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Summary Statement
1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 20 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, and

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

(3) The extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence
supporting the proposed project, taking into consideration any differences in context.

**Strengths**

The New Teacher Center through its TEACh Initiative proposes to implement an effectiveness-based teacher preparation program. The project provides considerable data highlighting the need for the project in addressing the development of teachers who serve high-need students. Further, the project (TEACh) intends to create or expand the current programs being highlighted in TEACh, which is further documented by the same programs TEACh proposes to expand (Boyd et al., 2006 and Noell et al., 2009). The goals of the project are clearly stated and provides the foundation for seeking answers to the specific research questions highlighted in the project. The project provides a direct collection of data connecting the goals, objectives, and outcomes, which is consistent with the research evidence supporting the project.

**Weaknesses**

The project proposal needs to include research, which links directly to teacher instruction (pg. 20). There is no mention of teacher evaluation.

Reader's Score: 18

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 15 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 moderate evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that 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 likelihood that 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 20 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 complex 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 shows past performance through its TEACh Initiative as a system of support for training teachers through its teaching fellows programs serving schools districts within/outside its geographical location. The applicant has implemented large scale grants and provided subgrants to other agencies in the past throughout its geographical region. Through the high level of trained teachers, the applicant has produced substantial numbers of teachers trained to be effective educators across several states. Experience level and data on teacher success rate is extraordinary.
### Weaknesses

TNTP has no evidence of implementing complex services or implementing federally funded programs, and only provides moderate evidence of increasing student achievement. There is no significant data provided to show direct evidence of TNTP trained teachers on student achievement. Actual data for teachers trained by TNTP would have been more beneficial. There is no data on nonsuccess. The applicant did not address how teachers will be securing certification.

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 well designed quasi-experimental study.

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

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

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

5. 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

### 5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 10 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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other 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 availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

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

**Strengths**

The applicant proposes to reach a projected approximately 253,000-337,000 students across all sites over the duration of the grant period (pg. 26). The project has the potential through its proven record to be replicated successfully. Its fee-for-service model provides an avenue to replicate the project after the validation grant period, with fidelity. Data regarding teachers hired are provided.

**Weaknesses**

The applicant mentioned that it has raised $27 million since 2009 to support the organization's focus on teacher effectiveness; however, there is no mention of how these funds were used and how they will be used to scale-up the project after the validation grant period. There is no direct evidence of the availability of resources (funds) for replicating and scaling up the project. Even with the fee-for-service model, there is no guarantee that such a program will garner the resources necessary for scaling-up and replication.

Reader's Score: 8
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, as well as the support of stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions), to operate the project beyond the length of the Validation grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation grant.

Strengths

The project through its letters of support and project partners has demonstrated that it has the resources to operate the project within the proposed validation grant period. Many mechanisms to disseminate the TEACh programs are highlighted giving credence to sustainability of the TEACh program to operate the project throughout the length of the validation grant period. With the many partnerships and the collaborative nature of TNTP, it is possible for TNTP to secure support of stakeholders to sustain the project beyond the validation grant period. The project is well established within a complex urban district.

Weaknesses


Reader's Score: 10

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 complex 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 experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

**Strengths**

The project's management plan provides detailed information regarding the qualification, training, and experience of essential staff for the project through curriculum vitas. TNTP staff/i3 team has a substantial track record of managing large scale grants and providing large scale services. Key personnel (project director, professional development coordinator, literacy consultant, evaluator, etc) are identified with clearly defined responsibilities and duties. The identified LEA/partner responsibilities further solidify TNTP ability to manage and sustain the proposed project interventions and activities.

**Weaknesses**

The project's details about how they are going to manage the sites are weak. Considering the level of commitment needed for management of a state-wide initiative such as the proposed project, there needs to be more in-depth information as to how the interventions would be managed and accounted for at each school site and/or district. The timeline for implementation of interventions and activities are limited. Staff does not have high credentials in teacher education.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Competitive Preference**

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

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

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

### Strengths

The proposed project does not align appropriate outcomes and measures consistent with this preference.

### Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

### Strengths

The proposed project does not align appropriate outcomes and measures consistent with this preference.

### Weaknesses

None.
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3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

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

**Strengths**

| The proposed project does not align appropriate outcomes and measures consistent with this preference. |

**Weaknesses**

| None. |

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

**Strengths**

| The proposed project does not align appropriate outcomes and measures consistent with this preference. |

**Weaknesses**

| None. |

Reader's Score: 0
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Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

   The proposed project seeks to provide effective and certified teachers to urban school districts. The proposal lacks data regarding the impact on student achievement accomplished by the teacher trained in this program. In addition, the management plan lacks detail to insure successful project implementation. The staff lack background and training in teacher education and teacher certification. Since that is the core work of the project, staff trained in these important areas would strengthen the proposal.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 20 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, and

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

(3) The extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence supporting the proposed project, taking into consideration any differences in context.

**Strengths**

1. The proposal addresses teacher effectiveness and certification through the combination of two existing programs serving these priorities. The current operation of the program in an urban setting is described and the fee for service basis of the project is presented. The program is exceptional in that screening of candidates occurs twice in the preparation cycle and participating school districts report high levels of satisfaction with the program. The benchmarks identified require LEAs seeking to participate to have a 60% enrollment of minority students and the percentage of students not meeting AYP must be higher than the state level. This suggests that the targeted students to be served will be high needs students.

2. Goals are presented and objectives are stated in clear and measurable terms. For example, by the fifth year of the project enactment, 1850-2475 new teachers will be prepared to use a student achievement focused certification curriculum.

3. The project design reflects recent research. For example, Nye, et.al 2004 states that teacher quality impacts student achievement and research concerning the Fellows Program presented by Boyd, et.al 2008 presents the impacts of that program.

**Weaknesses**

3. Further references from research should be cited to strengthen the rationale for the proposed project. Direct links to improved student achievement resulting from instruction by teachers enrolled in such alternate certification programs needs to be presented with results linked to teacher instruction.

**Reader’s Score: 17**

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 15
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 moderate evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that 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 likelihood that 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 20 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 complex 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

1. The past performance of the applicant in complex projects is described in terms of the training of 37,000 teachers since the project began in 1997. Some of this experience is in the New City Schools which is a complex system where 26% of the teachers were trained by this program. Overall the applicant managed 40 Teaching Fellows Programs in 39 cities and in 23 states. p.20

Weaknesses

1. The experience implementing the project should be presented in terms of the complexity of the project in enactment. For example, information regarding securing certification of the candidates and securing contracts with large cities is not described. As a result the complexity of the project is not explained well. p.20

2. Data is not presented concerning the success of the trained teachers on improving student achievement. Evidence of improved student achievement resulting from instruction by these prepared teachers is needed to strengthen the proposal. p.20 Data is not presented regarding attrition of teachers trained by this program and those that have lost their jobs due to a reduction in force.

Reader’s Score: 11

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 well designed quasi-experimental study.

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

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

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

(5) 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 10 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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other 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 availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

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

Strengths
1. The project will reach 253,000-337,000 students over 5 years. The applicant has the capacity to reach this number of students through teacher preparation as it is presented.

2. The applicant identifies 12 site advisers and a central team of 57 staff members with 2 staff focused on registering new certification programs. Data from the participating cities regarding new teachers hired is presented. For example, Chicago hired 929 teachers in 2009. The organization raised 27 million in 2009 to support the teacher effectiveness effort. Forty teacher recruitment efforts have been launched in 23 states.

3. The replication of the project is possible since there is a need for recruitment and hiring assistance by large urban districts and the structure of the organization and its work is well structured and easy to understand. It is reported that there is a 100% satisfaction level by users.

4. The cost of $157 per student is based on 337,000 students. It is estimated that 500,000 students served results in a cost estimate of $106 per student.

5. Dissemination is planned using local media, a project web site and presentations at education conferences nationally.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 10

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, as well as the support of stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions), to operate the project beyond the length of the Validation grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation grant.

