Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/06/2010 6:33 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

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 20 Points)	20	19
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 15 Points)	15	0
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 20 Points)	20	20
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	0
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 10 Points)	10	8
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
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 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	1
TOTAL	105	69

Technical Review Form

Validation 17: 84.396B
Reader #1:
Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

    OPTIONAL

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 applicant demonstrates a targeted need for early childhood intervention (prenatal to 5 years old) in the 24 designated BIE schools. The evidence of subpar academic performance, low levels of pre-school service, and poverty attest to the grave educational and social conditions plaguing the BIE schools (p. 2). The project design is based on early childhood interventions and social supports (e.g., support services) and provides a unique and novel approach to address the holistic needs of the youngsters in a culturally-sensitive and comprehensive manner. The beauty of the design is the focus on the home-based childhood education programming in the early years (e.g. prenatal to 5 years of age) as well as the social factors (e.g. health/developmental screening, resource referrals) that impede achievement of the youngsters upon entry to school. The home-based program targets high quality early childhood education (e.g. literacy skills) while the social supports (e.g. parent and student support services) aim to help the early youngsters and parents with impeding social issues outside of the classroom. To this end, the design provides an explicit strategy to address early academic underperformance and social impediments to learning to ensure school readiness.   The parent training program is a key means of building capacity through parent education. To the degree that the design incorporates parent-trainers in the educational programming, the level of capacity is increased among parents in the homes and the potential of the program's success in meeting the holistic needs of the youngsters is furthered. The design is build upon the framework of the FACE and PAT models and solid research (pp. 10-15) supports the PAT program. The goals and objectives are aligned in the design (p. 5).

Weaknesses

It would prove helpful for the applicant to provide measurable outcomes (p.5).

Reader's Score: 19

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

Reader's Score: 0

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 provides evidence of a solid track record in programming dating back 20 years and targeting American Indian families (p. 16). The improvements in closing the achievement gap serve to support the applicant's ability to carry out projects to a larger scale with solid academic results (e.g. see Zigler et. al. evaluation on p. 16). Finally, the applicant demonstrates a commitment in working with partners in education. The partnership with the Bureau of Indian Education and Bureau of Indian Education's Albuquerque service center is critical in harnessing the vast educational and social expertise necessary to carry out the project's goals related to the youngsters' school readiness and achievement. In this vein, the applicant provides solid evidence of experience to harness resources in a constructive manner to ensure project success. The international and military program experiences also lend to the creditability and credentials of the applicant.

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 20

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

Reader's Score: 0

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 comprehensive and coordinated project design integrates all of the key components (e.g., early childhood literacy, parent education training and

social services) necessary to improve school readiness among the youngsters. To that end, it is highly likely that the project has the capacity to scale up and replicate to other sites. The proposed dissemination efforts (e.g., workshops), onsite efforts (e.g., conferences, workshops, State satellite offices), and media outreach (e.g., PATNews) provide an array of dissemination vehicles to ensure that the program's efforts are disseminated throughout all stakeholder groups (pp. 28-29). Similarly, the technical assistance expertise of the applicant will greatly enhance replication efforts of other sites. In this regard, the capacity to scale up reaches regional and state levels. In light of prior experiences, the applicant demonstrates the capacity to reach the targeted population of 864 to 1,152 children in year one in a cost-effective manner (p. 26).

Weaknesses

A detailed overview of resources sought for to sustain the project after funding would prove helpful. For example, what additional revenue streams will the applicant seek in addition to foundationregistryi3 website?

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 applicant's existing infrastructure and partner resources provide key sources of sustainability for the proposed project after the course of the grant period. A detailed overview of 'how' the program will integrate into existing structures after project funding is provided in terms of 'how' the program is seamlessly woven from the PAT and FACE models. In this vein, it is clear 'how' the project will continue to exist structurally in the ongoing work efforts beyond funding. The commitment of the partners in terms of long-term sustainability is evidence in the letters of commitment and assurances. The development of individual sustainability plans on the part of the schools

is proactive commitments by the applicant to ensure that the sustainability is build in the project from the onset rather than an afterthought upon the end of the grant.

