

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/23/2010 6:41 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --  
Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -  
Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)  
(U396C100135)

**Reader #1:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
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	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	8
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference</b>		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address 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	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>70</b>

---

## **Technical Review Form**

### **Development 29: 84.396C**

#### **Reader #1:**

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee -- ,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) - ,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) (U396C100135)

### **Summary Statement**

#### **1. Summary Statement**

SLOPE (Stem Learning Opportunities Providing Equity) will attempt to level the playing field as far as access to higher mathematics in high school by concentrating its efforts on pre-algebra and 8th grade algebra and the very students who tend to dismiss mathematics as something they will not ever be able to accomplish. Algebra is a gate-keeper to higher level mathematics which students need for college entry, and this project plans to improve the performance of low income and under represented minority students in Algebra, through project based learning, extended days, and summer academies, and build a college-going culture in the schools for eighth graders.

### **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**

The California Education Roundtable has identified three major factors in the lack of production of STEM majors which seem to have their roots earlier than high school: poor mathematics performance in 8th grade Algebra, mathematics curricula that is not engaging, and inadequate knowledge and preparation for high school courses required for college entry.

The goals and strategies are clearly outlined. Especially helpful are the measures for each goal which are included in this section of the application. Another need which the project will address is the development of quality professional development for rural teachers at their school via the web and the development of their ability to collaborate professionally with one another via the web.

### **Weaknesses**

The details about the college readiness activities are not readily available in the proposal.

The special activities for ELLs is not fully described, and a more coherent explanation of how this will be implemented would strengthen the application.

**Reader's Score: 20**

## **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 applicant has successfully implemented numerous projects of at least equivalent size and scope. Applicant has also administered complex statewide projects, directed at improving student achievement. The partners, ConnectED and WestED also have impressive reputations for their involvement with improving student achievement.

**Weaknesses**

**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**

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached is well articulated from several perspectives.
- (2) The Roundtable represents California entities which have the capacity to create policy and leverage funds, so scaling up a successful project will be achievable.
- (3) Because the project will be in a variety of schools, (urban, suburban, and rural), the feasibility of replication is essentially being explored during the project. The cadre of trained teachers by the conclusion of the project could become a cadre of trainers.
- (4) Several scenarios were presented on the cost of the proposed project, in terms of targeted students and the potential students affected by the additionally trained teachers.
- (5) The roundtable diverse membership represents the internal ability to disseminate the successes of the project readily. The Roundtable has hosted nationwide education conferences in the past, and would again host conferences, participate in others' conferences, and publish results of the project in a variety of media.

**Weaknesses**

**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 Roundtables and ARCHES have existing resources in place and generic MOUs with partners executed for this proposal, as evidence of their ability to operate the project beyond the grant period.  
The train-the-trainers model will be readily implemented with the trained teachers at the end of the grant period.

**Weaknesses**

The MOUs would strengthen the application if they were more specific and had more definable commitments.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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 is comprehensive, with activities and milestones and clearly defined persons responsible.  
The qualifications, training, and experience of the key personnel are impressive.

**Weaknesses**

**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**

Not applicable to this proposal.

**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**

Part of the summer academies will focus on college issues. Also the summer academies and the extended day will have project based curricula which will have high relevance for the students, paving the way for student achievement in higher level mathematics in high school.

**Weaknesses**

However, the proposal does not specifically address item(b); if this will be attended to in the summer program more description would have been informative.

**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 unique professional development planned for this project will partially focus on the special needs of the ELL students.

**Weaknesses**

**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**

Accessible quality professional development for rural teachers with the enhancement of being able to collaborate with teachers who are in other rural sites facing similar challenges will be beneficial initially to the teachers, and ultimately to the students. If this model is effective, and easily replicated, it could have tremendous implications for rural schools across the country.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 1**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/23/2010 6:41 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 1:00 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)  
(U396C100135)

**Reader #2:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	18
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	7
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
<b>Competitive Preference</b>		
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	1	1

(0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>60</b>

---

## Technical Review Form

### Development 29: 84.396C

#### Reader #2:

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)  
(U396C100135)

### Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement

The applicant proposes a 3-tiered intervention for high needs students designed to increase the number of students earning proficient scores on the 8th grade algebra test. Interventions will be implemented in 6 school districts and will begin with 90 students completing a summer accelerated pre-algebra project-based experience with emphasis on college pathways and exposure. The participating students will then complete an academic year of enriched algebra instruction with afterschool algebra support provided for those students not making satisfactory progress.