Strengths

1. A fee for service is the current funding for the project. The applicant states that LEA partners will contribute a subsidy to support
the initiative to achieve sustainability. Each partner is to submit sustainability plans. In addition, the organization is a working partner in several states and 100% of their sites are operational. The organization has 27 million in grant funds and is listed as a partner by the Gates Foundation.

**Weaknesses**

1. No plan to sustain the project that provides for the project costs is presented. No evidence of support of stakeholders is provided and discussed.

2. There is no assurance that LEAs will have the funds to pay the subsidy that is to be required to continue the project.

**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 complex 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 experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

**Strengths**

1. A chart reflecting the management plan is provided. The site manager's responsibilities are outlined at the site level. Responsibilities of other staff are also identified. The Team meets quarterly to manage the project. The members of the team are identified and appropriate. The partner LEA responsibilities are identified and appropriate.

2. The Project Director is identified. This person has a doctorate in applied child development and has worked in a Boston City project that is complex. The evaluator is identified and has background in similar project assessment and experimental design assessment.
Weaknesses

1. The timeline is limited with no key actions linked to objectives and then to staff responsible and benchmarks. A fully developed management chart is needed to strengthen the proposal. The chart and plan do not address tasks related to sustainability and to scalability of the proposed project.

2. The Project Director does not have a background in teacher education or teacher certification at the local or state level. The background of this person is not adequate for the position. (see resume)

3. The Project Director does not have a background in experimental design assessment. Other staff in key positions on the project lack backgrounds in teacher education and certification. (see resumes)

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant does not specifically address this priority.

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant does not specifically address this priority.

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

The applicant does not specifically address this priority.

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

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

Strengths

The applicant does not specifically address this priority.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2010 8:41 AM
Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The New Teacher Project, Inc. -- , - , (U396B100134)

Reader #3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS SCORED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Statement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary Statement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Selection Criteria**         |                 |               |
| 1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 20 Points) | 20 | 18 |
| 2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 15 Points) | 15 | ______ |
| 3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 Points) | 20 | 15 |
| 4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points) | 15 | ______ |
| 5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 10 |
| 6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 10 |
| 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 | 0 |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address | 1 | 0 |
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)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  105  61

---

**Technical Review Form**

Validation 04: 84.396B  
**Reader #3:**  
**Applicant:** The New Teacher Project, Inc. -- , - , (U396B100134)

---

**Summary Statement**

1. **Summary Statement**

This project seeks validation of its program to recruit/train/certify/place/ and evaluate teachers who complete its rigorous procedures. It has a strong track record of recruiting/training/sorting teachers by student achievement results. It has a number of successful sites including NYC and DC. It offers a full compliment of Human Resource services related to teachers; It is acknowledged by foundations. The organization has experienced managers and has its own protocols and standards. It meets the effective teaching requirements of the Validation criteria, serves low income schools successfully, has its own certification process and one grouping of its teachers has been found to be superior to a control group of teachers in NYC.

---

**Selection Criteria**

1. **A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 20 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, and

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

(3) The extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence supporting the proposed project, taking into consideration any differences in context.

**Strengths**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This validation grant can validate Human Resource practices that yield effective teachers in urban classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The applicant claims a high percentage of minority students are served by its trained participants in partner urban districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This application represents an innovative study that can bring forth useful information to strengthen selection training and retention of effective teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It somewhat models the successful NBPTS process that identifies teachers who can meet certain teaching standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project hopes to develop an &quot;effectiveness screening process&quot; for broad use in school districts over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project ties student achievement to teacher effectiveness (pg 12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weaknesses**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no mention of local collective bargaining/ state standards re: Teacher evaluation limitations or use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The application contains no reference to teacher failure, or sub standard performance, and how that has been dealt with in partner districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no mention of trained teacher turnover in the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 15 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 moderate evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that 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 likelihood that 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 20 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 complex 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 experience in innovating and managing Human Resource processes in education.

The applicant has strong urban school district partnering experience.

The applicant cites very strong trained teacher numbers in NYC, particularly in math (26% of math teachers in New York City are from this program).

The agency has supervised a number of federal grants.