Weaknesses

A detailed overview of 'how' the program will ensure the financial resources needed for sustainability is needed

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 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 applicant outlines the professional experiences of the project's management team (pp. 32-33). The team is well trained, seasoned, and credentialed in the educational field especially in managing the FACE programs. Similarly the applicant notes a description of the external evaluator's work in quasi-experimental design in FACE and PAT. In this vein, the evaluators (RAT) demonstrate the prior expertise and management skills needed to carry out the proposed evaluation plan (p. 33). A timeline for the management of the project along with targeted benchmarks are provided (p. 28, Appendix H).

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant demonstrates clear evidence of an innovative program design targeting early childhood education and school readiness for at-risk BIA schools.

Weaknesses

none noted

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

K-12 students that

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

Strengths

Not Addressed

Weaknesses

Not Addressed

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

The applicant captures the targeted populations through FACE program.

Weaknesses

None noted

Reader's Score: 1

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

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in

this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The schools meet some of the SRSA and RLIS guidelines (p. 2).

Weaknesses

The schools are not eligible for SRSA or RLIS funds according to the applicant (p. 2).

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2010 6:33 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/07/2010 9:09 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

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 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	19
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	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	2
TOTAL	105	71

Technical Review Form

Validation 17: 84.396B
Reader #2:
Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

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

Only six of the additional 24 schools currently have early identification and intervention services. Therefore, expansion of the FACE program to more schools and families increases the number of students needing early intervention services.

Schools and families located in rural communities will benefit from the home-based services. This will likely result in an efficient approach of implementing identification and intervention activities, based on the population and socioeconomic profile of the constituents.

Weaknesses

There is minimal research comparing American Indians to other races.

Research does not address indicators in the objectives (page e4 of Project Narrative). Indicators not addressed include early identification of health and developmental issues, increased parental knowledge of child development, increased parental involvement in education and increased school readiness.

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 proposed intervention program has been implemented for over 20 years.

The FACE program serves 45 schools in 11 states.

Evaluation results clearly states positive impact in school readiness and achievement and narrowing the achievement gap between children in poverty and those from non-poverty homes.

Weaknesses

There is a lack of substantial quantitative data to support evaluation results regarding student achievement and narrowing of achievement gap.

Reader's Score: 19

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

There is proven sustainability of the FACE program. A significant number of families (960) will benefit from the program.

Human resources possess credentials.

Quality Assurance Guidelines are developed by the national center to ensure fidelity.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

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

Letters of intent and sustainability plan from each school ensures viability of the program. Also, coordination of financial resources between the school (Title 1) and the FACE program ensures high/long-term commitment.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses 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

Clearly identified timeline of activities and personnel responsible.

Initial and on-going training embedded in the proposal.

Experienced personnel, to implement the proposed program and evaluate its outcomes, are identified.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

> **Strengths**
>
> The FACE program addresses school readiness of children ages birth through 3rd grades. The program consistently addresses narrowing the achievement gap through early identification and intervention.

> **Weaknesses**

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

> **Strengths**
>
> **Weaknesses**

> There is minimal evidence (narrative, goals and criteria responses) that the FACE program supports the preparation of students for college.

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**

> Early identification of students with special needs is a huge component of the FACE program. FACE will provide interventions and resources to close the achievement gap and increase student achievement for high needs students. English speaking and Non-English Speaking families and children are equally supported.

> **Weaknesses**

> No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

> **Strengths**

A home-based program for families and students in communities who would less likely have afforded transportation or minimal education or literacy skills to fully participate in the program at a school site.