The proposed project will serve approximately 1,620 high needs students in 5 years.

### 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**

The applicant proposes working with schools in six regions of California (Los Angeles Unified School District, Pasadena Unified School District, Antioch School District, Porterville Unified School District, Redding Joint Union School District, Waterford School District, Patterson School District and Newman Landing School District) to serve a 5-year total of 1,620 high-needs students.

The applicant proposes to develop and implement a 3-tiered intervention for high-needs students designed to increase the number of students earning proficient scores on the 8th grade algebra test, increase the number of high-needs students enrolling in college-prep courses and increase the number of participating students who choose STEM paths in high school.

The applicant clearly identifies objectives and measures for specific goals designed to guide the proposed project.

### **Weaknesses**

The applicant provides data concerning California students' lack of college academic readiness for math learning, but the data presented is not specific to the six districts the applicant proposes to serve. Similarly, facts are provided about minority students and poverty, but much of the information is not specific to the targeted school districts identified in the proposal.

The applicant does not make a strong case as to why 8th grade algebra 1 was selected as the area of focus for intervention. The approach, while novel, seems disjointed and includes several components, including direct services to rising 8th graders and 8th grade algebra I students, professional development for teachers using web-based technologies, and instruction for teachers on the MDTP assessment system. Also mentioned as areas of focus are ELLs and schools located in rural areas.

Some of the specific details of the proposed implementation seem to be

omitted. For example, the applicant states that teachers will receive professional development in mathematics project-based learning curricula, addressing language needs of English Learners, and college readiness prior to the Summer Academy and ongoing throughout the school year. No additional information is provided concerning how this will be accomplished.

The applicant does not make a compelling argument that the proposed approach is something novel or new that has not been widely adopted. The applicant simply combines three research-proven strategies, intensive project-based curricular, quality academic instruction and afterschool tutoring and instruction.

While goals, outcomes, and objectives are identified, action steps or measures to achieve each are not always clearly presented. It is unclear how many weeks the summer academy would be conducted and how long sessions would last. It is unclear whether teachers would participate in specific professional development prior to implementing 3 STEM-themed curricular units.

**Reader's Score: 20**

## **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 applicant argues that it is well-positioned to build upon its previous successes. The applicant heralds the existence of educational collaboratives across the state of California with a total of 27 regional sites of the ARCHES alliance across the state.

The applicant lists a number of previously funded and implemented projects. Many of these were funded by business or non-profit agencies, and data or outcomes for these projects are provided. ARCHES has administered several statewide projects.

The applicant collaborates with ConnectED and WestEd, the evaluation partner.

### **Weaknesses**

The applicant does not clearly present how the ICC, ARCHES, the Round Table and other partnering agencies or organizations plan to work collaboratively to implement the proposed program.

While ARCHES requires the regional collaboratives to report annual data concerning academic achievement of all students and the status of closing achievement gaps, the applicant does not explain how the proposed project would utilize the established regional collaboratives.

While the tiered interventions focus on high-needs students, other elements of the proposed project focus on ELL students and teachers' professional development. The applicant does not clearly demonstrate how all the proposed components of the project will improve student achievement.

The applicant does not address how the proposed project will result in significant improvement in graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high quality teachers and principals.

**Reader's Score: 18**

### **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 proposal includes plans to train teachers, resulting in the potential for a "Train the trainer" model for dissemination of the approach to other schools and/or districts.

The applicant proposes serving 1,620 students in the tiered intervention as well as training of 18 teachers per year for 5 years. Additionally, the applicant proposes to train 60 additional teachers in years 4 and 5, thus increasing the potential number of students that will benefit from better-equipped or prepared teachers.

The applicant provides MOUs and letters of support as evidence of the collaboration involved on the project, from both the public and private sector, and to document that the capacity is available to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project.

The applicant presents an approximate cost per student of \$2,657. The cost-benefit ratio for all students taught algebra by those trained teachers is calculated at \$356 per student.

