

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/25/2010 12:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

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	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	22
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 43: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The proposed project will implement a program to use writing as a pedagogical method in all content areas, not only ELA. The proposal has clear goals and objectives that are measurable. The proposal focuses on students' preparedness and understanding for college entrance, and focuses on students with limited English proficiency. The proposal has a well-detailed management plan, although a limited timeline of activities. The project appears to be sustainable with the resources of the district.

Selection Criteria

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

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

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

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit

strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposal describes the use of teacher-developed activities to enhance writing as a pedagogical practice across multiple content areas (in addition to ELA). It will include a computer-based writing assessment and scoring system to allow faster feedback to students and teachers. This seems innovative and would be greatly beneficial if the results were quick turnaround and reliably scored writing tasks. The proposal also describes the appropriate forms of professional development that would help teachers make best use of these new systems, including iterative learning/application models and cognitive coaching. These are practices that have been demonstrated to help inservice teachers adopt novel instructional practices. Finally, the proposal describes explicit goals and objectives and identifies measures that are appropriate for determining if these goals are met.

Weaknesses

One of the proposed activities will be to develop online courses to improve students' writing and to increase students' and parents' understanding of the application process, expectations, and financial aid options for colleges. However, it seems probable that there are existing curricula or lesson modules that other schools or educational researchers have used. Accessing and building on prior work in this area would conserve time and resources, but still allow adaptation to the CNUSD teachers' needs and knowledge of students and parents.

Reader's Score: 23

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The LEA has received grants of comparable size in the past and has demonstrated ability to implement them well. The LEA also has demonstrated its successes in raising student achievement (as state test scores and AYP) and attainment (graduation rates) overall including subgroups, though it has not yet been able to reduce achievement gaps.

Weaknesses

Though the LEA states it has had federal grants and funding in the past of similar scale, the total dollar amount quoted in the proposal is just \$16 million and they list multiple programs. Therefore, the mode of dollar amounts funded and scope of each project may not be as large as the current request.

Reader's Score: 22

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student

populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The proposal describes the LEA's experience in implementing programs across all district schools and ensuring fidelity of implementation, and the district commits to implement across all schools with fidelity. This is an important part of the success of the proposed project across the district. The proposal also indicates that the project will disseminate findings through careful documentation and publication for other LEAs and by having school district staff participate in regional and national conferences. The materials to be used by the project are broadly available. The project's estimate of cost per student is \$754, and when taken to scale the proposal recognizes that there are start-up costs that must be in the calculation.

Weaknesses

Though the proposal describes its intention to assure fidelity of implementation, little further information is provided.

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 proposal describes the LEA's success in working with its teacher association. The LEA has also identified other ways that it can assure sustainability. These include no-cost access to the computer-based writing assessment system (CTeWriter) and the district's investment in IT staff so that it can support the grant-related computational requirements during and after funding. These elements indicate that the proposed project could be sustained by the district after the grant ends.

Weaknesses

None.

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 proposal describes its management plan, which will include senior officials from the district office, a cohort of teachers on special assignment who have experience with technology-based instruction, and district IT staff. The management plan specifies the LEA staff involved and their particular roles in the conduct of the project. The project staff members have experience implementing grants and other federally-funded programs, and appear to be qualified in training and experience to conduct the project.

Weaknesses

There is inadequate detail in the timeline, aside from detailing the number of students who would be impacted by grant year and grade level.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

This was not described in the proposal.

Weaknesses

This was not described in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths

The proposal describes its intention to include content that focuses explicitly

on students' college preparedness, expectations, understanding of finances, and access to supports. It also includes an outreach through online modules to parents in both English and Spanish.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

The proposing LEA has a significant proportion of students who have limited English proficiency. It has a history of helping improve performance and reduce gaps for this population. The project includes an explicit focus on these students with attention to continue closing the achievement and attainment gap. It also will provide information about college application and financing to parents in both English and Spanish, which may further help these students.

Weaknesses

None.

Reader's Score: 1

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

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the

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

Strengths

This was not described in the proposal.

Weaknesses

This was not described in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 12:22 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/22/2010 10:36 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Reader #2:

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

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

Technical Review Form

Development 43: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Strengths:

The applicant identifies the need for student improvement and provides data to support this assertion. The district has improved achievement over the past decade but gaps still exist. Data to illustrate the need, specifically in high need student populations, and details regarding writing and language deficiencies and obstacles to college success are identified.

