

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:28 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

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 | 1 |
| 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 62: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

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 proposal presents unique and innovative ideas for redesigning persistently low performing schools. |
|--|

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 LEA clearly demonstrates that it has made significant progress in improving academic achievement and decreasing the dropout rate. The applicant has experience in implementing projects of the proposed size and scope.

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 applicant has the capacity and the partnerships needed to develop the proposed project. The project can be replicated in a variety of settings with a variety of students. The applicant demonstrates that they have the resources and qualified personnel to develop and implement this project.

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 clearly has the financial resources and partnerships needed to operate the program beyond the grant period.

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

The applicant has a comprehensive management plan with clearly defined goals, milestones and timelines included in the grant.

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

The applicant outlines innovative strategies designed to enhance educational outcomes for high needs students in the early grades.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant's innovative practices provides innovative practices to support college readiness.

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 applicant's strategies focus on meeting the needs of limited English proficient 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

not applicable

Weaknesses

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:28 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 8:56 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

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 | 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 | 8 |
| Competitive Preference | | |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |
| 4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve | 2 | 0 |

Technical Review Form

Development 62: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant, along with its "official partners" UNITE-LA, United Way of Greater Los Angeles and the USC Rossier School of Education, proposes to enhance and embed a transparent, systematic and sustainable turn-around process for chronically low achieving schools. In this project, operations and instructional plans from internal and external groups will compete to operate both the lowest performing "focus" schools and new "relief schools" designed to ease overcrowding in low- performing schools.

The three goals of the project are to enhance the public schools' choice selection process, support the implementation of the instructional plans of the selected providers, and to implement accountability and continuous improvement measures.

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 application proposes an innovative program to address persistently low performing schools through solicitation of entrepreneurs to take on the LAUSD's most challenging schools. Members of the LA Compact, led by United Way and LAUSD will work to increase the number of applicants for each focus and relief school. It is anticipated that these applicants may include existing school personnel, organized labor, non-profits, and charter associations.

A carefully planned communication plan from outreach, pre-application support, and training in effective practices in turning around low-performing schools is described. Consultants and coaches will be made available to assist applicants during the development stage of the process.

LAUSD will also assist applicants in revising and implementing their instructional plans and applications, to start or restart their schools, and link selected applicants with additional resources. The LAUSD proposal contains a full and detailed list of these support activities.

LAUSD describes a two tiered accountability system which will hold the focus and relief school operators accountable for improved student performance, and LAUSD accountable for providing tiers of support to those schools to ensure they have the opportunity and supports to succeed.

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

LAUSD provides evidence of a number of partnership projects of similar size and scope.

Examples of student performance at both focus and growth schools was included in the proposal. The first round of the Public School Choice Resolution took place December 2009 to February 2010, too late to affect achievement data for the 2009-10 school year. However, overall, LAUSD raised its API scored by 11% in 2009, and met the AYP graduation criteria.

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 project seeks to serve 60,000 students during the grant period and during scale-up another 300,000 students.

Members of the LA Compact have committed to assist LAUSD in its described project activities. UTLA and AALA, the largest education related labor organizations in LA County, have provided support and expertise in the first cohort and along with the project partners and other non-profits, have begun a concerted campaign to secure private funding and additional commitments.

The California Charter School Association will also work with LAUSD on this project and have committed to providing resources to the effort.

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 LA Compact is the identified vehicle through which the applicant proposes to sustain the improvements achieved as a result of this project.

This project enjoys high levels of support as evidenced by letters from, among others, United Teachers of Los Angeles, California Institutions of Higher Education, City of Los Angeles, LAUSD Board of Education and Superintendent, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, American Federal of Teachers, the Governor of the State of California, and the LA Educational Research Consortium.

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

Project milestons, the role of each partner, and specific activities are well described.

Weaknesses

The work plan lacks data about who will be responsible for each milestone.

