

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

Technical Review Coversheet

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

Reader #1:

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

Technical Review Form

Development 22: 84.396C

Reader #1:

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

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

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

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

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

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

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

demonstrated with meaningful data; or

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

Strengths

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

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

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

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

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

Weaknesses

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

Reader's Score: 23

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

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

to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

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

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

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

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 10

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

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

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

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

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

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Preference not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths

The proposal explicitly addresses college readiness issues through the tutoring, pre-emancipation planning, as well as "Level Up" college

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

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

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

Weaknesses

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

Strengths

Preference not addressed.

Weaknesses

Preference not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

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

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

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

Reader #2:

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

Technical Review Form

Development 22: 84.396C

Reader #2:

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

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

the uniqueness of the approach. P 6

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

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

Goals are clearly written. p 10-12

Weaknesses

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

Reader's Score: 24

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

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

Weaknesses

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

Reader's Score: 23

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

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

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

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

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

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which

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

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

Strengths

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

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

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

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

Weaknesses

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

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

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

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 10

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

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

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

The applicant provides clearly defined tasks, timelines, and milestones.

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

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

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

(0 or 1 Point)

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

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

Strengths

Applicant did not address this competitive preference.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths

The specific program component, Level Up, provides weekly sessions that address this competitive preference through sessions sharing college knowledge, guidance for applications and financial aid for high school

students. P 3

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

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

Weaknesses

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

Strengths

Applicant did not address this competitive preference.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

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

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

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

Reader #3:

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

Technical Review Form

Development 22: 84.396C

Reader #3:

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

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

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

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

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

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

Weaknesses

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

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

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

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

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

Strengths

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

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 10

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

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

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

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

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

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

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

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

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths

The proposal addresses a number of issues related to college preparedness, expectations and readiness. As noted in the introductory section, the applicant is especially concerned with college attending and graduation rates, as well as a college access program.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

Strengths

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

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

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

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

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

Reader #1:

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

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D

Reader #1:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

Weaknesses

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

Reader's Score: 7

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

Weaknesses

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

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

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

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

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

Reader #2:

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

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D

Reader #2:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

Weaknesses

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

Reader's Score: 7

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

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

factors.

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

Weaknesses

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

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

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