Using writing across the curriculum is not new but the addition of technology, teacher training, and a comprehensive design to improve achievement is not widely adopted and addresses a great need demonstrated at this school district and nationwide.

Weaknesses:

The management plan does not detail a timeline for implementation with identified project tasks and milestones.

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

1) The applicant identifies the need for student improvement and provides data to support this assertion. The district has improved achievement over the past decade but gaps still exists. Data to illustrate the need, specifically in high need student populations, and details regarding writing and language deficiencies and obstacles to college success are identified. p 3-4
Using writing across the curriculum is not new but the addition of technology, teacher training, and a comprehensive design to improve achievement is not widely adopted and addresses a great need demonstrated at this school district and nationwide. p. 4

2) Goals and objectives are described in the narrative with detail regarding activities and outcomes. The proposed strategy is clearly described. The narrative is supported by a goals and objectives chart in appendix H that further details Goals, objectives, research, strategies and measurable outcomes. The goals and objectives are well-aligned with the proposed project priorities.

Weaknesses

1 and 2 No 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

- 1) The applicant is a large school district with evidence of experience in successfully implementing large projects. Several examples are provided. p. 14
- 2) i) Data and explanations are provided to support the applicant's success in closing achievement gaps among various groups of students and improving achievement of high need students. p. 14,15
- ii) Increase in graduation rate by 4% over 6 years is stated.

Weaknesses

1 and 2 No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

- 1) This project will reach 8415 students in the 5 target schools. The district has demonstrated capacity to implement this size project. Several examples are provided. p. 20
- 2) Through partner technology and ongoing staff development, this project will be brought to scale and expanded by the district. Based on findings, the project may be revised or adjusted appropriately. p. 21
- 3) Replication will require staff development, technology and technical support. These resources are available and the project is adaptable to a wide variety of students and settings. p. 21 and previous sections.
- 4) Cost per student for the 5 year project is \$754. The scaled-up costs for larger populations are calculated at similar or less per student. Initial technology increases start up costs.
- 5) Dissemination is described and includes internal sharing with stakeholders, presentations at relevant events, website development, participation in conferences, and publications.

Weaknesses

1,2,3,4,and 5 No 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

- 1) The applicant is prepared to dedicate resources to ongoing implementation. Teacher associations have also been involved and obstacles to continuation have been explored. IT and staff development resources will be used effectively to support continuation and expansion.
- 2) A plan for incorporating the project purposes and activities beyond the grant is described and is cost effective and appropriate. The applicant is a partner in the development of the key CTeW technology and therefore does not have to pay for license or use. p. 22

Weaknesses

- 1 and 2 No 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

- 1) The management plan narrative clearly describes the project activities and oversight. Responsibilities of key personnel are described and the timeframes for meetings and communication are described and include weekly and monthly meetings. A more detailed chart is provided in the appendix H and includes a timeline for professional development activity. A data collection timeline is also provided in appendix H
- 2) The project director and key personnel are described with reference to responsibilities and experience. Resumes are provided and indicate

appropriate qualifications.

Weaknesses

- 1) The management plan does not detail a timeline for implementation with identified project tasks and milestones.
- 2) No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

Not applicable

Weaknesses

Not applicable

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

Project includes preparation for college level work and support for application process and financial aid.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

The described project is personalized to each student and provides support and feedback to students and teachers. The applicant specifically describes uses to address special needs students and LEP students.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

Not applicable

Weaknesses

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/22/2010 10:36 AM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 06/24/2010 10:50 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	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	_____

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____
TOTAL	80	73

Technical Review Form

Development 43: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396C100467)

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

Diagnostic writing assessment tool hoped to bridge gap between groups of students. Immediate feedback, motivating technology. Writing across the

curriculum emphasized, rather than simply ELA.

Important: addresses the need for improved student writing for high school graduates so as to be eligible for college writing programs.

Supports existing Step Up to Writing initiative in district.

Will standardize expectations for student writing with use of research based, 6 writing index inclusive, artificial intelligence scoring rubric.

Provides collaborative professional development experiences for teachers to improve writing assignments and instruction.

