

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/25/2010 9:54 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

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 | 4 |
| 4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 7 |
| 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 | 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 Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points) | 2 | 0 |

Technical Review Form

Development 39: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The project proposed by the Erickson Institute in collaboration with the Chicago Public School system identifies an enormous need for guided, supported implementation of mathematics concepts and appropriate instructional strategies for teachers of young children.

Based upon a highly successful early literacy professional development model of enhancing teacher effectiveness and learning regarding pedagogy and content knowledge. the Erickson Institute has designed a compliment in the area of mathematics filling a void for early childhood education professionals.

Additionally, the project has the backing and support of every nationally recognized professional organization not only in the early childhood arena, but also the mathematics arena. The qualifications of all partners including NAEYC, NSDC, NCTM, scholars with international recognition and honors and CPS personnel illustrate the ability of the collaborative partners to impact early childhood education and the achievement of our youngest children in a profound way.

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 Erickson Institute presents an exceptional approach to meeting the priorities set out in the application of meeting the instructional needs of high needs students in the area of mathematics through improving upon a highly successful and proven model that has been used in early literacy instruction for some time. Furthermore, the application identifies a huge need within primary education for teacher support in understanding mathematics concepts as well as the instructional strategies that are appropriate for young children.

The project contains appropriate, attainable goals linked to student learning and a recognized need that is supported with evidence and data.

A learning lab approach greatly enhances teacher effectiveness as the teacher is now a supported, learner who then goes on to support their students learning in a similar fashion. Similarly, the "Whole Teacher Development" chart presented on pg 8 is a model for other LEAs to use when designing appropriate professional development that brings about systemic change and enhanced student growth.

The logic model of Intervention presented on page 4 clearly delineates the unique and multi-tiered delivery model of effective professional development.

The application includes teacher instruction in new knowledge, coaching to model and support the instructional strategy in the teachers' classroom, site groups and Professional Learning Communities to provide collegial support and learning from other on the ground practitioners and guided classroom implementation so that teachers are supported as learners rather than dictated to by someone they have no connection to. This model has been extremely effective in early literacy and the process of using what works from the reading model. Learning from the past growth opportunities from the reading model assures continuous learning for both students and teachers.

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 documentation of past performance of the applicant with projects of the scope presented is unquestioned. Additionally, the evidence of Erickson Institute, an Institute of Higher Education, to significantly improve student and teacher achievement through their considerable, validated work within the Chicago Public School system is above reproach.

Lastly, the applicant has the unequivocal endorsement of every recognized national organization in mathematics and early childhood education to further illustrate their experience and qualifications.

Weaknesses

No weakness 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 identifies the number of students that will be supported by the grant including start up and scale up cost estimates. There is no question that the applicant has the ability and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the strategies presented in the application. Because of the endorsements and support of national early childhood and mathematics organizations, dissemination through conferences and journal publications is clearly supported.

Weaknesses

The feasibility of replication in a variety of settings would be challenging if

the LEA were not of the size and commitment of Chicago Public Schools. This would be particularly challenging to implement in small, rural districts where fiscal resources as well as human resources are not as widespread. Additionally, LEAs experiencing severe fiscal limitations would struggle to support the project fiscally.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

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

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

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

Strengths

The application clearly demonstrates how capacity is being built at the school level to sustain the training beyond the length of the grant. Additionally, creation of videotapes for training not only supports the continued dissemination of learning after the grant sunsets but also provides a potential source of revenue to continue the project.

Weaknesses

Clear evidence that all stakeholders would be able to sustain the project, particularly from a fiscal perspective, is not provided.

Insufficient information about how the grant process will be incorporated into others' work at the building, district and IHE level are not evident.

Reader's Score: 7

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

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

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

timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

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

Strengths

The management plan presented has clearly defined objectives, timelines and milestones. Additionally, the responsibilities are defined as well as the unquestioned qualifications of every key project person involved. Of particular note is the inclusion of the K-12 LEA into the plan noting the collaborative partnership created by the organizations involved.

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

The applicant has the endorsement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children to compliment their outstanding approach to providing quality, developmentally appropriate mathematics instruction to young children.

Weaknesses

No weakness noted.

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

Weaknesses

The applicant did not address this priority.