The application cites strong data on teacher retention.

The applicant cites success with improving test scores in high minority-poverty schools.

The program currently has 40 TNTP teaching fellowship sites in 23 states

Weaknesses

There is no data in the application about unsuccessful teachers, nor non-renewed/dismissed/RIFfed teachers, and how these factors have effected the project.

There is no discussion as to how the trained teachers connect to various school district performance evaluation procedures or other collective bargaining contract language restrictions in various school districts.

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 well designed quasi-experimental study.

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

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

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

(5) 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 10 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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other 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 availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible
applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

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

Strengths

Student cost estimates include $253,000 for 337,000 students. Costs range from $134.00 to $157.00 per student as the numbers scale up.

The applicant already certifies teachers in several states.

There are 53 staff members to support sites.

The organization has 40 teacher recruiting programs in 23 states since 2001.

Weaknesses

Despite the focus on critical human resource issues of recruitment and training, there is no data (such as teacher performance records) in the report dealing with teacher turnover, and related in-district Human Capital issues re: seniority/RIFing/measures of effectiveness as evidence to strengthen the scaling up rationale etc.

Reader's Score: 10

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, as well as the support of stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions), to operate the project beyond the length of the Validation grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation grant.

Strengths

The applicant agency is already established as a working partner in several states.

The applicant agency has integrated its Human Resource capabilities and
training with ongoing needs for urban teachers in many US Cities.

100 percent of all TNTP sites are currently operational.

This process is already attracting attention as a national teacher effectiveness model

The applicant agency has secured 27 million dollars in grant money over time.

The project is recommended by the Gates Foundation to become a listed organization in the Foundation Registry for matching funds etc.

Weaknesses

None Noted

Reader's Score: 10

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 complex 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 experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

Pg 32 and appendix H outline details of the management plan.

The resume's of key staff reflect seasoned, experienced managers and supervisors who run the organization.

The applicant agency has provided data in the application of its successful record in serving certain key Human Capital needs in client cities.
Weaknesses

The plan ignores revealing critical statistics about teacher effectiveness, reassignments, transfers, and turnover in its partner districts that may influence how the proposed project may play out over time.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0
Status: Submitted
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## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The New Teacher Project, Inc. -- , - , (U396B100134)

**Reader #4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statement</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS SCORED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary Statement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Selection Criteria

- **1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 20 Points)**
  - 20
- **2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 15 Points)**
  - 15  14
- **3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 Points)**
  - 20
- **4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)**
  - 15  13
- **5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 10 Points)**
  - 10
- **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 27

---

Technical Review Form

Validation 04: 84.396B
Reader #4:
Applicant: The New Teacher Project, Inc. -- , - , (U396B100134)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 20 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, and

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
(3) The extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence supporting the proposed project, taking into consideration any differences in context.

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 15 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 moderate evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that 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 likelihood that 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

STRENGTHS: The project components are firmly grounded in the research on teacher professional development. Each component is discussed as it relates to and aligns with the available evidence base for increasing student achievement outcomes. Beginning at the teacher recruitment stage the research supporting the component is detailed to support data informed decision making. The table on page three displays the core components of the TEACH Initiative which are anticipated to link to the success of teachers and students. Project goals and objectives on page 5 link the overarching
goal of increasing teacher effectiveness with significant student achievement gains. The potential for being an effective teacher as measured by increasing student outcomes is the focus of the project and is reinforced and discussed throughout the proposal. Numerous studies are cited that support the components of the project and demonstrate moderate evidence for substantial and significant impact on student achievement and closing the achievement gap. For example on page 15 the work of Tennessee's project STAR is cited that found a moderate effect on student achievement in math and reading. The California STAR project was cited to demonstrate the link between teacher effectiveness and student achievement, although the specifics of the research are not described so it is difficult to determine the validity of the study. Other studies are cited from other parts of the country that demonstrate the link between teacher effectiveness through the use of teaching fellows component, teaching certification and student achievement for low income, high poverty students which have the potential for decreasing the learning gap. Likewise the results are supportive of reducing the student reliance on remedial education. The discussion of the magnitude and the effect grounded in previous research is supportive of the current model's potential for achieving similar outcomes. The proposal highlights the estimations of effect of the current project is a conservative estimate of the impact of the professional development model on student achievement.

