indicates the applicant has developed and maintained a program has been functioning since the 1990s and has added an average of 100 schools per year for the past 20 years.

On pages e13-e17, the applicant provides numerous data demonstrating a plethora of increased student achievement successes sustained with schools from 1998 to the current date.

There is documented evidence that the program has increased student achievement in math and reading at the preschool, elementary and middle school levels. In addition, the program is looking to pilot at the high school level. On page e20 the proposal sites studies which support the increases in student achievement for all the student populations cited in the grant proposal

The proposed applicant has demonstrated the ability to replicate the program with success for more than twenty years. The project is already successfully operating in multiple settings with different types of students. The reference on page e5 that there will be a "facilitator in each school who helps all teachers with program implementation, ongoing professional development, and school wide assessments" demonstrates a strength for facilitating placement of high-quality teachers in demonstrating how to gather and use meaningful data and provides strong evidence for successful fidelity of replication of the program.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

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

(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.

(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.

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

(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.

Strengths

Not assigned to score Selection Criterion D.

Weaknesses

Not assigned to score Selection Criterion D.

Reader's Score: 0

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(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 proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

The vision of the project is recognized on page e28. In this portion of the proposal the notes state that 1,100 additional schools will be added over 4 years which would include approximately 555,000 students.

On pages e29-e33, the proposal lists a variety of urban and rural school districts that have been involved with the project over time. The range of these districts provides a span that has successfully replicated the project at national, regional and state levels.

On page e34, the grant proposal clearly identifies the cost per pupil and estimates that significant differences in per pupil costs above the cost of reaching out to 500,000 students should not result in significant increases. Overall, the estimated cost of the project is aligned with the large numbers of students that the applicant proposes to reach with the project.

Documentation is provided relative to districts and states that have been part of the program and projects and these entities have committed to continue support and spread of effect for the project.

On page e34 the applicant proposes to "disseminate information in many ways". For example, the application indicates that Success for All, university partners and teachers will publish articles in well respected educational journals, work with journalists and technology media, and participate in major local and national conferences. The applicant also proposes to work closely with state education agencies and cohorts of districts as well as partner coalitions.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

The grant proposal provides evidence of a detailed multi-year timeline of activities and financial and operational budgets. In addition the applicant demonstrates commitment for the long-term sustainability of the project with well-known established partners. The applicant indicates that there is little dependence on federal and private foundations and that the Success For All program seeks out ways to be financially self-supporting which provides further verification for the successful sustainability of the project beyond five years. In addition, it is clear in the documentation that the program has successfully sustained itself for the past 20 years indicating a clear history of success in this area.

By training teacher coaches to adopt the project purposes, the coaches will pass the on-going benefits of the project onto the students, teachers, and administrators and the scale-up strategy can continue to build capacity beyond the years of funding.

On page e35, the scale-up project will "invest in infrastructure." The application proposed investing in infrastructure such as professional development for district-based coaches along with the development of materials and supplies designed to assure fidelity of implementation.

Weaknesses

On page e36, the proposal states, "if all works as planned we expect to maintain these trainers." With declining economic status for districts, it is questionable as to how schools will afford to continue and sustain funding if funding and budgets allotted to districts are cut back or eliminated. Because of lack of funding furloughing of teachers is occurring throughout the nation.

Much of the program sustainability is based upon utilization of Title I funding. It is unclear how the sustainability will be maintained if all does not work out as planned.

Reader's Score: 8

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

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

(3) 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.

Strengths

The documentation provided relative to personnel demonstrate that all personnel have training and experience in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects. On page e37, the proposal indicates that the management team that has been in place for the past 20 years will continue to maintain the management of the project activities. In addition, resumes and references for each key management person is provided and detailed paragraphs on pages e42-44 document each person's experiences in designing and conducting large-scale rapidly growing projects.

The independent evaluator has been named as part of the project and has documented experience with evaluating large scale programs. Pages e41 and e42 highlight the credentials and references attesting to the successes of the

independent evaluator. In addition, the independent evaluators have documented credentials demonstrating their expertise with experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Pages e38-e39 succinctly outline detailed timelines and milestones for the project. The project timelines and milestones indicate that the project will meet all goals and objectives on time and within the proposed budget. The documented experience of the program staff in scaling up proven reform designs in managing projects of this nature and in successfully accomplishing large scale project tasks in a timely manner and at the same time assuring long-term sustainability.

Current partners will be maintained. In addition local state and national partners will be recruited to meet the goals of the project. On page e40, the proposal documents the number of staff and field coaches available to successfully handle the implementation and execution of the project.

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

On page e0, the application states that "The Success for All elementary program is used in grades kindergarten through grade 6. The preschool program focuses on oral language, social, emotional and cognitive readiness... and makes effective transitions from preschool to kindergarten and beyond." The application demonstrates this commitment through the literacy success of the partners associated with the Success for All program. Additionally, the new schools that are being recruited for the project have high numbers of students at the prekindergarten through grade 3 levels. The program provides for effective transition from preschool to kindergarten and beyond by focusing on language, cognitive development, and transitions, while adding an emphasis on phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension, which then builds as children progress through the grades.

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

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 program demonstrates a strong emphasis on increasing literacy gains for students who are identified to receive Limited English Proficient services.

A Spanish version of the program is offered for LEP students along with accommodations and transition from Spanish to English and English to Spanish strategies.

On page e1 the supporting evidence for successful studies linked to LEP students is highlighted. The research provided throughout the grant has provided evidence of high rates of increased student achievement especially for LEP students in kindergarten through grade 8.

Weaknesses

There is limited data found in the grant proposal to support that the Success For All program has been the prime strategy for increasing college and career readiness.

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 grant proposal will serve students in rural and isolated areas. Partner schools in rural areas are named in the grant proposal by the applicant.

On page e2, distance education is being utilized as one of the strategies to increase contact with students and provide professional development for teachers and principals in rural areas. Also on this page the applicant provides a listing of partners served in small towns and rural areas.

Weaknesses

The project proposes that the program will meet the needs of students in all areas. The majority of partners documented with success in the proposal are urban settings and the majority of successful data are provided for urban areas. However, there is not an overall underlying conviction of successful past experience components dedicated to students in rural areas.

Urban areas receive direct contact interventions. The rural areas receive distance learning interventions. Considering school district budgets, personnel and program cuts, there is not dedicated funding for rural districts that may not be able to afford distance learning technology.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/08/2010 3:38 PM