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Technical Review Form

Development 36: 84.396C
Reader #1:
Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

Summary Statement
1. Summary Statement

This proposal was thoughtfully organized and addressed all aspects of the Selection Criteria. It would serve as a model proposal to assist others who attempt this process.

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
This proposal is to develop and enhance A4L, an academic program that integrates standards-focused, text-based content and arts strategies to improve students' achievement in literacy, learning, and life skills. The goal is to implement A4L learning in grades 3-5 across the applicants' district. As part of this implementation, comprehensive evaluations - both formative and summative - will monitor the implementation of the program and rigorously evaluate its impact on student achievement.

This i3 grant will allow BSD to faster leverage their existing systems, stakeholder support, and other available state and federal resources to significantly and rapidly improve all of our students' reading and writing achievement, particularly their high-needs students.

A4L has been piloted in 92 schools in 28 districts across the country; a majority of participants were students in grades 3-5 (14,123 students). In previous evaluations, significant student gains in key literacy skills, including ELL students and those who perform below grade level. This program is closely aligned with the high priorities of BSD. The distinctive features of the program are listed on p.4 of the narrative. Through implementation of the A4L Lessons, the applicants expect to achieve the following goals: 1) close achievement gaps in learning; 2) increase the percent of elementary students meeting or exceeding benchmarks for college and career readiness in literacy; and 3) increase 4th grade students' writing performance.

The district goal is to ensure that all students show continuous progress toward their personal learning goals and that they are prepared for post-secondary education and career success. Our staff engages in purposeful, research-based, and ongoing professional development. With a fast growing percent of English language learners (9-15%) and a doubling percentage of underserved students increasing from 24-43%, while the applicant is proud of the progress students have made, 1 in 4 students failed to meet the standards in reading/literacy and the majority of these students are economically disadvantaged, ELLs, and students with disabilities.

**Weaknesses**

none

**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

| BSD has extensive experience securing and successfully managed grant of the size and complexity of this i3 grant. In the 2009-10 year BSD managed almost 27 million in grants from federal, state, local and private sources in which fiscal reporting was completed on time for all grants. BSD has made strong progress between 2003-04 and 2008-09 by increasing the percent of students meeting or exceeding state standards in reading by 7%; in math by 4% in writing in grade 7 by 12%. Most importantly BSD has been successful in closing the gap between Black and White students (by almost 10%) and between White and Hispanic students (over 16%). |

Weaknesses

| none noted. |

Reader's Score: 25

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths**

A total of 12,850 students in grades 3-5 will be served by this grant period. The requested i3 grant and matching funds will serve 4,500 students annually for four years, with an additional 4,500 supported by the district in the final year as they move toward sustaining the program.

The per student cost per student will be $107. for the initial year; subsequent years will be $78. For 250,000 students at $24,744,00 initially; subsequent years $18,035,000.

**Weaknesses**

none

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**

In year 5 of the proposed project, BSD will support the cost to implement A4L in the 17 treatment schools using Title IIA and general fund allocation. This includes support for the Teacher on Special Assignment, release time for teachers to collaborate, related materials and accompanying Residencies.

With the gradual replacement of Federal grant support with funds from other sources, the district will be able to assume all costs associated with implementing A4L in each of the 33 elementary schools.

The sustainability of the project will have support from strong consensus BSD has established among school and community stakeholders around the districts overarching theory of action.

(more information on pp.18-19)

**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 Management Plan will organize around three broad tasks: 1) Design and Development, 2) Implementation, 3) Evaluation.

Timelines for each task and associated activities along with target benchmarks/outcomes and responsible parties are presented in Appendix.
Ensuring the amount, quality, and timelines of implementation of the program requires the confidence of teachers and principals that they will be supported with expertise that is sensitive to their experiences.

The team invests in multiple means for timely data, support, and feedback from the field - meetings of the study groups, formal observations, informal connections, scheduled and asynchronous voluntary electronic connections and regular e-mail exchanges to support practice and prompt feedback.