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

The applicant did not address this priority.

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

Weaknesses

| |
|--|
| The applicant did not address this priority. |
|--|

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 9:54 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2010 0:44 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

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 | 9 |
| 5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 10 |
| Competitive Preference | | |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 1 |
| 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 Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points) | 2 | 0 |

Technical Review Form

Development 39: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

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

Based on problems nationwide in mathematics and the achievement gap that exist between low-income and minority students with their non-minority counterparts, the applicant is addressing this need through teacher professional development for grades Pre-K - 3. This grade range is crucially important to the future mathematical abilities of the students. Conceptual understanding, according to the applicant is the key to reducing the mathematics achievement gap, The co-facilitation in the classrooms helps

to build teachers confidence after individualized coaching session labs. The conceptual framework brings together the initiative in a pictorial snapshot. The model provides the framework for teachers to learn and relate to.

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

Partnering with a reputable independent accredited institution of higher learning noted for improving educational outcomes for young children and strengthening teacher practices will help prevent and reduce the achievement gap. Teachers will receive conceptual mathematical training to equip them with strategies for classroom use to improve students math skills.

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 various mediums (i.e. website, conferences, newspaper, television, letters to the home of each child and journal articles) used to disseminate project information is commendable. The number of students to be served along with the cost was provided. By the end of grant period, all students will be served and a summative evaluation will be performed.

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 initiative partnership has embedded sustainability --train-the-trainer, teacher roles within and across responsibilities during professional development, website, quarterly newsletters, videotapes, journal articles and the manual.

Weaknesses

New teachers and teacher attrition could be a potential problem in terms of professional development and training.

Reader's Score: 9

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The background experience and training of the project director and other key personnel implementing the project is above reproach. Established timelines to carry out the plan were provided.

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

The proposed project is targeted to serve high needs children and their PK - 3 teachers within the public school system in Chicago. Many services will be provided at school sites, and all teachers serving the PK - 3 grades levels will be included.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

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

Weaknesses

Preference not addressed.

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

Preference not addressed.

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

Weaknesses

Preference not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 0:44 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/24/2010 6:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

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 | 7 |
| 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 | 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 Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points) | 2 | 0 |

Technical Review Form

Development 39: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396C100383)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The Erikson Institute proposes to partner with Chicago Public Schools and SRI International in a project to improve mathematics achievement in grades PK-3, as measured by the Illinois State Achievement Tests that are based on the adopted statewide standards for mathematics. The project will include teacher development, teacher coaching, in school collaboration, video production and a well designed evaluation of both the process and student outcome. The project is very well designed and commendable.

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

Erikson Institute in partnership with Chicago Public Schools proposes to close the mathematics achievement gap of high- need minority students in grades PK- 3 through professional development aimed at teaching mathematics and the production of videos that capture the training sessions. The professional development will focus on teaching the standards of the Illinois Learning Standards for Mathematics. The videos produced at the Erikson Institute will be used for those teachers that are not part of initial group selected for inclusion in the professional development and for new teachers coming into the Chicago system. This project meets an unmet need in Chicago where achievement gaps exist and mathematics achievement overall is low. The goals of the project are clear with a specific strategy to meet them. The goals and objectives match the project priorities.

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

Erikson Institute and research partner SRI International have extensive experience in teacher professional development and assessment of student mathematical achievement, page e4. For the past four years Erikson Institute has successfully utilized its learning labs on campus for teacher development. A key component of the training is the use of well trained coaches that will assist teachers in the program. Erikson Institute, a graduate school that focuses on elementary education, has over a twenty year record of training that produce achievement gains, page e11 and e12. SRI International has an impeccable array of talent assigned to this project as an official partner. Research and project design along with evaluation are their major strengths.

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 Logic model or management plan is clearly written with responsibilities assigned. The proposed formative evaluation will assist in keeping the program on course over the five years of the project, page e13. The number of participants in the project can be reasonably accommodated, Table 2, page e16. This project is designed for continued professional development beyond the five years of the actual grant in that the large numbers of teachers trained will be a resource for other teachers in Chicago. Creating the multi-level learning communities will assist in bringing the goals to fruition but also have a lasting impact on teaching mathematics PK-3. This project could be replicated in most districts in America that had a great desire to improve mathematics instruction and a willingness to invest in professional development aimed at improving mathematics achievement. Having a partnership with a graduate school of education would be extremely helpful. Corporate Partners and Foundations have contributed to the work at Erikson that supports the fidelity of implementation, page e18. Scale-up cost estimates have been included.

