

Status: Submitted  
 Last Updated: 06/29/2010 5:53 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

**Reader #1:**

|  | <b>POINTS<br/>POSSIBLE</b> | <b>POINTS<br/>SCORED</b> |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Summary Statement</b>   |                            |                          |
| 1. Summary Statement   | N/A                        | N/A                      |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>  |                            |                          |
| 1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)   | 25                         | 22                       |
| 2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)   | 25                         | 23                       |
| 3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)   | 5                          | 5                        |
| 4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)   | 10                         | 10                       |
| 5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)   | 10                         | 9                        |
| <b>Competitive Preference</b>  |                            |                          |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)  | 1                          | 0                        |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)  | 1                          | 0                        |
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point) | 1                          | 0                        |
| 4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)  | 2                          | 0                        |

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development 27: 84.396C**

**Reader #1:**

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

### Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement

The proposal gave evidence of a strong track record of data-driven school improvements and sustainability. The project was research-based, clearly written, and well thought out. The application did not identify any competitive priorities and it would have seemed appropriate to have asked for CP5 and CP7.

### 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 project provides for interventions that will benefit 6800 students in 12 low-performing schools. It was helpful to have the table in the appendix that reported individual building demographics.

The proposal was very well organized and well written. The goals (p. 49-52) were clear and tied to program evaluation components.

There was a strong tie between project goals and activities and solid research.

Using 6 schools as a control group is impressive.

The identification of specific school level assessments (DIBELS) and other evaluation tools - the need to create one using prior district successes was also a good idea. The applicant then does not have to wait until this project is in its 4th year to develop something that it needed from the start of the project.

The recognition that in order to continually improve and to be able to share with others evaluating your process is crucial and impressive.

### **Weaknesses**

In the appendix you have the demographics and test data for 4 of your 6 control group schools. It is not clear how the applicant will get the 6 control schools to cooperate for 5 years. There appears to be no incentive for those schools to "put up" with the intrusions of an external evaluation process.

Data were not given for academic needs.

**Reader's Score: 22**

## **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**

In its 4.5 years of operation the applicant has provided evidence that using the research for teaching and learning works. This proposal comprehensively demonstrated that this nonprofit organization has the ability to improve student achievement.

**Weaknesses**

It was not clear about what levels of expertise the partners bring to the table.

**Reader's Score: 23**

**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**

This project is cost effective. The allocation of \$64 per student for five years of service (\$13 per student per year) is impressive.

The project holds nothing as proprietary. It actively pursues collaboration with others also committed to school improvement. This is impressive and adds the scalability of the project design in dimensions beyond budget issues. It is with this openness and willingness to share what works that US schools will make the necessary progress to retain its place in the world.

**Weaknesses**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)**

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

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

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

**Strengths**

The proposal identified sustainability costs post grant as \$1500 per school. It was noted that Title I dollars could be allocated to this purpose. BSRI also reported that they would work with district superintendents to secure local funding. In the event that there are no places for the local district/school to find funding, BSRI has a cash reserve for the purpose of supporting sustainability. This is not only beyond their responsibility but indicated to

this reader a true heart for their mission.

**Weaknesses**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths**

The Executive Director's experiences in managing large scale initiatives and projects are excellent.

The resumes indicated clear abilities to perform required functions of the project.

There was strong evidence of capacity to perform the project at the highest possible standards.

**Weaknesses**

One question relates to the budget category: "OTHER"

Over 5 years \$1,043,841 is allocated to this category. The brief explanation identifies such expenditures as: miscellaneous office expenses, costs of expanded evaluation planned for this project, and the purchase of their professional development program.

The budget has a \$807,000 allocation for the program evaluation component. It is unclear why other dollars would be needed for an expanded evaluation.