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

More detail would be required in the application in order to determine the degree to which the requirements in this section were met.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

This criterion was not addressed in the application.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

While this may certainly be part of the plan, more detail would be required in the application order to determine the degree to which the requirements in this section were met.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Not addressed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 8:56 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

Reader #3:

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

Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

TOTAL 80

75

Technical Review Form

Development 62: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396C100336)

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

Project need is apparent. The Los Angeles Unified School District (lead applicant) is the second largest district in the U.S., with 675,000 students attending 658 public and charter schools, with 322,000 of these students attending one of the more than 260 elementary, middle and high schools in

Program Improvement 3+ status (2009). Over 81% of students qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program; over 90% percent are non-White; nearly 41% are English language learners; and approximately 11 percent have special needs. Only 52% of students graduate on time; however, graduation rates increased from 66.0 in 2008 to 71.1 in 2009. (Page 2, Appendix H)

The application is based on the hypothesis that, through a bold competition among operators of turn-around schools, a portfolio of innovative schools will be created, supported and sustained, to better respond to the needs of the local community and systemically turn around low achieving schools. In August 2009, a smaller scale competition met with success as the 260 lowest performing schools solicited plans from internal educator-led teams, management organizations, external nonprofit agencies and charter school operators. Subsequently a resolution was presented to and adopted by the LAUSD School Board, thus paving the way for this initiative. (Pages 3-5; Exhibits 4, 5, Appendix H)

The applicant ties directly to Absolute Priority 4 as an exceptional innovation to turn around persistently low-performing schools (three or more years). It may go beyond whole school reform efforts, including public school choice, in its specific focus and plans to ensure turn around, support, and sustain student learning and achievement. The applicant asserts that this plan differs from similar reforms in Boston, Chicago, New Orleans, New York, and Washington, D.C. It differs in the degree of parental and community involvement in selecting schools and collaboratively shaping who will operate the schools and in what manner (instructional models, etc.); as well as the tangible work done through the influence of the broad and diverse L.A. Compact (18 major institutions with experts and the will to engage parents, teachers, bargaining units, organized labor, nonprofit organizations, administrators, and private businesses. and access to other stakeholders, including families). (Pages 4-9, Exhibit 6, Appendix H)

Accountability and transparency are integral to the three-year initiative to turn around chronic academic underperformance. Clearly stated and well-discussed goals include (a) Enhance the Public School Choice Selection Process - with new supports; (b) Support the Implementation of Instructional Plans of Selected Teams - as overseen by the applicant's Innovations and Charters Division; and (3) Implement Accountability and Continuous Improvement Measures - creating two parallel oversight systems; top review school choice processes and to implement a new performance management framework applied to all schools in the district. (Pages 7-10, Exhibit 6, Appendix H)

The applicant provides extensive data and information in Appendix H,

including a tool for annual data collection and tracking of key initiative activities which clearly demonstrate a high degree of planning and forethought (Exhibit 10). A well-planned timeline of goals and activities (Exhibit 11) demonstrates when and how measurable objectives, linked to the Priority, will be achieved.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses 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 applicant presents multiple examples of other successful initiative and efforts which have resulted in significant improvements. In 2009, the applicant raised its API scores by 11% while six Title 1 schools exited Program Improvement status, and 48 made AYP, thus will be exiting that status if targets are again met in 2010. On the other end of the spectrum, 27 schools have been honored as 2010 California Distinguished Schools by the

Department of Education. (Page 17)

The applicant states that the L.A. Compact document with goals, strategies and specific measures to allow the community-at-large to track progress, etc. is modeled after a Boston Compact to pool resources. Signed 30 years ago, the Compact has produced notable outcomes, such as increasing college attendance rates from 50% in 1985 to 78% in 2007. (Page 15; Exhibit A, Appendix H)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses 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

During the grant period, as many as 36 low performing focus schools (8-12 each year) and 30 new relief schools will go through the public choice process impacting 60,000 students. Eventually, 260 persistently low-performing schools or 300,000 students will be affected. By the end of the third year, the applicant anticipates that the independent assessment will produce a roadmap for other school districts to use in their transformation efforts. (Page 24)

There is broad-based support to develop and take to scale the school improvement initiative. All 18 member organizations of the L.A. Compact, including two education labor-related organizations, the United Way, the Chamber of Commerce and others, have committed in writing that they are fully committed to further development and scaling, including prevention-oriented strategies before schools reach Program Improvement year 3 status. Additional commitments have been made by the Walton Foundation and the Wasserman Foundation; and past support from the Ford Foundation and the California Community Foundation adds credibility. (Pages 23-24)

It is strength of the application that the cost per child for this three-year, \$6 million, highly replicable initiative, is only \$100 each. The approximated cost to reach 100,000; 250,000; and 500,000 students is \$9.4 million; \$23.5 million; and \$47 million respectively. (Page 25)

Weaknesses

The applicant does not sufficiently address in its narrative the mechanisms to be used for broadly disseminating information on its entire project so as to support further development or replication in other communities and states, including but not limited to educators. (Page 25)

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

(1) The applicant makes an adequate case for stakeholder support as will be provided by the L.A. Compact for the purpose of sustaining improvements and systemic reforms. For example, the applicant states that key representatives, including the Mayor, will continue to meet as the L.A. Compact Development Strategy Work Team, responsible for coordinating individual organization fundraising plans, grant development, and leveraging opportunities. (Pages 25-26)

Weaknesses

The applicant does not sufficiently address planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities or benefets into the ongoing work of the school district itself.