In addition to closing the achievement gap and improving student achievement, the proposal implies that early identification and intervention also has an impact on graduation rate.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/07/2010 9:09 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/06/2010 11:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

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 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	20
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	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	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)	2	2
TOTAL	105	71

Technical Review Form

Validation 17: 84.396B
Reader #3:
Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

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

(1)
Proposed project will address a high area of need for early education and child development services among American Indian communities. (pp. 3, 4)

(2)
Clear set of goals, strategies, and actions are aligned with the priorities and outcomes the applicant is seeking. (pp. 5, 6)

(3)
Intervention strategy follows the theories of Dr. James Heckman, Nobel Laureate in Economics, University of Chicago. (p. 7)
The project is an adaptation of an intervention proven successful with American Indian families implemented over 20 years, Family and Child Education (FACE). (pp. 7-9)

Weaknesses

Needed to have specified objectives in the Program Design in measurable terms. (pp. 6, 7)

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

> (1)
> The past performance of the non-profit National Center in implementing complex projects is evidenced by the fact that the Center has directed the replication of the Parents as Teachers service model in all 50 states and 7 other countries. Today there are 3,200 PAT programs serving more than 250,000 families representing more than 335,000 children. (p. 16)
> (2)
> Evaluations of the PAT program and the home-based FACE model

demonstrate closing the achievement gap for children who participate in the program with their families. (p. 17)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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 number of children to be served annually by the proposed project is between 864 and 1,152. Over the course of the project, children served will be no fewer than 2,500. (p. 23)

The fact that last year the 45 FACE programs served 3,190 children and parents is evidence of the applicant's capacity to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period. (p. 23)

(2)
The number of existing operating sites cited, and the number of FTE's employed together with the qualifications of the key personnel demonstrate the applicant's ability to scale up and replicate the project. (p. 24)
(3)
The National Center has developed "Quality Assurance Guidelines" for ensuring model fidelity and program outcomes. (p. 25)

The fact that FACE has been successfully replicated with 21 different tribes speaks to the ability to successfully replicate with different cultures. (p. 25)

(4)
Since the estimated number of students to be served ranges from 864 to 1,152, the estimated cost per student ranges from $3,076. to $4,101. per year.

(p. 26)

Estimated cost, although high, appears adequate in view of the personnel needed for outreach to families in their homes in rural areas in 24 sites.

The applicant included projected costs for serving larger numbers of students as requested in the application. (p. 26)

(5)
The applicant cites a variety of mechanisms that will be used for broad dissemination of information on the project to include publications, newsletters, different organization conferences, and workshops. (pp. 27, 28)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were noted.

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)(2)
The project has the support and letters of intent from BIE, school leaders, and the BIE Line Office indicating intent to participate. (p. 27)

Enthusiastic role and involvement of the BIE in developing the application points to their future involvement in continuing funding, either through the Bureau or other federal funding. (p. 28)

As part of the project, each school is asked to develop a sustainability plan that is submitted to the Education Line Office (ELO) and the Bureau. (p. 28)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were 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

(1)
Thorough, well-organized management plan includes activities, benchmarks (milestones), responsible parties, and projected timelines. (Appendix H)

(2)
Qualifications of Project Director and key personnel are appropriate. (p. 32)

(3)
Qualifications of project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator are appropriate. (p. 33)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

> **Strengths**

> Major focus of the project is on increasing young children's school readiness by increasing literacy resources and literacy activities in the home, assessing young children's developmental milestones, and conducting meeting with parents to facilitate transition to pre-school and kindergarten. (p. 1)

> **Weaknesses**

> No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

> **Strengths**

> Competitive Preference #6 not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Competitive Preference #7 not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

American Indian families on tribal lands are often geographically isolated.

The project, therefore, sends the parent educators into the homes of the families. (p. 2)

A high percentage of the American Indian families speak the Native language at home as the primary language. Parent educators who speak the Native language are hired from within the community to address this issue. (p. 2)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2010 11:04 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/06/2010 6:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

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 20 Points)	20	_____
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 15 Points)	15	15
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   28

Technical Review Form

Validation 17: 84.396B
Reader #4:
Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

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

"Four independently conducted randomized controlled trials of the program and seven peer reviewed published outcome studies" (e8) constitute considerable evidence for the internal and external validity of the effects of the program. You further note that the evidence draws from the model implanted in a wide variety of educational community settings, some of the research was longitudinal, and some of it was conducted by SRI, a nationally renown research institute. With this much research showing positive outcomes, the program has certainly been validated and can be considered

scalable.(e24) The program has been replicated with 21 different tribes and is currently being used by a wide variety of populations internationally (e24), further evidence of wide scale use.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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

PATNC will contract with Research and Training Associates (RTA) The cost of evaluation is $1,940,660 over 5 years. - 11% of total cost, with considerably more allocated to year 5 (e23). This appears reasonable.

