

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2010 7:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

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	24
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	9
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	1

Technical Review Form

Development 18: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant provides a clear presentation of how TSIC addresses the needs of minority students and children of poverty. The FLIGHT model is an extension of the TSIC approach, with the project districts selected as ones that exhibited best in class implementation of the TSIC Advocacy model. The goals and objectives are well written, with specific targets and measures. The project includes a comprehensive strategy that involves mentors, parents, school staff, and student commitment--all of which have been

shown to be necessary for success. The proposal presents a clear strategy linking goals, actions, and outcomes, all aligned to the project priorities.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

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

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

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant has 15 years experience in Florida serving a high need student population (page 16). It works with 21 districts across the state, and with numerous public and private agencies. The TSIC program has grown steadily each year in the number of students served. TSIC has demonstrated student growth in the LEAs in which the program exists, compared to other at-risk students. LEAs implementing TSIC show increased student GPA's, and an increase in the graduation rate for TSIC students.

Weaknesses

The applicant provided evidence of higher graduation rates compared to other non-program high risk students, but did not provide evidence of improved student achievement. This data, especially an historical trend, would have highlighted the efficacy of the model.

Reader's Score: 24

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 presented a clear growth plan to reach capacity during the grant, along with sufficient resources to assure student success. The narrative provided a thorough explanation of the strategies and resources TSIC would use to enhance the model and bring it to scale statewide. The LEA partners provide a demonstration of the feasibility of the project for replication in a variety of settings. The applicant not only provided the estimated costs for

scale up to 100k, 250k, and 500,000 students, but the process TSIC used to develop the projected costs. The narrative noted a variety of methods and strategies that TSIC would use to broadly disseminate the model.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant has an impressive array of private and public donors, that not only provide operating costs but student college scholarships. The narrative included a written sustainability plan, which indicates commitment to the model and a focus on success.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The narrative presents a well thought out management plan with quarterly milestones and activities, and the responsible personnel. The key project personnel has experience managing a project similar in size and scope (i.e., the current TSIC program)(pages 29-30).

Weaknesses

The applicant provides a timeline of activities and milestones (pages 27-29). However, the timeline is not sufficiently detailed regarding milestones and targets. For example, it is not clear when the new and enhanced technology applications will be ready to pilot and when they will be ready for large-scale implementation. All that is in the table (page 27, QTR 1) is a general statement of "initiate technology platform integration."

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

priority not addressed

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 7:57 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/19/2010 2:01 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

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	9
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	2

Technical Review Form

Development 18: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant will assist school districts in increasing student data to increase high school graduation rates and improve college attendance rates. The applicant will use a student advocacy model that includes comprehensive services to support student success.

Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant has a developed intervention to help students prepare for successful matriculation to college and to experience academic success (p. e6). Data provided by the applicant reveals a pattern of success in improving student achievement as measured by high school graduation rates (Appendix H, pp. e10 and e.11). The applicant provides evidence that the achievement gap has been reduced through the application of the intervention (p. e16). Project goals, performance measures, and indicators are measurable and well defined.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

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

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

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant has demonstrated successful application of the intervention in school settings where the intervention has been developed and refined (p. e16). The applicant has expanded the program in a manner that suggests

extensive experience in managing complex projects and programs that now include 8% of high-need students in the applicant's state. The applicant establishes important partnerships to meet expectations of the project, including 26 community foundations, 21 local school districts, and nine community colleges (p. e16). A second review of the application resulted in scores being retained.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant proposes to closely refine the student advocacy element of its intervention as it prepares for state-wide scale up. Scale up cost estimates were professionally developed. A strategy to expand the project is a component of this development application, including the identification of key personnel that would be needed by LEAs as they are included in the scale up. A table of project resources (p. e22) identifies assets and strategies for the scale up process. A second review of the application resulted in scores being retained.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant has a consistent and substantial source of funding and in-kind support from various agencies. The intervention was developed and applied well before federal funding. Plans have been made for scale up beyond the funding period.

Weaknesses

Planning for sustainability with milestones or indicators is not evident in the project timeline. A second review of the application resulted in scores being retained.

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 timeline, milestones, and responsibilities of the project are clearly delineated. The project administration will be led by a team of experienced and skilled professionals. Position descriptions include skills and abilities linked program operations.