#### **Weaknesses**

The applicant does not clearly identify how each partner or entity will contribute to the proposed project, particularly with regard to resources and costs.

It is unclear how the applicant derived the proposed project costs per student per year.

Mechanisms for dissemination of ideas and practices seem to be limited to conferences sponsored by ARCHES, other national, state or regional conferences and journal publications. It is not clear how teachers would continue to receive professional development, training and support after the grant funding ended or how funding could be addressed on a larger scale.

**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**

The applicant states that the regional collaboratives provide an extensive network and the Round Table provides support from key education stakeholders in the state.

The applicant proposes using a "train the trainer" model to help support the continued use of the proposed program in other middle schools.

##### **Weaknesses**

The applicant does not make a strong case that it has the financial or material resources to sustain the initiatives after the grant funding has ended. While the applicant states that each school has agreed in their MOU to work with ARCHES to sustain the project at the end of the funding cycle, no further information is provided to suggest the nature or interaction of such work together.

**Reader's Score: 7**

**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 wide and varied group of educators and leaders are assembled to work on the proposed project from a variety of organizations.

It is evident from the information provided that some of the key personnel have depth of knowledge and experience working with math pedagogy, ELL students.

An Advisory Panel will advise the work of the project director and key personnel two times per year.

A 5-year project management plan is presented and West ED will provide the evaluation component of the project implementation.

**Weaknesses**

The focus on college readiness and preparation, along with meeting the needs of ELL students, seem to be marginal in the grand presentation of the proposed project.

The management plan seems quite ambitious in that some major activities and milestones are expected in the very first quarter of funding. A delay in timelines would negatively affect implementation of the first summer academy.

Score remained the same after panel discussion even though other reviewers awarded full points.

**Reader's Score: 8**

## **Competitive Preference**

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

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

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

#### **Strengths**

#### **Weaknesses**

The applicant did not respond to this competitive preference.

**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**

Emphasis on college pathways and college exposure is incorporated in the summer accelerated pre-algebra project-based curriculum.

### **Weaknesses**

The applicant does not address how the proposed project will help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes or how the proposed project will provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

**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**

One goal of the proposed project is to build a college-going culture in schools that serve low income and underrepresented minority students.

The three-tiered intervention is designed to focus on high needs students.

### **Weaknesses**

The applicant does not identify innovative practices that would be implemented to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities or students with limited English proficiency.

**Reader's Score: 1**

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

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

**that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.**

**Strengths**

The applicant proposes to offer web-based professional development opportunities for teachers in rural schools for 30 minutes two times a week.

**Weaknesses**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 1**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/26/2010 1:00 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 10:09 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --  
Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -  
Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)  
(U396C100135)

**Reader #3:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	22
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	5
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference</b>		
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	1	1

(0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>64</b>

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development 29: 84.396C**

**Reader #3:**

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --  
.,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -  
.,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)  
(U396C100135)

### Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement

The project addresses three areas of need: 1) minority success in passing the California Mathematics course required for graduation from high school, algebra I, 2) access to academic advisement and information to prepare minority students for college, and 3) participation rate of minority students in STEM related careers.

### 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**

The project addresses three areas of need: 1) minority success in passing the California Mathematics course required for graduation from high school, algebra I, 2) access to academic advisement and information to prepare minority students for college, and 3) participation rate of minority students in STEM related careers.

The model upon which the Algebra component of the project is based shows promise in enhancing targeted student performance. The year-long student support systems and focus on problem-based learning increase the probability of student success. A summer Algebra and College Exploratory Academy (p.6) exposes students to project-based mathematics instruction and college exploration activities. In the fall students who attended the summer academy are placed in Algebra I courses which employ instructional units that build upon knowledge learned in the summer academies. Extended day support systems are then provided to students who do not achieve the proficient level on an Algebra readiness exam (p.6-7).

Geographic scope of intended project is significant (encompassing multiple school districts and serving a large population of rural students from high poverty communities).

### **Weaknesses**

Specific details related to college exploration activities beyond the summer experience are not included. It appears that school year college exploration activities are planned. However, details related to these activities are not clearly described or discussed in the proposal narrative.