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 applicant presents an adequate management plan, including the building of necessary internal infrastructure and overall capacity of the district, while gathering external support and engaging the community. A well-defined timeline of key activities, roles and responsibilities is included as Exhibit 11. (Pages 26-29; Appendix H)

The applicant clarifies the reporting and support structures, with Mr. Cortines, District Superintendent of Schools, leading the effort. He will be supported by Mr. Hill who manages strategic initiatives and will serve as the liaison with Compact partners. (Pages 26-27; Resumes)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

This innovative competition includes developing plans on how each school will address early learning and integrate early childhood education in their overall instructional plans, such as through collaboration with community providers and preschools, including Head Start. (Page 1 and attachment)

Weaknesses

None

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

K-12 students that

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

Strengths

The applicant clearly affirms that this initiative requires detailed plans from each competing school for ensuring college access and career readiness, using a p-20 framework. This intent is also supported by official partners, UNITE-LA and the United Way of Los Angeles, and others including institutions of higher education. (Page 1 and attachment)

Weaknesses

None.

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 applicant specifically declares that participating schools are required to address the needs of special populations, including those with learning disabilities and English language learners. Experts provide training in both developing and implementing plans shown to help raise achievement for students with disabilities and those who are limited English proficient. (Page 1 and attachment)

Weaknesses

None.

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

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:50 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2010 3:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396D100336)

Reader #1:

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

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396D100336)

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 project description provides an articulated vision for a plan to turnaround low performing schools. Research on various school improvement models such as site-based management, pilot schools, and charter schools is identified, along with the limitations of each initiative. The site-based management model allows for decentralization and takes the decision-making process closer to the student environment. Pilot schools also include a decentralization of power, as well as the authority to hire and evaluate the principal. Charter schools allow for innovative ideas in education and for targeted focus on groups of students with unique needs (students at-risk of dropping out). The locus of control for both the pilot and charter schools comes from partners external to the public education system. Problems with the models have been studied by Calkins(2007). Lack of buy-in, confusing policy designs, and fragmenting training are cited as reasons why certain of these models have not met with success. The crux of the proposed portfolio model is the belief that school authority and structure need to fit the culture of the school community. The research is summarized in the work of Hill(2006) and Lake and Hill(2009). Based on the weaknesses of models identified in the research, the roles of the LAUSD administration and the collaborative partners are crafted to provide support and monitor accountability to further study a model's potential .

Weaknesses

The outcomes of the 2009-2010 LAUSD initiative are undetermined. The evaluations are still in data collection phase. Some anecdotal success stories are presented but it is too early to draw conclusions about the success of the school models. The replicable impact of any one type of school design is not available for discussion. There is no discussion about specific portfolio school reform efforts that do not succeed.

Reader's Score: 7

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

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths

The evaluation design is broad, which is appropriate given the multiple layers of depth(organizational structure at the school and district level) and breadth(portfolio of the school reform models)of the proposal. The range of data collected will provide information across all fronts, including organizational, school, teacher and student level. Each wave of schools selected to participate will be monitored and analyzed using standardized assessments, survey instruments and rubrics.

The expertise of the evaluators includes knowledge on policy implementation and school reform, case study analysis and implementation, and education finance and governance. This collection of expertise and the assignments to specific aspects of the evaluation(schools and organizational support) will allow for pointed attention to key elements of implementation. The skill set of the L.A. Compact partners provides an unprecedented support system for analysis and interpretation of the data. Compact organizations such as the USC Rossier School of Education, UNITE-LA,

and the United Way of Greater Los Angeles offer critical perspectives on indicators of successful change efforts.

To examine the individual school level models, five case studies, covering the district's grade level spans, will be conducted in each of the three phases of the program rollout. The close attention to detail provided by the case studies will supply the kind of in-depth information needed to determine the extent of implementation of the model and the degree to which the district's support systems were needed and utilized. To provide a way to summarize and compare school model success, rubrics will be designed to guide the analysis.

