

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -  
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High  
Schools (U396C100380)

**Reader #1:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	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
<b>Competitive Preference</b>		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

---

## **Technical Review Form**

### **Development 62: 84.396C**

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

**Applicant:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -- Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools (U396C100380)

### **Summary Statement**

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

### **Selection Criteria**

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths**

<p>The applicant demonstrates a need for the project and presents an comprehensive approach to working with high needs students. The strategy of utilizing trimesters is a unique strategy that has not been widely</p>
---

adopted. The goals and objectives are clear, specific, and measurable.

**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 applicant has demonstrated success with the program proposed on a limited basis in their school district. The applicant has closed the achievement gap utilizing the trimester program in some of the districts' schools.

**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 to develop the project. The program can be replicated in other districts with other student populations. The applicant is partnering with Education Northwest to produce a formal guide on program results.

#### **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 is currently utilizing the major components of the program in high schools throughout the district. The applicant has formed strategic partnerships with colleges, business and community groups, and other stakeholders to ensure that the project continues after 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 developed a management plan with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones. The management personnel selected are qualified to handle the proposed project.

**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 applicable

#### 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 applicant had developed a program that will assist students in preparing for college. The program also provides support to students from knowledgeable adults.

**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**

not applicable

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

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

**Strengths**

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:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -  
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High  
Schools (U396C100380)

**Reader #2:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	20
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
<b>Competitive Preference</b>		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>66</b>

---

## **Technical Review Form**

### **Development 62: 84.396C**

#### **Reader #2:**

**Applicant:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -- Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools (U396C100380)

### **Summary Statement**

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

Making Time for What Matters Most. The project is aimed at 6 high schools and includes four goals: improve achievement and close achievement gaps, decrease drop-out rates and increase graduation rates, increase college readiness and access, and improve teacher and school leader effectiveness. This is proposed to be accomplished through increased learning time, increased time for personalized student support, and increased time for teacher learning to improve instruction.

### **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 program proposes to add at least 67 hours of "learning time" annually, specifically to address the needs of struggling learners, in six district high schools. This will be coupled with additional learning time through double periods for those students who need a deeper immersion type intervention, effectively increasing instructional time each day to 140 or even 210 minutes in a single subject.

The project includes research based effective practices including a weekly 55 minute period which will consist of focused college access curricula, delivered by an adult who will stay with each group throughout their high school careers. This program will also include focused time for teacher learning and collaboration, cross disciplinary learning teams that will meet each week to discuss the personalized learning needs of each.

### **Weaknesses**

Increasing student contact time is a research-based effective practice when coupled with high levels of teacher content knowledge and expertise in high quality instructional practices during that extended time. The measurement proposed for teacher content knowledge lacks an objective measure, instead relying on "teacher perceptions of self efficacy." (p. 5)

Methods whereby students would be selected for the additional 70 or 140 minutes periods (in addition to the existing 70 minute period) for students needed extra assistance are not described in sufficient detail to determine if they are linked to the priorities.

**Reader's Score: 20**

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

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

**(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**

**(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**

**(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**

**(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**

**(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**

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

### **Strengths**

The proposal cites student achievement in two high schools to demonstrate how it has significantly closed achievement gaps and increased graduation of its students. At one school overall reading scores have increased 26% in two years and 10% in mathematics. Students in poverty closed the achievement gap in reading (23%) and math (8%). At Shawnee the gaps in reading scores between blacks and whites in the last year have been reduced by 12.2%.

Graduation rates at both Western (9%) and Academy@ Shawnee (6%) have increased.

The applicant clearly described projects of similar size and scope undertaken and the positive results that emerged from those projects (see Section E).

### **Weaknesses**

In its statistics showing overall increases in student achievement at Western High School, there was no closure of the achievement gap between blacks and whites in reading and only a 3.1% (not percentage point) closure in mathematics. There is also little of no closure in mathematics performance between blacks and whites in the last year at Shawnee. No data was provided for the other four high schools.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**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 application provided clear evidence that it has the capacity to take large academic projects to scale through its examples of previous and current work, including Every 1 Reads, and Developing Futures in Math.

The project plan calls for the production of a "formal guide" and "user guides" in best uses of increased learning time that will be carried out by project partner Education Northwest.

**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 application documents the district's ability to garner public and private support of its academic programs through entrepreneurial fund-raising.

The project plan places two district cabinet members as project leads, creates a leadership team at each school, and has a communication plan in place to share results and practices with principals, resource teachers and curriculum directors. The application states, "The goals, strategies, and programs described herein are not dependent on continued funding from external sources, but rather are incorporated [into] the on-going improvement plans of JCPS." p. 23

**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 management plan is clear and detailed, describing activities, timelines, and who will be responsible for each step.

The qualifications of the project director and key personnel are well matched to the project activities.

**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 CAT program with 55 minutes per week devoted to post secondary success directly addresses this criterion.