BSD will serve as the fiscal agent and lead organization, including overseeing the execution and monitoring of contracts. (more details on pp.21-25.

**Weaknesses**

None noted.

**Competitive Preference**

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

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

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

**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

2. **Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success**
We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

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

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

Strengths

In meeting the district goal to narrow the achievement gaps for ELL students in reading and writing results drawn from piloting A4I schools and districts that serve large numbers of ELL students will be particularly helpful. From the clarity of the proposal and the way research support was drawn on at each turn to qualify and enlarge the scope of understanding for each decision has added to the clarity and transparency of the decision-making of how best to meet the needs of the special needs students and ELL students.

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

Status: Submitted
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Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

Reader #2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS SCORED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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  2
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  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  1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve  2  0
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Development 36: 84.396C
Reader #2:
Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

Summary Statement
1. Summary Statement

The applicant is focused on developing, implementing, and evaluating a program that integrates student focused, text-based content and art strategies to improve students' achievement in literacy, learning, and life skills for 12,850 students in grades 3-5.

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

Outcomes are clearly stated on page 65 and include spending more time reading, efficient use of time, building on strengths, building community, using specialists and PLC’s, and meeting specific standards. The needs of all learners are included in goal 11 by ensuring equal access to all students. Integrating disciplines is a strong component of the program. Measurable and specific outcomes are clearly addressed in the narrative on page 67. The program is aligned to the state standards as evidenced in appendix H, which is a priority for the applicant.

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

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 shows evidence on page 11 that they have managed grants of this size and scope, managing over $27M in grants. The applicant provides
statistics on page 1 of the narrative that they have improved student achievement in reading, especially for LEP and minority students. Additionally data tables in appendix H and information on page 12 support this.

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

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 identifies that they have qualified personnel, who have worked
together successfully on similar projects, to develop the program beyond the grant. The staff is committed to expand the program. Scale up costs are outlined on page 16 of the narrative for up to 500,000.

Weaknesses

The applicant has not demonstrated the capacity to work with the 12,850 students in the proposal with evidence in the narrative. Feasibility of replication is not addressed in the narrative. Mechanisms for dissemination are also not included in the narrative.

Reader's Score: 2

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

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

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

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

Strengths

The application shows that the stakeholder will support the project beyond the grant. All costs will be assumed by BSD. On page 1, BSD states that they will implement lessons in all elementary schools at the end of the project.

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

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

Responsibilities, timelines, and milestones clearly stated in Appendix H and aligned to outcomes. Responsible parties are identified for each objective. This extensive chart gives a clear indication that the project will be completed on time and within budget. Roles and responsibilities are clearly and specifically outlined and defined in the narrative on pages 21-24. Training and experience of key personnel is evident and supported in the attached CV's/

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

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: 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: 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

The applicant addresses meeting the needs of LD and LEP students throughout the proposal and specifically in goal 11.

Weaknesses

No significant weakness noted in narrative.

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: 0

Status: Submitted
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<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS SCORED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary Statement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS SCORED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive Preference</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS SCORED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
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Development 36: 84.396C
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Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, Teaching and Learning, (U396C100900)

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

Innovative approach focused on using the arts to boost literacy. The program is a “groundbreaking supplemental literacy program that blends the creativity and discipline of the arts with learning science to raise student
achievement in reading and writing, and to develop learning and life skills" (pp. 3-4). The project is a "unique design interweaving the arts, reading, and writing" (p. 6). Data from pilot projects indicate gains in key literacy skills, including LEP students and those who perform below grade level. These features are aligned with the key needs of the target district. The project is aligned with Oregon academic standards. Application specifies 11 distinctive features of the project (p. 4). The project is focused on units of instruction aligned with work by trained teaching artists who collaborate with classroom teachers. The project provides students with opportunities to excel through activities that draw on a variety of skill sets and learning styles (p. 5). The project includes both formative and summative assessments.

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
Applicant has experience managing grants from federal, state, local, and private sources. Applicant has raised student achievement, helped to close achievement gaps, and improved graduation rates (p. 12).