The proposal narrative provides specific details related to the Algebra component of this proposal, including supporting research, student achievement data, and instructional models. However, the college-readiness and ELL components of the project are not described in similar detail.

Little information related to the professional development for teachers is included. The proposal describes regular meetings with instructional coaches via video-conferencing. Beyond that few details related to the professional development component for teachers are included. More information related to professional development model would provide a clearer understanding of this project component. Similarly, more information related to how the instructional coaches will be selected and prepared would allow for a more

informed judgment.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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**

Project is led by the Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES), an organization that includes several universities and state level leaders in education (State Superintendent and the Executive Director of the California Post secondary Education Commission for example). Evidence of multiple successful projects focused on enhancement of minority performance in science and mathematics completed by ARCHES included (p. 10, 12-14). Among these are National Science Foundation and United States Department of Education funded projects.

The project leadership is well-defined and includes personnel with extensive experience in projects of this type and scope.

The detailed, preplanned information included with supporting documentation is evidence of the level of experience the proposed leadership group brings to this project.

### **Weaknesses**

Information related to successful initiatives that increased recruitment, retention and/or placement of high-quality teachers in targeted schools is not provided.

**Reader's Score: 22**

### **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**

Although the project targets 1,620 students, the training project teachers receive will result in enhanced Algebra instruction for a much larger number of students and will benefit students beyond the life of the grant. The level of planning and detail apparent in the provided memorandums of understanding enhances the likelihood of successful implementation of the Algebra-related

components of the project.

The California Education Round table is consortium of institutions with a strong history of collaboratively working to improve education across California. Their prior experience and previously developed collaborative mechanisms increases the likelihood that the proposed program will successfully be brought to scale.

The middle schools targeted in this proposal represent a wide variety of schools and demonstrate geographic and ethnic diversity. The project also requires little equipment or start-up costs. These factors increase the probability that the project can feasibly be implemented in other sites.

Dissemination will occur across a number of venues. The California Education Round Table consists of Chief Executive Officers in California K-20 education, providing a clear means for regional dissemination. Project personnel also plan to disseminate through state and national organizations and publications and have a track record of publication and presentation across such venues.

#### **Weaknesses**

While the description of the Algebra-related components of the project demonstrates thorough discussion and planning, details related to the other components of the project are not as clear. As a result it is difficult to determine the probability that these components of the project can be brought to scale and/or replicated.

**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**

Proposal indicates that partner school districts have committed to operation

of the project beyond the length of the grant period.  
The enhanced teaching abilities of the participating Algebra I teachers will be a positive sustainable aspect of the project.

### **Weaknesses**

Memorandums of Understanding do not include a written commitment to operation of project components such as the Summer Academy or extended day support systems beyond the length of the grant period. Additionally, no clear statement of a commitment to sustaining these project components is included in narrative.

**Reader's Score: 5**

### **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 detailed Management Plan with Activities, Responsible Personnel, a Time-line, and Milestones is provided.  
High level of collaboration between several education organizations is evident in the letters of support provided. Specific project-related details and responsibilities have been negotiated and determined prior to proposal submission which is an indicator of thoughtful planning and coordination of project efforts.

Inclusion of an Advisory Board, regularly scheduled meetings of key stakeholders and examination of project-wide data to inform project activities ensure shared, data-based decision-making.  
Advisory Board is composed of faculty and administrators from multiple institutions with a history of success and collaboration on projects with similar focus and scope.

Clear, measurable objectives are provided. Proposed strategies are logical

and well-connected to each objective. Further, measurable outcomes for each objective are included.

**Weaknesses**

None cited or found. Score remained unchanged after review panel discussion.

**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**

**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**

Exposure to the college campus through the Summer Academy.

**Weaknesses**

**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 theories and strategies associated with intended English Learner professional development for teachers are clearly described.

**Weaknesses**

**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**

Use of distance-based technologies to support Algebra teachers from rural communities.

**Weaknesses**

No description of a mentor training program and lack of school-based support for the implementation of instructional strategies learned during teacher professional development.