RTA has already done several evaluations of this program and another quasi-experimental study including a randomly selected comparison group is proposed.
r
The proposal notes that after twenty yeas of working with FACE implementation at BIE schools, RTA and the National Center have developed quality indicators of program implementation. " (e21) The proposal includes many good research questions.

RTA has a 30-year history of providing technical assistance and evaluation services to BIE schools enabling them to understand the context in which they are working very well. They use a statistician to analyze the data.

Weaknesses

Procedures are established to obtain data on an annual basis. (e21) which is not very frequent.   The reader could find no mention of site visits by the evaluator.

"RTA has conducted independent out side evaluations of the BIE's FACE program since it's beginnings in 1990s." (e21) One might ask whether they can still be objective after all these year of involvement.

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2010 6:30 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/06/2010 5:52 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

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 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	14
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	28

Technical Review Form

Validation 17: 84.396B
Reader #5:
Applicant: Parents as Teachers National Center -- N/A,N/A - N/A,N/A (U396B100189)

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 cited research demonstrates the ability to claim causal conclusions with high internal validity and moderate external validity.
> Proposal provided four RCTs and seven peer-reviewed published studies with at least moderate internal and external validity. Sample sizes were not always provided, but the proposal appeared to indicate most had small sample sizes and not all were from American Native Indian populations that may not limit generalizability. Equivalence between the intervention and comparison groups at program entry were assumed, but that no other major

flaws related to internal validity were mentioned. Several SEM research studies were discussed with strong statistical controls for selection bias and for discerning the influence of internal factors One large sample of 7,700 public schools was cited using a SEM design. Most studies indicated significant differences in student achievement of standardized tests.

The project described in the prior research is the same as, or very similar to, that proposed for support under the proposed project.
Participants or settings in prior research were not more limited than those proposed to receive the treatment under the proposed project.
Significance of effect in prior research would be likely to be statistically significant in a sample of the size proposed for the proposed project.
Proposal supported that parent literacy activities at home were a strong predictor of student readiness and achievement. Noted that the proposed method works well with low SES student populations. Project demonstrates strong potential to close achievement gap with Native American population.

Weaknesses

Magnitude of effect could not be accurately determined based on the description of the prior research although it appears both substantial and important, and possessing the same potential for the target population being proposed.

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

Evaluation design- The evaluation will be using a QED with a equivalent control group (1,000 children in intervention sample) which will help support data for causal evidence. Control or comparison group will be randomly selected from a stratified sampling (1,000 in comparison group). Evaluation methods include: quality of implementation data, performance feedback, periodic assessment of intended outcomes that are depicted in the project's logic model. Annual data and reviews will be conducted.
The evaluation will provide data on the key variables or elements of the approach.
Results and data from the reports will help facilitate replication in other settings.
Evaluation has sufficient resources to carry out effectively.

> Assessment instruments are established. The Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Protective Factors Survey
> Evaluation has sufficient rigor and is being conducted by an experienced (30 yrs), independent evaluator-RTA.
> Evaluation takes into consideration strategies for establishing evidence of causality on the efficacy of the BabyFACE model.
> Adequate resources are being provided for the evaluation (11% of total budget) to make it feasible to conduct a rigorous evaluation.

Weaknesses

> Evaluation has at least 8 research questions which may be a little ambitious for this one project.
> No mention of how results and model will be disseminated for replication.

Reader's Score: 14

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

Last Updated: 07/06/2010 5:52 PM