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

Key project staff have worked successfully on similar Arts for Learning projects (p. 16).
Weaknesses

Limited discussion efforts to disseminate project information broadly and support replication.

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 applicant will incorporate the program into the district strategic plan to ensure sustained commitment (p. 17). The applicant has secured stakeholder consensus on "inherent values and educational priorities" of the project community (p. 18). Applicant reports strong community commitment to ensuring that all children receive instruction in the arts as well as in core subject areas. Applicant reports that once established, program maintenance will be manageable and involved "nominal cost" (p. 19). Applicant will seek public and private sources of support to sustain program.

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**

Personnel have experience managing large, multi-faceted federal projects. Key staff have subject matter and management experience. For example, the Project Coordinator has 15 years of experience working with arts organizations and other team members are experts in learning sciences. The management plan emphasizes effective communication and coordination among program partners, including monthly meetings, feedback, and quarterly reports. Applicant plans at least monthly internal reviews of work progress and budget status. Applicant promotes a "shared responsibility for quality within all of our teams" (p. 22).

**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**

Priority not addressed.
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.

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.
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
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Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396D100900)

Reader #1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS SCORED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396D100900)

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 Arts for Learning Lessons (A4L) project intends to improve the achievement of high needs students in grades 3-5. A4L is a supplemental literacy program that blends the arts with science to improve reading and writing. This project has been piloted in 92 schools across the country. Evaluations of the pilot found significant student gains in "key literacy skills" for English Language Learners (ELL) and students performing below grade level. (p. 4) The A4L project is based on the "How People Learn" model by Bransford, Brown and Cooking. (p. 5) A number of research studies to support this project are discussed on pages 7-11. The applicant states on page 10 that the research in the past 5 years on the A4L project were not of scale or rigor of the proposed study. However, positive results were obtained in literacy gains, particularly for ELL students. (p. 10)

**Weaknesses**

The research studies discussed in this section provide summaries of the findings and their relevance to this project. However, few details on the studies are included.

Reader's Score: 9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths**

WestEd will serve as the independent evaluator. The evaluation design includes quantitative and qualitative data and details for the formative and summative evaluations. (p. 13-15) Biannual classroom observations, an online teacher survey, student surveys, professional development observations and annual interviews with principals and district administrators will be part of the formative evaluation. (p. 13-14) The summative evaluation will be a three year, cluster-randomized trial in 33 elementary schools in the Beaverton School district. (p. 14) To ensure internal validity of the random assignment process, statistical analyses will assess the baseline differences of the treatment and control groups. Appendix H contains a five year project overview and the logic model. Sampling and Power Estimates of the project are also provided in detail on pages H-35-36. A detailed chart of the tasks, timelines, benchmarks/outcomes and responsible parties is also detailed in Appendix H. During Year 1 WestEd will develop the protocols for comparisons.

**Weaknesses**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/21/2010 5:55 PM
Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396D100900)

**Reader #2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Review Form

**Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D**

**Reader #2:**

**Applicant:** Beaverton School District 48J -- Teaching and Learning, - Teaching and Learning, (U396D100900)

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

A4L has significant support from the research literature including its basis in How People Learn, a seminal meta-analysis of education research. A4L has been piloted in 92 schools in 28 districts, with positive results. The combination of its strong literature-based and empirical-based support makes it a promising program that is likely to produce positive outcomes and warrants more rigorous study.

Weaknesses

None 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 experimental design of the summative evaluation matches the project goal of rigorous study of impact on students. The description of this design demonstrates understanding of designs aimed at facilitating causal inferences.

Implementation data will be collected using a comprehensive set of measures including independent measures such as observation protocols.

The implementation data collected, including fidelity of implementation will be useful in replication.

WestEd is a sound choice for external evaluation. The subcontract is large ($900K); nearly 20% of the entire budget but this is appropriate given the size and rigor of the summative evaluation design (cluster randomized trial).

**Weaknesses**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

---

Status: Submitted
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