**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**

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**Strengths**

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 4:51 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -  
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High  
Schools (U396C100380)

**Reader #3:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	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	9
<b>Competitive Preference</b>		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>75</b>

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development 62: 84.396C**

**Reader #3:**

**Applicant:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -- Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools, High Schools (U396C100380)

### 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

Directly linked to Absolutely Priority 4(b), the application targets six persistently low-performing high schools for demonstrating the effectiveness

of switching to a five-period trimester school year, adding 30% more learning time for struggling students and increasing time for electives and advanced classes. The project also includes a rapid employment of prototyping for continuous improvement, such as to the extent that core curriculum better aligns with the state's common core standards. For example, five 70-minute courses per day for each of the three 12-week trimesters are now allowing its students to earn more credits in four years (30 vs. 24). Additionally, four other strategies will add at least 67 hours of learning time in the school year. (Pages 1, 2, 6)

The project's three overarching goals are clearly stated; e.g., provide structures and supports for student mastery of core courses in year one; provide a range of personalized supports to students to increase college readiness; and improve teachers' pedagogical and student support practices. Large qualitative objectives range from increased monitoring of student intervention with rapid engagement of supports, such as immersion courses or peer-to-peer support, to enhance teacher knowledge and attention to students with unique challenges. The trimester also makes time for a weekly 55-minute College Access Time (CAT) period where 20 students are paired with a supportive adult who stays with them across four years of high school; as well afterschool CAT classes and summer institutes. (Pages 2-7)

This project is somewhat unique in its collective group of approaches in a 3x5 trimester plan, with accompanying components. This project pulls from best practice models, such as the reportedly successful Talent Development High Schools and First Things First high school reform that integrating advisors as advocates and involve parents in academic goal setting, for example. (Pages 10-13)

#### **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 demonstrates that it has experienced success in significantly increase student academic achievement. The applicant adequately discusses challenges, such as its operation of two Title I schools classed as NCLB in need of improvement tier 5-2, where 82% of students are eligible for free or reduced price lunch program. By implementing whole school reform, the recruiting and retaining of qualified teachers is 92.2% and 98.7%. In two years, overall reading scores have increased by 25.5% while math scores have increased by 10% with slightly higher gains made by African American students. Over the last three years, graduation rates have risen 9%.(Pages 12-13)

**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**

The applicant clearly states that 5,800 students will be reached by this more comprehensive approach. The applicant demonstrates significant capacity to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period, as made evident by its implementation of other large-scale projects, e.g., Every 1 Reads, an \$8 million effort engaging 10,000 trained volunteers in tutoring and mentoring students and reducing the percent of struggling readers from 18% to 9% over the past four years. The applicant has also successfully managed a \$25 million Developing Futures in Education grant from the GE Foundation (2005) with an additional \$10.5 million granted by the Foundation for the next three years to further develop the math and science initiative. Added proof of capacity includes more than \$93 million in grants and contracts, along with partnerships with more than 600 organizations, businesses, corporations and foundations. (Pages 21-22)

The applicant clearly states that the cost the proposed project (including anticipated cost-share and \$1 million for evaluation and technical assistance) is nearly \$6 million. Therefore, it is suggested that replication in six similar schools would cost approximately \$5.2 million, with some economies of scale for larger districts. The estimated costs to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students are \$23.7 million, \$59.2 million, and \$118.5 million respectively.(Page 23)

#### **Weaknesses**

No weaknesses 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 applicant absolutely demonstrates it has a history of garnering external resources to continue promising practices and model initiatives after project grant funding expires. Additionally, the District is a member of a collaborative Joint Commitment to Educational Attainment wherein area post-secondary institutions, businesses, a myriad of organizations and the Mayor's Office have pledged to work together to increase the number of college graduates by 40,000 by 2020 in Jefferson County. With two district Cabinet members leading the project and similar engagement at each school, it is likely that the infrastructure will be adequate to integrate the practices into ongoing operations. The project is replicable district-wide and across Kentucky as suggested.(Pages 23-25)

**Weaknesses**

No weaknesses 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 applicant thoroughly demonstrates that the very qualified Executive Director for their internal research and development arm (Mr. Camins) will commit .25 FTE of his time to serve as Project Director in coordination with Mr. Burks, another Cabinet member. Camins has led numerous National Science Foundation grants and other major initiatives. Other key positions and functions include a College Access Time Coordinator, Master Scheduler, Counselor, and Team Members at each school. The applicant will utilize the services of a qualified external evaluator, also named in the proposal. (Pages 25-28)

**Weaknesses**

The applicant provides a general timeline; however, it does not include measures or sufficient milestones to demonstrate objectives that can be achieved on time and within budget. (Pages 27-28)

**Reader's Score: 9**

**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 requested

**Weaknesses**

Not requested

**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 applicant requests Competitive Priority 6. This is appropriate as College Access Time is a critical component of this initiative. Long-term mentors are matched with students, along with peer-to-peer support, for the purposes of college readiness and admission.