**Weaknesses**

**WEAKNESSES:** Although this section is very strong and provides evidence of the strength of the proposed model, the model for the Los Angeles study is not described (p.15). The narrative states a more recent experimental study but does not state if the students were randomly assigned as was the case in the Tennessee study or if the design was quasi-experimental. Including the details of the study would strengthen the proposal.

**Reader's Score:** 14

**3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 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 complex 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 well designed quasi-experimental study.

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

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

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

(5) 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

STRENGTHS: The independent external evaluator is named and the evaluation aligns with six evaluation questions that address both fidelity of implementation (formative evaluation) and impact on teacher and student outcomes (summative evaluation). The evaluators will use a mixed methods approach to the evaluation which includes standardized instruments, surveys, interviews and observations to determine teacher and student impact. The data will be shared with the project staff to provide feedback on project quality and implementation progress (p.23). This component of the
Evaluation will allow for mid-course corrections and ensure that the project stays on the timeline and maximizes impact. The outcomes component will employ a quasi-experimental non-equivalent comparison group design using interrupted time series analysis. Effect sizes are discussed for the instruments based on the sample size and the measurement time points. A discussion of the use of the data is discussed on page 25 which includes exploring the relationship of implementation and testing administration context to inform program replication. Student achievement outcomes will be examined based on a value added analysis using the prior year test score and demographic factors as covariates. The comparison group will be drawn from non-participating classrooms using propensity score matching. This model will help tease out the differential impact of these factors as well as teacher factors on student achievement outcomes. The investigation of the effectiveness of the screening component is novel and will add to the literature base. The external evaluator is included and there appears to be sufficient support to carry out an effective evaluation. The inclusion of an evaluation advisory board is also a strong technique for ensuring rigor.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: Validity and reliability of each of the assessments needs to be described. For example, the description of the Content Knowledge of Teaching questionnaire on page 25 lacks reliability and validity information although the CLASS instrument description states the assessment has been validated for PK-5 and is in the validation process for G6-12. Likewise, examples of the items in the on-line survey of teacher perceptions should be included. The continuous quality improvement component is not built into the timeline. Including reporting and feedback loops for program improvement and documentation of lessons learned would improve the proposal.

Reader's Score: 13

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 10 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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project)
working directly, or through other 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 availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project to support further development, expansion, or 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, as well as the support of stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions), to operate the project beyond the length of the Validation grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation 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 complex 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 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
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Summary Statement
1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 20 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, and

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
(3) The extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence supporting the proposed project, taking into consideration any differences in context.

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 15 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 moderate evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that 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 likelihood that 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

The applicant cited studies that found that teacher quality explains about 13% and 7%, respectively, of variance in student achievement in math and reading. Additional information was provided about studies showing that the Practitioner Teacher Programs they are proposing have a modest effect on student achievement.

They hypothesized that the project would increase math and reading student achievement by about 0.15 SD.
Weaknesses

The applicant discussed only one study in which the impact of the project reduced the achievement gap of disadvantaged students.

Reader’s Score: 14

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 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 complex 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

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 well designed quasi-experimental study.

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

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

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

(5) 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

The applicant proposes to conduct a quasi-experimental study with comparison schools.
A value added analysis of student test scores will be used which should provide good implementation data.
They detail the likely observable effect that will be meaningful to detect educationally meaningful differences.
A continuous reporting system is described that will delineate factors that support program implementation and those factors that pose challenges.
Learning Point Associates appears to have the staff and resources to properly conduct the evaluation.

Weaknesses

The reporting may not contain the detail needed for replication.
They did not specifically state that neither the program developer, nor the program implementer, would evaluate the impact of the project.

Reader's Score: 12

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 10 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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other 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 availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project to support further development, expansion, or 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, as well as the support of stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions), to operate the project beyond the length of the Validation grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation 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 complex 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 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
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