Four separate quasi-experimental studies will compare initiative schools to control schools to study the longer term outcomes of success on critical outcomes. These outcomes (student achievement, graduation rate, teacher retention) require an extended period of time to measure in a system where organizational change is just beginning.

Weaknesses

The umbrella of evaluation activities covered is extensive and will demand on-going communication across the educational components. There are references to end of year reports in all of the separate research efforts. There may be a need to include more frequent communication across smaller subsets of evaluators to manage the volume of data collected.

The evaluation resources appear to be low at \$200,000 per year. Given the number of quasi-experimental studies (4) and the 5 case studies per year, the resources may be spread too thin. The Data Analyst position, filled by an internal employee of the LAUSD, is not included in the cost of the evaluation but may introduce an element of bias to the interpretation of the data.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2010 3:38 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396D100336)

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 | 5 |
| 2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 12 |
| <i>SUB TOTAL</i> | 25 | 17 |
| TOTAL | 25 | 17 |

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 07: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Los Angeles Unified School District -- Office of the Superintendent, - Office of the Superintendent, (U396D100336)

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

STRENGTHS: The proposal responds to Absolute Priority 4 and Competitive Priorities 5, 6 and 7. It builds on previous work initiated in August of 2009 by the LA USD which is the current applicant. The hypothesis is presented on page 2 and the research presented demonstrates preliminary positive results in the use of a portfolio of innovative school models to turnaround low performing schools. School reform research from across the country is cited which highlights the key features of a portfolio system that the proposed project intends to integrate into the proposed initiative (p.11 & 13). The proposal highlights barriers to success for portfolio models from research on prior implementations and how the current project will remedy those barriers to increase the potential for successful outcome achievement (p.14).

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: The data presented on page 14 is very limited. It cannot be determined if the results cited on page 14 are statistically significant. For example, clarification on the magnitude of a 78 point jump in API score for the Belmont High School needs to be further anchored with statistical significance. Likewise, there is no discussion on the magnitude of the effect

since the effect size, number of students, schools and specific implementation features are not discussed. The proposal would be improved by including specific information on the methodology used to evaluate the previous efforts and provide details of the magnitude of effect and impact on student outcomes that can be expected in the proposed project based on the previous research. The information from the Boston Compact research (which is presented on page 15 in the Applicant Experience section) should be included in the research section as well to support the proposed model.

Reader's Score: 5

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

STRENGTHS: The evaluation will use mixed methods to address three evaluation questions. Both process and outcomes components are discussed that will capture data on both the key components of the project and project effectiveness. The process outcomes will include a check of fidelity to document the project key components that may impact outcomes. Case studies of 10 schools will be included to document context and process for the evaluation which will be vital since the portfolio model includes several models with distinct implementation features that will need to be captured to ensure replication and transferability. Rubrics will be employed to determine quality of implementation plans for the various models and will be supplemented by surveys to school leaders to cull for factors of low and high performing schools. This information will also assist in distinguishing the impact of specific factors on project outcomes and will inform future replication potential. Outcomes will be compared based on frequency,

duration and model of the intervention to compare differences and factors associated with outcome differences. The inclusion of this information will maximize the utility of findings by creating the potential for explaining differential impact. Outcome measures are described on page 21 and appear to align closely with the anticipated project outcomes. The evaluation methods include interrupted time series and regression discontinuity design methods to determine student outcomes which could temper the short amount of time that the evaluation will cover (3 years). The data collection tracking key is detailed and presents the phase in of various data collection activities (Appendix). The University of Southern California, Rossier School of Education and RAND Corp. will be the independent external evaluators. The evaluation team has the requisite skills to conduct an evaluation of the scope proposed.

Weaknesses

WEAKNESSES: The budget for USC and RAND are combined so it cannot be determined if the allocation is sufficient to cover the individual pieces. The budget should specify the costs for each evaluation partner which aligns with the specific scope of work for each partner so sufficient resources for scope of work can be determined. More information is needed on the data analysis, continuous quality improvement reporting and how results will be used to inform practice. Although continuous quality improvement is underscored in feedback to school choice implementers in their plans, it is not built into the evaluation plan as only annual reporting will be required which does not account for mid-course corrections. Three years does not appear to be enough time to determine long-term outcomes as stated on page 19 such as student achievement changes and school climate changes. It is not clear how the evaluation efforts will be coordinated since there are two distinct evaluation organizations involved collecting a large amount of data.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 9:40 AM