Weaknesses

Linkages between the activities and outcomes are not fully developed through the use of benchmarks or indicators that link activities of the management plan to the measurable objectives of the project. A second review of the application resulted in scores being retained.

Reader's Score: 9

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Early learning experiences for young children are not included in the project design.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant proposes an exception approach to helping students prepare for college and to provide them with resources to matriculate.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

The applicant has included specific accommodations in the intervention to include the target population of students in the proposed project.

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

The applicant will include rural student populations in the project and the applicant will make accommodations to the intervention to meet their particular needs.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/19/2010 2:01 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/05/2010 10:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

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	24
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1

Technical Review Form

Development 18: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396C100570)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The innovative use of data to support the detailed program design and implementation prior to the initiation of the i3 initiative served the internal program design and matching staff supports are extremely integrated and substantive. A micro and macroscopic view of the high needs population begins early in their academic and school career and leads to a full set of programmatic supports, or wrap around services. The focus is on students with low income and high poverty needs, and a possibility of accompanying

social challenges also. Early identification of the needs allow for full analysis and program design for each participating student, school, and parent from middle school through college matriculation.

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

Dedicated growth seems to be the indicator for Take Stock of Children, Inc. They appear driven to provide a specialized service to the adolescent person, especially one that has been identified as high need. They've developed many public-private working relationships to provide the students with the best possible experience to bring trust in their lives. They are in touch with 26 Community Education Foundations, 21 local school districts, and 9 community colleges in various locations throughout the state of Florida. More than 7,600 students in grades 6-12 receive Take Stock

program services. It appears this organization grows in spite of itself. Wherever and whenever they are in a position to provide services, they do a step more to bring security into that relationship. To support a student, the school, and whomever else must be involved. New people are added to the circle of support, hence the basis for the growth. As they grow, the reviewer recognizes expansion and refinement; refinement in the use of technology and how they support. Seems TSIC receives funds from the DOE, along with access to technological benefits to improve the quality of their work. It's all in the relationship building. The research, the monitoring, the data refinement, the analysis and interpretive work becomes of high standard.

8% of Floridian high needs youth participate with TSIC, inc. daily.

Weaknesses

with the growth comes the understanding of change to redevelop the organization to provide even broader and more complex services.

Reader's Score: 24

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

With 94% of program dollar going to the student consumer, and new corporate endowments annually, along with a return on investment above 35% the capacity to scale up is apparent. The student population continues to grow, however, the graduation rates soar, and so does the percentage who raise their grade point averages. More students admitted to colleges and universities, and more students complete their higher education programs with graduate degrees. The work is not easy, and it never will. The overall effort self replicates and sustains itself through the many who change grow.

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

TSIC appears to have gained substantial resources from programmatic support of service delivery and through various private and public funding streams including nonprofit and profit, volunteer assistance, as well as governmental agencies through national, state, and local funding for direct services delivery, Stakeholders via matching funds, and organizational investments. Further sustainability planning through task force efforts the the development of a Sustainability Plan following key evaluation findings which identify which program strategies have the greatest impact to support the partners and stakeholders in the expansion of services.

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 10

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The management plan although thorough, lacks the visual detail demonstrated in the narrative and appendices. Organized in quarter years the plan also lacks the intricate interfaces necessary for such an upscale project. The key personnel are more than appropriate for the size and scope of the project. In fact, most have been on the same work team for quite some time in various support positions. Many have organizationally developed to accept the up-line positions that support a project of this nature. There is continuous mention of fidelity in project implementation which speaks to the timeliness of operations and respect for budgetary concerns.

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

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

Strengths

TSIC will continue to partner with 3 LEAs to create: FLIGHT (Facilitating Long-Term Improvements in Graduation and Higher Education Tomorrow.).

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 project is designed to increase utilization of student data by school/district partners and stakeholders to identify high-need students and implement timely interventions to increase their academic success.

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

The project will support at-risk student participants receiving wraparound supports including ongoing, intensive academic and behavioral monitoring.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/05/2010 10:02 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396D100570)

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	11
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	21
TOTAL	25	21

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396D100570)

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

TSIC seems to have a strong track record of helping students to enroll and succeed in college, as evidenced by the high proportions of students mentioned on page e1, e4.

The hypotheses listed on pages e7-e8 are reasonable hypotheses based on the literature described elsewhere. Each hypothesis is measurable and testable based on the proposed research design.

