

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2010 11:19 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

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	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	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 42: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

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

The CollegeYes program directly addresses the i3 grant Absolute Priority 3. The program is designed to meet the needs of high-risk students in the Los Angeles area. The program has a focus on English Language Learners. 92% of the students receive free or reduced lunch. Its design is intended to prepare these students for college or post-graduate career

paths. The goals of the project are clearly set and measurable.

Weaknesses

None noted.

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 supervising board of the project, The Alliance, have conducted several projects with greater size and scope than the CollegeYES proposal. Previously they have partnered with the Mayor of Los Angeles in the construction of a Math and Science Charter High School. The Alliance group has a demonstrated track record of improving student achievement for high-risk students - all of their schools have outperformed traditional schools with similar demographics.

Weaknesses

None noted.

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 grant writers have a demonstrated track record of developing and expanding programs successfully in the LA area. Given appropriate funding, the program could be replicated in districts across the country. The proposal clearly estimates to costs to expand the program all the way to 500,000 students.

Weaknesses

None noted.

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 Alliance group has an extensive history of successful fundraising activities in the past. Key stakeholders such as the Ahmanson Foundation and the Gates Foundation, as well as others, have pledged continued support for the project. 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 area clearly defined.

Weaknesses

None noted.

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 has been thoroughly developed, with specific budgetary needs and goals identified for each phase of the project. The project director has extensive experience in helping low-performing public schools, and her support staff have the skill sets needed to support her in this role.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority.

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 STEM courses and Advisory periods designed into the program provide students with the practical knowledge needed regarding college expectations, affordability, and financial assistance available.

Weaknesses

None noted.

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

Approximately 25% of students in the Alliance schools are ESL students. The CollegeYES principles address the unique learning needs of these students.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Applicant did not apply for this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2010 11:19 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/27/2010 2:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

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	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	9
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 42: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

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

The applicant has paired two central goals for meeting this priority on college and career readiness by integrating innovative uses of technology and project-based learning with STEM courses and college counseling experiences. With a Latino population of 86%, and high poverty rates in these Los Angeles schools, the applicant is clearly serving an unmet need by providing these opportunities for students. The use of students as technology leaders is especially innovative, cost effective, and promising in terms of

increasing student engagement and motivation.

Weaknesses

The application narrative is not very specific on how the professional development plan will address STEM content and project-based learning, especially as it pertains to the annual STEM student projects.

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 non-profit charter school operator established the first high school in 2004 and has impressively scaled up to a total of 17 middle and high schools in just 6 years, with 3 more planned during the grant period. The 99% graduation rate and 73% college attendance rates are also very impressive given the depressing fact that only 30% of students are proficient on the CST in middle school years. The implementation partner, Kijana Voices, has over a decade of experience and proven track record in meaningful professional development and increasing 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

The strategies for scaling up and dissemination involving conferences, publications, and community outreach are all excellent. Foundation partners are impressive and will enable targets to be reached in the grant period provided there are no glitches in opening three new schools. The plan for integration into courses is a bonus for continued development of the project as it becomes increasingly institutionalized.
--

Weaknesses

The applicant's estimates for costs to scale up to big targets seem low given the high dependence on delicate technology such as laptops and tablets with mobile functionality that have costly upgrades and repairs. Details in how those estimates were calculated are missing.

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 has demonstrated success in diversified fundraising, and has a track record of scaling up the school model quickly and effectively. Creating course integration from the outset is also a strategy that will likely enable ongoing support for the project, and resources that will be built into future school budgets.

Weaknesses

The continued training of student technology leaders and new teachers beyond the grant period is not specifically addressed and could pose an onerous cost and time burden. The institutionalization described through policy, procedures, programs and budgets lacks specifics and details on how this will be accomplished, particularly regarding summer training for teachers.

Reader's Score: 9

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

All partners have experience working on technology integration and project-based learning in high-needs urban schools with clear parameters and defined responsibilities that also involve teachers, parents, and students. Timelines provide details and are broken down by quarter. There is potential for additional funding from the private sector as the project moves forward so goals should be accomplished without budgeting difficulties. All personnel are highly qualified and committed to the goals and desired outcomes of the project based on prior experiences and successes.

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

N/A: The proposal did not apply for this competitive preference category.

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 project is specifically designed to improve student achievement for college readiness and success, as well as prepare students for college entrance procedures. There is explicit instruction in understanding financial aspects of college. Peers and adults are used in leadership roles to assist with support and dissemination of project's goals.

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 proposed project is designed for a high percentage of limited English proficient students and an overall Latino population of 86%. The programs proposed are specifically designed to increase college and career readiness and maintain high graduation rates for these populations.

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

N/A: The proposal did not apply for this competitive preference category.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/27/2010 2:57 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 7:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

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	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 42: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396C100321)

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

The proposed project is targeting a high need student population. The 17 schools in the Alliance Network are 86% Hispanic, 13% African American, 23% ELL, 6% Special Education students and 92% of students participate in the Free/Reduced Meal Program.

With the addition of 3 schools in 2011, the project will serve 10,000 students.

The goals of the program are clearly stated and measurable. They are challenging but reasonable for the proposed project.

Weaknesses

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 Alliance has demonstrated the ability to implement a project of the size and scope of the one proposed. Examples of past project successes include the Construction of a Math/Science High School on the CSULA Campus, the opening of 13 new charter schools over a 4 year period and the Center for Math and Science Instruction Partnership with Loyola Marymount University.