**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**

Priority not addressed.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**Strengths**

Priority not addressed.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**Strengths**

Priority not addressed.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/29/2010 5:53 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 4:20 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

**Reader #2:**

|  | <b>POINTS<br/>POSSIBLE</b> | <b>POINTS<br/>SCORED</b> |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Summary Statement</b>   |                            |                          |
| 1. Summary Statement   | N/A                        | N/A                      |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>  |                            |                          |
| 1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)   | 25                         | 20                       |
| 2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)   | 25                         | 23                       |
| 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                         | 8                        |
| 5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)   | 10                         | 9                        |
| <b>Competitive Preference</b>  |                            |                          |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)  | 1                          | 0                        |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)  | 1                          | 0                        |
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point) | 1                          | 0                        |
| 4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)  | 2                          | 0                        |

## Technical Review Form

**Development 27: 84.396C**

**Reader #2:**

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

### Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement

The Bay State Reading Institute is cooperating with several districts to develop a "literacy-based" and "data-based" program that could be expanded statewide. It is partnering with 12 high-need low-performing elementary schools. The project would identify the skills and resource requirements for scaling up a rather well designed program.

### 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 statement of needs is well documented and focused on developing model program based on experiences in 12 elementary schools. Strategies deployed appear to be drawn from both a body of research and from direct experience. Support from the state is recognized as an advantage in moving this project further. Basically, a well written section.

### **Weaknesses**

Details of the conditions that exist in the schools that are being targeted are not adequately described. Some addition details that would demonstrated a more in-depth analysis of the problems and conditions as they currently exist could have been included. The respective roles of the principals and others should have been described at the outset. The appendix picks up on some of the details that describe the program design.

**Reader's Score: 20**

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

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

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

### **Strengths**

The applicant demonstrates evidence of having considerable and direct

experience in working with school districts in the state over the past five years. The DSTP approach seems to have evidence that it has contributed to the improvement of young children that are identified as being "at risk" or failing out of school. Three years of data is impressive.

#### **Weaknesses**

Possibly, additional details of the involvement of partners would have helped.

**Reader's Score: 23**

### **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 demonstrates that it has considerable political and professional experience and to work with project partners to continue and expand the project beyond the experimental school sites.

#### **Weaknesses**

The proposal lacks some relevant details that would have added strength to the applicant's capacity to document research-evidence and further develop the project. Information regarding cost implications including those associated with whole school reform are not given adequate attention. Citing prospective funds from Title 1 and other sources could have been identified.

**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 experience of the staff and credibility of the project director in being able to marshal support for this project throughout the state are recognized strengths for carrying on this project to other districts. Funding sources located to move forward.

#### **Weaknesses**

Although the overall capacity of this applicant to carry on this innovative project beyond i3 funding is generally acknowledged, more documentation would have contributed to the strength of the applicant to sustain the project's development. Having support from the state assembly is noted, but not necessarily a contributing factor for addressing these criteria.

**Reader's Score: 8**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths**

The management plan is comprehensive and the staff seem very well qualified to manage this project. The director has considerable contacts with officials in the state that could add to its capacity to orchestrate the various components of this project. Drawing on former and successful principals to serve as trainers and coaches is another strength worth citing here.

**Weaknesses**

It is unclear how much time the proposed director will devote to manage this project.

**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**

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

**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**

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

Competitiveness priority not addressed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/28/2010 4:20 PM

Status: Submitted  
Last Updated: 06/25/2010 11:50 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

**Reader #3:**

|  | <b>POINTS<br/>POSSIBLE</b> | <b>POINTS<br/>SCORED</b> |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Summary Statement</b>   |                            |                          |
| 1. Summary Statement   | N/A                        | N/A                      |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>  |                            |                          |
| 1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)   | 25                         | 25                       |
| 2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)   | 25                         | 21                       |
| 3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)   | 5                          | 4                        |
| 4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)   | 10                         | 7                        |
| 5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)   | 10                         | 8                        |
| <b>Competitive Preference</b>  |                            |                          |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)  | 1                          | 0                        |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)  | 1                          | 0                        |
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point) | 1                          | 0                        |
| 4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)  | 2                          | 0                        |

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development 27: 84.396C**

**Reader #3:**

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396C100623)

### Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement

DSTP will be partnering with BSRI, who has 18 current partner schools to assist approximately 6800 students in the area of literacy.

### Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

#### Strengths

|  |
|--|
| <p>There is a need for DSTP with several low income, non-white, ELL schools. The belief is that out of 6800 students, literacy will be increased by 20%.</p> |
|--|

Addressing early reading difficulty has been related to achievement later on, which DSTP plans to address. DSTP will be partnering with BSRI, who has 18 current partner schools to utilize several of its program components which are detailed and research based. Data to support the achievement already established at one of these other cohorts included in section B.

#### **Weaknesses**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 25**

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

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

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

#### **Strengths**

Although the BSRI has been only in MA schools since 2005, there has been substantial growth in those years for expertise. It is impressive that they are able to increase 120% for partner schools in a year without fidelity loss. Good strategies and steps are in place for measurement of success, which correlates to the percentages of increases in achievement on page 12.

### **Weaknesses**

The margin of reading is lower than the rest of the application merits. There is concern for the level of significance on page 14.

**Reader's Score: 21**

### **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**

DSTP will serve 6800 students, already assisting 18 schools. Expertise is established with other schools showing that this project can continually be replicated successfully. Management has continued success in implementing these types of interventions and is seeking state-wide scaling. Costs per students are indicated.

### **Weaknesses**

Dissemination is not addressed outside the lines of Departments of Education in MA.

**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 MA legislature has supported BSRI with allocation funding and BSRI receives support from various superintendants in MA. Schools know upfront the funds needed to stay with BSR, utilizing other resources that are detailed for the costs. BSRI coaches will be used to guide future professional development. A cash reserve is going to be maintained by BSRI to continue with DSTP, in the event other sources cannot be found.

### **Weaknesses**

There is not much in the view of further purpose or activity to stay ongoing with this partnership after the grant. It is stated on page 20 that upon entering a partnership with BSRI later, schools will be responsible for covering costs using Title1 funding which may be hindered at a future time.

**Reader's Score: 7**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths**

There is great qualifications and management for this project team, including an Associate Commissioner to assist with policies who has previously served as a House of Representative. Gardner has been associated with many large scaled projects. There are details of management roles and responsibilities. A timeline is addressed in another section and gives good merit to the plan being outlined.

**Weaknesses**

More detail needs to be set on the Turnaround coaches, at the heart of the program on page 22.

**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**

Preference 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**

|                           |
|---------------------------|
| Preference not addressed. |
|---------------------------|

**Weaknesses**

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**Strengths**

Preference not addressed.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**Strengths**

Preference not addressed.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/25/2010 11:50 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted  
Last Updated: 07/22/2010 2:43 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396D100623)

**Reader #1:**

|   | <b>POINTS<br/>POSSIBLE</b> | <b>POINTS<br/>SCORED</b> |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>  |                            |                          |
| 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                         | 14                       |
| <i>SUB TOTAL</i>  | 25                         | 24                       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | 25                         | 24                       |

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development Tier 2 Panel 05: 84.396D**

**Reader #1:**

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396D100623)

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

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

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

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

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.
- (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

#### **Strengths**

The applicant summarizes research findings that connect each component of the proposed intervention with improved student outcomes or successful school turnaround efforts. In addition to identifying the research-based instructional practices or school structures of the model, the applicant also describes characteristics of high-fidelity implementation, which are embedded within the proposed intervention model (page 8). A strength of this application is the description of a model that connects instructional elements with training, changes in the infrastructure, stakeholder involvement, evaluation, and attention to policy and funding.

The descriptions of previous implementation efforts and outcomes of those efforts offer promising results that support additional implementation and further study. The reported effect sizes (page 10) suggest that the proposed intervention will have a positive impact on student achievement as measured by DIBELS of an appreciable magnitude.