**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**

Not requested

**Weaknesses**

Not requested

**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 requested

**Weaknesses**

not requested

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/28/2010 4:51 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:44 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -  
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High  
Schools (U396D100380)

**Reader #1:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	8
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
<b>TOTAL</b>	25	18

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development Tier 2 Panel 01: 84.396D**

**Reader #1:**

**Applicant:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools  
-- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High  
Schools (U396D100380)

**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:**

Three research questions are identified by the applicant. These include looking at the amount of time that successful students need for remediation and accelerated learning activities; How do successful students become engaged, challenged, and affiliated; How do effective teachers use time to collaborate, and to improve teaching practice.

The applicant demonstrates how they have implemented some of these concepts and practices already and provides recent evaluations, references and research conclusions to document the success. (pp 7-9)

Additional rigorous research and references are provided to help document why these practices were included. Many of the items are from well known authors, and researchers and appear in well-respected peer-refereed journals.

## **Weaknesses**

### **WEAKNESSES:**

The only topic missing from discussion that would have helped to strengthen this proposal is Communities of Practice , or Professional Learning Communities which are both allowing teachers the time and opportunity and professional development to collaborate and build their team relationships. There is a wealth of research and information explaining and defining and demonstrating the effectiveness of this practice on student achievement and advancement.

**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**

### **STRENGTHS:**

The applicant proposes specific measurable and observable goals, objectives, and outcomes as a result of their identified needs. ( p 4) An external evaluator is identified. Identified staff are well qualified to conduct an evaluation of this magnitude.

Specific research questions are proposed to be studied. (p 16) The applicant identifies that they will conduct an experimental study using multiple methodologies. The applicant includes a table of data to be collected , when

and how is identified.

A detailed outcome evaluation is included with specific ways that conclusions will be determined. Continuous and ongoing discussion are included between the evaluator and project staff. Evaluation activities are included on the management timeline plan.

### **Weaknesses**

#### **WEAKNESSES:**

The applicant states that they have an IRB review board, but does not provide any details about any of the required assurances and refers the reader to some other documents. It is unclear how or what required human rights and individual assurances the applicant will provide.

The budget only identifies about 4% to be allocated to the entire evaluation. This may not be enough resources in order to conduct the longitudinal and multiple data collection throughout the life of the project.

The three components of their project: Academic Acceleration, College Access Time and Teacher Professional Growth. Do not easily lend themselves to the targeted audience or the overall proposal to turn around six persistently low-performing HS.

**Reader's Score: 10**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/22/2010 2:44 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:03 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools -  
- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High  
Schools (U396D100380)

**Reader #2:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	19
<b>TOTAL</b>	25	19

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development Tier 2 Panel 01: 84.396D**

**Reader #2:**

**Applicant:** Jefferson County Board of Education DBA Jefferson County Public Schools  
-- Jefferson County Public Schools,High Schools - Jefferson County Public Schools,High  
Schools (U396D100380)

**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**

One strength of the proposal is the literature review outlining existing research. The JCPS team effectively provided an overview of the research pertaining to their three priorities for restructuring the area high schools.

A second strength is that JCPS is currently implementing the proposed approach (i.e., trimesters with emphasis on core academics, individual attention through CATs, and professional development and PLCs) and has evaluated those efforts. As a result, JCPS already knows that their approach works in their community and has documented gains made by students, especially African American students. As a result, JCPS staff have realistic expectations about expanding their efforts and realistic expectations of student performance.

#### **Weaknesses**

Although the literature review was a good overview, one weakness was that little detailed information was provided. For example, the authors state that "schools that serve large concentrations of poor students were able to obtain

achievement gains" (see pg. 11) but it is unclear under which academic domains those gains occurred - reading, math, science, etc.

**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**

For the outcome study JCPS proposes use of a comparison group that has been matched to the treatment group using propensity scores. Use of propensity scores is recognized by evaluators and research scientists as an effective and appropriate method of matching participants for a quasi-experimental design.

A strength is that the evaluation incorporates both process (e.g., documenting the implementation of the problem based learning approach) and outcomes findings which will provide information on both what happened (i.e., process) and the impact (outcomes) of a JCPS's program.

Another strength is the inclusion of multiple methodologies across multiple stakeholders. Because the evaluation does not rely on data from only one assessment instrument or one stakeholder group, it is likely that the evaluation will capture important information about the impact of JCPS's program.

### **Weaknesses**

One weakness is that the proposal did not clarify the source of the comparison group schools/students. It is unclear if JCPS will match schools and students within the district or seek other sources for the comparison group. Because the source of the comparison group students is not known, the appropriateness of the comparison group for this study cannot be determined (even though propensity score matching will be used).

**Reader's Score: 10**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/22/2010 2:03 PM