Five components of the FLIGHT system have been supported by education research (p. e14). Several support programs similar in nature to FLIGHT, but not containing the full wrap-around services offered by FLIGHT, showed some positive effects in WWC evaluations (p. e14)

Several earlier studies of TSIC suggested some positive results (e15).

The magnitude of the potential impacts is quite large, as noted in the text and table on page e15. If effects on high school completion and college enrollment are even a few percent in magnitude, the impact would be great when TSIC was scaled.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses.

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 table on pages e7, e8 identifies objectives and appropriate measures for each objective. Both process and outcome objectives are included, which addresses factors 2 and 3 of the 4 key factors.

Evaluation information will be used to facilitate improvement in the FLIGHT program (p. 8) as requested in point 3 of the 4 key factors. The authors indicate that the evaluator will provide evidence in an ongoing basis, as well as at the conclusion of the study, as to the effectiveness of the components of the FLIGHT program for improving student outcomes.

The logic model in the appendix details the measures to be taken for each step in the causal chain. Again, the use of multiple outcomes will enhance the understanding of the pathways through which TSIC does or does not have impacts on student outcomes.

Methods for analyzing quantitative data (p. e18) seem appropriate, given that this is a student-level intervention.

Fidelity of implementation will be measured with multiple measures, allowing for the triangulation of findings as to overall fidelity.

Weaknesses

While not a randomized design, the use of PSM enhances the internal validity of the study as compared to a simple matching. However, the quality of PSM is always difficult to estimate in advance, and it will be impossible to ascertain whether effects identified are true treatment effects. A lottery approach would be superior from an internal validity standpoint.

The authors indicate that fidelity of implementation data will be combined into an index but are not clear on how that would be done. In general, their discussion of the ways they will measure fidelity of implementation is vague. More detail should have been provided about the specific types of questions they will ask participants or use in observation protocols to measure implementation fidelity.

The sample size as proposed is only large enough to detect an effect of .33 sd, which is a bit larger than would be ideal. If there were an effect of .25 sd, a meaningfully large effect, this study might miss it. A larger sample would be better.

Reader's Score: 11

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 8:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396D100570)

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	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	20
TOTAL	25	20

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: Take Stock in Children Inc. -- , - , (U396D100570)

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 proposers provide a traditional literature review documenting the effectiveness of the components of their proposed intervention. In addition they report results from similar programs evaluated by WWC that indicate moderate or strong effects and point out that none of the three examples included all five of the proposed components pp. e14-15

They have provided a strong rationale for the research hypotheses that are supported by good research. They also report studies of a limited range of participants that the report had promising effects which suggests that the study will be a contribution to the research literature because it will expand the types of settings and students who have been included in the research.

They provide a chart on p. e 17 that documents higher rates of high school graduation, matriculation and college graduation. The data are provided by the FDOE which has one of the more advanced data systems in the US. The differences shown are substantial and justify further research.

Weaknesses

The proposers report results of the two prior studies, but do not report the data that led them to deem the efforts promising.

The estimates of possible economic benefit are based on graduating all Florida students. But the applicants do not make a good argument suggesting that FLIGHT can achieve this level of success. The charts on p. e17 only a rate of HS graduation of approximately 95%. Therefore the estimate of savings is higher than is justified

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 proposed evaluation study is exemplary in its design. It includes the use of comparison groups and it provides both formative and summative data that can be used to determine effectiveness and implementation data that can be used for mid- course correction and later development and replication efforts.

The proposers have included a logic model as the basis of the evaluation that will enable them to evaluate intermediate and mediating variables

The proposers have conducted a power analysis that supports the proposed sample size.

The chart of evaluation questions on p. e18 includes a list of both quantitative and qualitative measures that will be used in the study. This list includes multiple measures for evaluating implementation, key elements, and student achievement. The list reflects judicious choice of measures which

will capture the various outcomes but will not involve excessive variables.

The proposed 499,998 dollars should be sufficient to accomplish the evaluation because it represents a significant portion of the allotted budget. They report that they will use a team that includes 8 full-time evaluators, an on-site assessment staff, a budget analyst, data analyst, technology analyst, and a technical write. This suggests that the group possesses adequate resources to evaluation the project.

Weaknesses

The proposers provide insufficient information about a timeline for the study implementation.

Reader's Score: 13

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 8:24 PM