#### **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 methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project. The evaluation plan will examine both the effectiveness of implementation as well as the observed outcomes. The experimental design of the controlled study is a strength in that a well-designed experimental study can theoretically predict future outcomes in similar settings. This type of study could provide stronger support for the efficacy of this project than could an evaluation with a less rigorous design.

The evaluation plan describes a method that will collect high-quality implementation data and performance feedback. Data from classroom observations, interviews, and surveys will provide information that can inform improved implementation.

The applicant describes an evaluation that will collect information about the key elements and approach of the intended intervention. Connecting implementation information with the outcome evaluation will provide information to facilitate further development, replication, or testing of the model.

The evaluation plan includes sufficient resources - funding and capacity of identified evaluation firm - to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Weaknesses**

The proposal describes an experimental design but does not identify the ways in which comparison schools will be chosen, how quantitative and

qualitative data will be analyzed, or the instruments that will be used to analyze the data.

The intervention model suggests that evaluation results will be used to inform implementation (pages 8 and 9), but the proposal does not explicitly identify the time lines for sharing evaluation information with stakeholders and the process by which those data will inform implementation modifications and improvements.

**Reader's Score: 14**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/22/2010 2:43 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted  
Last Updated: 07/22/2010 6:41 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396D100623)

**Reader #2:**

|   | <b>POINTS<br/>POSSIBLE</b> | <b>POINTS<br/>SCORED</b> |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>  |                            |                          |
| 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                         | 14                       |
| <i>SUB TOTAL</i>  | 25                         | 24                       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | 25                         | 24                       |

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development Tier 2 Panel 05: 84.396D**

**Reader #2:**

**Applicant:** Bay State Reading Institute -- , - , (U396D100623)

### 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**

##### **B. Factor #1**

There is a methodical explanation of the research behind each of the hypotheses (p. 7-8) and good references listed for every one suggesting support for these hypotheses. This covers each of the four elements of the planned intervention. They stress the importance of the integration of the four parts of the DSTP model (p.8).

##### **B. Factor #2**

The proposal discusses how the DSTP model has been previously implemented in '18 schools over the last 4.5 years' (p. 9). They show the high implementation fidelity and the gains made all suggesting promising results with the current proposed intervention with large statistically significant results from ANOVA (p. 10).

##### **B. Factor #3**

The investigators clear step-by-step discussion of the process behind the project including the research-basis behind each step results in a clear understanding and confidence that the intervention as proposed should yield a positive impact on student achievement.

#### **Weaknesses**

No weaknesses found

**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**

#### **D. Factor #1**

The evaluation design includes a well-specified plan for both implementation and impact studies (p. 14). They make clear the importance of demonstrating the quality of the implemented intervention in that 'the quality of the implementation is as challenging as it is important' (p. 8). The plan includes the collection of data through surveys, documents (meeting minutes), observations, and school data (achievement scores) (p. 16-17). They also plan to 'triangulate the data to complete an index that qualitatively rates each school on both implementation fidelity and intensity' (p. 16).

#### **D. Factor #2**

The proposal discusses the use of valid and reliable tools (DIBELS, MCAS) for confidence in the assessment data to be collected (p. 12). There is also a strong training component for data collection team to ensure consistency and quality of data to be analyzed (p. 15).

#### **D. Factor #3**

The investigators make clear their intent to identify key parts of the program in order to assist in replication of the program in the future (p. 14). The data collection places a great deal of importance on the study of the implementation process for fidelity to the current project and future

replication (p. 16). The use of a mixed methods data collection strategy will result in triangulation of the data for greater confidence in the results generated (p. 16-17; 23).

**D. Factor #4**

The budget suggests that over 15% (\$807K/\$5000K) of the budget will be reserved for the evaluation component.

**Weaknesses**

**D. Factor #2**

The timelines for sharing information with key project participants are not delineated. There needs to be a timely sharing of this information in order for the results to be helpful to responding to any needed changes in the implementation of the intervention.

**Reader's Score: 14**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/22/2010 6:41 PM