The Alliance has provided evidence that they have increased student achievement in the past by almost all subgroups increased performance on

the CST for 2008-2009. All Alliance schools outperformed nearby traditional schools on the CST.

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

The number of students targeted is appropriate and attainable for the proposed project.

Alliance and Kijana Voices have demonstrated the capacity for replicating programs and scaling them to a larger group through opening additional successful charter schools and the STL program.

The applicant has provided reasonable costs to scale the project to 500,000 students.

The plan for dissemination is detailed and includes avenues such as conferences, professional networks, professional associations and publications.

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 applicant has demonstrated support of ongoing work. Foundation supports include Ahmanson Foundation, Gates Foundation, and Baxtor Family Foundation.

The project design lends itself to incorporation into the Alliance School Network.

Weaknesses

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

Key personnel have been identified and project responsibilities are clearly identified. Key personnel have the experience and expertise to implement the proposed project.

A detailed timeline with attainable milestones for the project is provided.

The budget detail is appropriate for the project and clearly presented.

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

Not addressed

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 College Yes program targets all of the objectives for Competitive Preference Priority 6 including college expectations, college affordability, financial aid and the college application process.

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 proposed project targets Special Education students as well as English Language Learners.

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

Not addressed

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 7:14 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100321)

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	8
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 05: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100321)

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 identified a number of program variables that program developers hypothesize affect the expected outcomes. The authors also describe studies of the outcomes of Tech-Yes programs, the findings of which support the proposed project. The results of the described meta-analyses, in particular, provide good evidence and support for the proposed intervention. The description of the previous implementation of the STL component of the intervention is a strength of the proposal.

Weaknesses

A stronger explanation of the similarities between TechYES and CollegeYES would have strengthened the proposal.

The applicant does not provide information about the expected magnitude of the effect of CollegeYES on the expected outcomes. Page 15 identifies outcomes of a previous implementation of the STL component but the way in which the results are reported does not provide a good indication of the magnitude of the change. Details about the potential impact of the project on student outcomes would have been helpful.

Reader's Score: 8

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 methods are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project. The CBAM and Guskey models offer appropriate frameworks for data collection and analysis. The evaluation plan calls for the collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data from a variety of stakeholders. The strength of this plan is that it will likely provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings. Also, the evaluation plan allows for the sharing of evaluation data to allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. These elements of the plan will allow for a comprehensive review of the project and support program implementation and formative review.

The identified resources should be sufficient to carry out the project evaluation.

Weaknesses

The weakness in the evaluation plan is the lack of details about how student outcome data will be collected and analyzed as well as an overall description of methods of data analysis and how the various data sources will be integrated to tell a complete story of implementation and outcomes.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:43 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/23/2010 1:17 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100321)

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	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	23
TOTAL	25	23

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 05: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools -- , - , (U396D100321)

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

B. Factor #1

The proposed project uses research-based findings to develop the hypotheses (p. 2). The 'causal chain' of events of the intervention is nicely articulated showing how they eventually impact the key indicators. This includes referencing the Carpenter study (p. 8) and a justification of the project hypothesis and its research underpinnings (p. 12). Finally, the description of the meta-analyses conducted previously on project-based learning (p. 14) helps lend confidence to the hypothesis proposed.

B. Factor #2

The intervention proposed is based on 'rigorous California State standards' (p. 8). They are also aligning with the 'ISTE Technology and the 21st Century Skills Standards' which complement California's standards. There is a lengthy discussion of the previous implementation of the STL project (P. 14-15).

B. Factor #3

The proposal discusses quite well how the research as well as previous implementation of the intervention would suggest a positive impact of the intervention on the student achievement (p. 14-16) as well as 'college readiness, student efficacy and confidence, and learning skills.' (p. 16). The gains made in math, language arts and reading scores in similar projects in Texas (p. 15) offer promise for this intervention to result in similar student

achievement impacts in Los Angeles schools.

Weaknesses

B. Factor #1

There is a lack of clarity regarding the interrelationship between 'College YES' and the 'Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools.' It is unclear whether these are the same groups or different entities. It would have been more helpful if the investigators offered more explanation regarding these two organizations.

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

D. Factor #1

The proposal offers a thorough discussion of the process and outcome evaluation plans. The research questions are well-outlined and matched with the project objectives (p. 19). The evaluation plan is strengthened by the inclusion of comparison schools and the collection of self-report and observational data.

D. Factor #2

The tools being used in data collection have been previously validated (Five Levels of Professional Development Form, CBAM) (p. 20). Included in the evaluation plan is the need to share results with implementers to 'refine

program components' (p. 22)

D. Factor #3

The proposal offers a thorough discussion of the feedback loop for data collection and analysis (p. 18) as well as the extent that key informants will play a role in any changes needed/required for the evaluation design. Plans for replication (p. 23) and future dissemination of results from the evaluation (p. 24) are included in the proposal.

D. Factor #4

The evaluation personnel indicated in the proposal appear to be experienced to handle the evaluation tasks included in the design. The percentage of the budget devoted to the evaluation (884K or 17.7%) seems adequate to complete the tasks at hand.

Weaknesses

D. Factor #1

Greater detail is needed to demonstrate to the reader how exactly the analyses of the data will take place for both the process and outcome evaluation components.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 1:17 PM