Weaknesses

This project depends on the cooperation of 16 schools and 160 teachers committed to improving mathematics instruction. It may be somewhat problematic to recruit that many willing participants even with the monetary incentives.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

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

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

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

Strengths

This project will be sustained at four levels, the classroom, the school, the project and Erikson Institute. To the extent that schools and teachers are committed to improving the teaching of mathematics the project will be sustained. Erikson has the resources, expertise and the motivation for this project to be successfully completed. Erikson Institute will provide website and newsletter support for the project..

Weaknesses

The question of school and teacher commitment with the large numbers to be recruited (only three schools have committed when the application was submitted) may be a problem.

Reader's Score: 7

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The management plan with timelines and responsibilities noted is well organized. Milestones will be addressed through frequent meetings of the management team. All of the project leaders are highly qualified and experienced, page e23-e25.

Weaknesses

No noted 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

This project is directly aimed improving early learning outcomes for high-need minority students. It is an effort to improve scores on the Illinois State Achievement Tests.

Weaknesses

No noted weakness.

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

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

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

Priority not addressed.

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

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2010 6:43 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 2:12 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396D100383)

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 | 9 |
| <i>SUB TOTAL</i> | 25 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 25 | 16 |

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 03: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396D100383)

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 research cited has both internal and external validity. The research cited includes studies about the proposed project that use data to drive the decisions for planned changes to the project in the proposed study. Other studies that discuss the student successes of the proposed program are included and discussed. There are strong studies that cite high strengths of generalizability.

Weaknesses

On page 10, the proposal discusses the outcomes of PD sessions linked to student outcomes as a failure in most programs, yet this proposal suggests just that outcome. Therefore, the proposal should include how this project will be different and connect PD for teachers to student successes and growth.

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 plan is thorough and includes an experimental design that addresses all foreseeable issues that may occur during the implementation of the proposed program. The experimental design is clear and could be easily replicated. There is evidence that the data collected will result in usable reports with both formative and summative data to determine continued implementation of success. The evaluator is independent. The budget is clear for the evaluation costs.

Weaknesses

There are inconsistencies on the student numbers that are quoted throughout the proposal, therefore it is unclear the sample size of the students and teachers. No timeline for the data collection and analysis is provided.

Reader's Score: 9

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 2:12 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/26/2010 10:14 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396D100383)

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 | 8 |
| 2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 9 |
| <i>SUB TOTAL</i> | <i>25</i> | <i>17</i> |
| TOTAL | 25 | 17 |

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 03: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Erikson Institute -- , - , (U396D100383)

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

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant provided information on results from their previous research and findings from other studies on the effectiveness of professional development, thus providing a reasonable hypothesis for the proposed study.

The applicant has previous experience with outcomes of the early mathematics project which showed changes for students up to grade K, thus an extension of the project to grade 3 would help to keep a continuum for mathematics teacher development.

The applicant has reported positive student achievements for priority students of interest for this grant application.

Weaknesses

Although the applicant provided supporting evidence for teacher variables that may be related to student performance and the significance of some studies, there was no empirical evidence, magnitudes of effect and/or amount of academic increase provided that linked teacher inputs to student success.

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

Student outcome measures will be tested using standardized tests that have high reliability.

Two different evaluation teams will focus on different aspects of evaluation, thus providing for equivalent attention to formative and summative analyses.

There is information on what constitutes the PD/math instruction/development that teachers will receive, thus facilitating replication in other settings.

There will be a quasi-experimental design to improve the internal validity of results.

Weaknesses

It is unclear what is the target number of students to be reached as different numbers are reported in the abstract (4,512); page one (2,400); and page five (3,600). Therefore, the size and scope of the project is unclear.

Power analysis information was provided, however no sample size estimates were calculated/provided to justify the ability to detect effect sizes.

Reader's Score: 9

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/26/2010 10:14 AM