Clear goals, outcomes linked, strategies specific

Addresses college awareness prep resources for students, parents, community

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

District has experience implementing similar scale projects.
Recent student achievement growth higher than ever before, with use of EBDM.
District experiencing increases in all state measures, across all disciplines, above average increases within state.

Only district to meet the federal AYP requirements in CA.
Grad rates up from 90 to 94%.

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

District has personnel, technology and leadership to bring project to scale. Project targeted at 8415 students within district, but can easily be disseminated and used across the district, since leadership and infrastructure would facilitate this.

Builds upon existing writing initiative.

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

District has personnel, technology and leadership to bring project to scale. Project targeted at 8415 students within district, but can easily be disseminated and used across the district, since leadership and infrastructure would facilitate this.

Builds upon existing writing initiative.

Private partnerships.

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

Management team already in place with a few additions to be made. This project builds upon an existing initiative, so infrastructure in place to support it.
Includes description of IT staff support.

Weaknesses

Wkness: Lacking management timeline.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

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

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

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2010 10:50 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396D100467)

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	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396D100467)

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

This project will implement the Writing to Learn!(WtL!) program in 3 elementary, 1 intermediate and 1 high school. This program builds on a previous writing initiatives in the district. It will go on to establish a comprehensive, curriculum-wide program for the district. (p. 1) The five principles of WtL! are presented with supporting research on pages 9-10. These studies support a system of practice, assessment, feedback, meta-cognition, student-centered/standards-based, and reinforcement in writing will increase student achievement in English Language Arts(ELA). Quasi-experimental matched case comparison studies on the writing program were conducted over the past seven school years.(p. 11) The results were increased student proficiency on the state assessment as compared with students from another district matched on four demographic variables.(p. 12)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The evaluation design will focus on measuring improvement in student academic achievement and increased professional development opportunities and coaching support using a quasi-experimental design. (p. 17-18) For each objective the application includes operational standards and measures. Teachers will take the Identifying Needs with Data Quiz(INDQ). Teacher observations will be conducted by principals using a checklist on a quarterly basis. (p. 19) Principals will meet annually to calibrate ratings using the checklist. The funds dedicated to evaluation are substantial and appropriate for the scope of the project.

Weaknesses

District developed ELA and writing benchmark assessments will be the second measure of student performance. (p. 17) The validity and reliability of these assessments was not included. The external evaluator will meet at regular intervals with the program director, coaches, principals and teachers. The specifics regarding what is meant by "regular intervals" are not provided.(p. 20) The teacher classroom observation tool has many room environment elements that are not clearly linked to the research goals. The impact of some of these items may result in inaccuracies, particularly when scores are averaged.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

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

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396D100467)

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	10
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	10
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Corona-Norco Unified School District -- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services - Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Services (U396D100467)

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 WtL approach is described as an approach based upon 5 principles from the writing literature. Sufficient empirical evidence supporting each principal provided and described on pages 9-11.

WtL has been tested using quasi-experimental designs in several contexts with compelling positive results for both achievement gains and achievement gaps. As such, positive outcomes for participants in the proposed project are likely. This intervention appears to warrant further study with designs better suited for high confidence causal inferences (e.g., RCT).

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

This study will use a matched-pair quasi-experimental design. Implementation data will be collected using independent measures such as observation protocols (p. 19).

The breadth of implementation data collected should inform replication efforts. These data sources include evidence of important features such as posted assessment results, writing samples, and student engagement.

The evaluation capacity of KSD staff appears adequate to conduct an effective evaluation.

Weaknesses

Previous study of this program used a quasi-experimental design as well. Using this design once again will limit the increase confidence that the developers can have in causal inferences of impact. Access issues that lead to this choice are duly noted. Presumably, the prior study of WtL did not use statistical adjustment (ANCOVA) to account for pre-existing differences. The current design could have also benefited from this technique using some of the same matching variables.

The proposers suggest that a Cronbach's alpha of 0.80 will be required for the observations but did not suggest a contingency plan if the observers fail to come to that level of agreement.

Ten percent of the budget is allotted for evaluation which is sufficient for many designs. However, because the number of students and teachers involved in the evaluation (a proxy for data analysis burden) was not completely clear, it can't be certain that sufficient funds exist. There wasn't

clear indication that the number of students and teachers touched by the program, as described in section E, is the same number participating in the evaluation.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

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