**Reader's Score: 1**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/28/2010 10:09 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)  
(U396D100135)

**Reader #1:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	6
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i><b>SUB TOTAL</b></i>	<i><b>25</b></i>	<i><b>16</b></i>
<i><b>TOTAL</b></i>	<i><b>25</b></i>	<i><b>16</b></i>

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D**

**Reader #1:**

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)  
(U396D100135)

**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 application cites several research studies to support the three project components: 1)summer accelerated project-based pre-algebra; 2)academic year enriched algebra; and 3)after school algebra support. Several studies that were cited support the effectiveness of project based summer programs for increasing skill and concept knowledge in mathematics. (p. 8) Three state/regional projects have implemented one of the components of this project with positive impact on student achievement in Algebra. (p. 10)

### Weaknesses

The goals for the project are: 1)to master the California Algebra I standards; 2)increase college knowledge and pursue a college preparatory sequence of courses; and 3)participants will enter STEM program of study pathways in high school. The application cites the value of follow up coaching and support for teachers. (p. 9) However, it is not clear why this research is cited when it is neither a goal nor a major component of the project. Research on

the "responsive teaching cycle" is also referenced which again does not align with the project goals. (p. 10) The Student Improvement Through Teacher Empowerment(SITTE) study indicated that one of the measures of success was that "86% of the participating students earned a C grade or better." (p. 10) It is difficult to determine the strength of this study based on student grades or those passing the Algebra I course.

**Reader's Score: 6**

## **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 evaluation design includes qualitative and quantitative data with both formative and summative evaluation questions. The evaluation will include not only the effects of the intervention, but also the processes used and the fidelity of implementation. (p. 14) With the number of schools involved in the project and the three different components that will be implemented, it is wise that the first year will be dedicated to examining evidence for implementation and piloting and refining of instruments. (p. 15) Summative evaluation questions are focused on the three project outcomes. Qualitative data includes teacher, student and parent surveys. Classroom observations and focus groups will be conducted with teachers part of the treatment group. The method and sampling plan is described in detail on pages 17-18. The external evaluator will be WestEd and significant funds have been identified for the evaluation.

### **Weaknesses**

The application indicates that secondary research questions (p. 15) will examine the effect of the intervention by focusing on the differential effects for student subgroups. When referencing Table 2 in Appendix H, there is only one secondary research question listed which addresses females. The reason for the omission of additional secondary research questions is not clear. The process by which teacher observations will be conducted and instruments or protocols for these observations were not discussed in this application. The process by which feedback is provided as part of progress monitoring and implementation is not clearly described.

**Reader's Score: 10**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/21/2010 5:55 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 1:46 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)  
(U396D100135)

**Reader #2:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i><b>SUB TOTAL</b></i>	25	22
<i><b>TOTAL</b></i>	25	22

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D**

**Reader #2:**

**Applicant:** California Education Round Table Intersegmental Coordinating Committee --  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES) -  
,Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES)  
(U396D100135)

**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 team thoroughly documented support in the research literature for each of the key elements of the 3-tiered intervention (p. 8-9). This evidence is compelling that the approach approximates best practice in mathematics education for the desired outcomes.

The intervention has been piloted in several contexts with positive results that suggest further study would be worthwhile. Positive outcomes for participants in the proposed project are likely.

**Weaknesses**

Some of the research cited used grades as an outcome. This is less compelling outcome because of the likely non-normality of grade distributions - making the analysis suspect.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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 evaluation design is well-conceived with tight alignment between evaluation questions, measures, and analysis methods. Mixed Methods approaches should serve the evaluation questions well.

Power analysis was helpful in showing that detecting a meaningful effect was feasible.

Comprehensive implementation data will be collected in service of formative evaluation question #3 (p.16). Implementation data will be collected at multiple levels of the system and using independent measures such as observation protocols.

WestEd is an excellent choice for external evaluation with considerable evaluation capacity at the organizational level and at the personal level of those assigned to this study. The subcontract is large (\$700K+), nearly 15% of the entire budget but this is appropriate given the size and rigor of the summative evaluation design.

#### **Weaknesses**

Power analysis refers to use of a pre-test covariate on achievement outcomes. However, collection of pre-tests doesn't appear to be part of the plan (p. 15).

In addition use of course grades as an outcome measure is somewhat risky because these tend not to be normally distributed - this will be problematic only if inferential statistics are used in this analysis.

**Reader's Score: 13**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/22/2010 1:46 PM