

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

**Reader #1:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS 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	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
<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	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

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

**TOTAL** 80

75

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development 27: 84.396C**

**Reader #1:**

**Applicant:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

### Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement

This project is innovative and will move partners into a 21st century instructional model and design. It offers a practical solution to meeting Response to Intervention differentiated instructional needs and honors the diversity found within this country. The RFP was well organized, clearly stated goals and objectives, and represented a strong need.

### Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

applicant is seeking to meet.

**Strengths**

The proposal identified extensive needs for the continued development of the pilot model. To facilitate transitioning into high school, the proposal provided evidence for how 9th grade would benefit. There were strong clearly written goals, well thought out implementation plans, and a solid program evaluation plan.

**Weaknesses**

None identified.

**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 credentials of the NYC schools were impressive. The leadership seems focused on moving the district into the 21st century. To have wisely engaged each of the stakeholders in understanding your vision long before you submitted this proposal poised your partnerships to write strong supporting

letters. Their personal experience with the system and their sharing added a powerful dimension to your proposal.

Time magazine's Top 50 recognition certainly added credibility to this project being innovative.

On page 19 the leadership reported the following student achievement gains: 3-8th grade Language Arts and Math gains on the NY State Regents' exams were 44.6%, 2009 graduation rate, as compared to 30% in 2005.

Evidence of the ability to scale up a project was found in the implementation of ARIS.

#### **Weaknesses**

None identified.

**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 proposal will involve 3,000 students (250 per school). The 6th-8th grade math scores were impressive. Evidence was provided supporting a past history of bringing technology to scale. The credentials of those responsible were impressive. The district has experience with scaling up on a national level through its partnerships with several other large urban districts.

The replication plan for this project includes a number of tool-kit procedures, student orientation handbooks, school selection criteria, and technical platform requirements.

There was an honest assessment of per student costs at \$3337.

The identified dissemination plan includes a realistic and concrete list of venues within which to share results.

On page 3 the teachers have stated that they want this project and the student achievement benefits that would result from its implementation.

**Weaknesses**

None 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 proposal identified an impressive list of partnerships that indicate

admiration and support for the framework of School of One.

There was clear evidence of strong district commitment to not only maintain but to build this system. The fact that the letters of support were written by partners that had visited the pilot months prior to the application was significant. The district had been solidifying and sharing their vision of 21st century instruction with many partners and potential partners.

#### **Weaknesses**

There was no evidence of professional development for the teachers. This is a concern related to the sustainability of the project, if the teachers are not well trained.

**Reader's Score: 9**

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths**

The personnel costs included one full time director.  
The proposal also included job descriptions for the new personnel to be hired. This indicated a thoroughness of planning and forethought. There was evidence of the connection between all positions and their responsibilities.

#### **Weaknesses**

None identified.

**Reader's Score: 10**

#### **Competitive Preference**

##### **1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes**

**(0 or 1 Point)**

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

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

**Strengths**

This project did not apply for this Competitive Preference.

**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**

There were no clear connections between the proposal and this preference.

**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**

This proposal addressed this Preference.

**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**

The project does not serve rural schools. The fact that it could in the future do so is not a factor for this proposal.

**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:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

**Reader #2:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS 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	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	3
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
<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	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>76</b>

---

## **Technical Review Form**

### **Development 27: 84.396C**

#### **Reader #2:**

**Applicant:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

### **Summary Statement**

#### **1. Summary Statement**

The New York City School of One Project is offering to develop a personalized instructional model for helping middle school students to master critical knowledge and skills that are considered vital for continuing on to high school and college. The project is based on the experience and success of a pilot program that involved 80 school in the City. The project is technology-based and includes ongoing and comprehensive assessments that will be used to direct supplemental education and support services.

### **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 is well designed innovative project that appears to complement and support the City's priority of improving the teaching and learning of math at the middle school level. The program makes use of a management information system that will provide ongoing data on the performance and achievement of students, and particularly for students with the greatest needs. The assessment system provides a key component for monitoring progress and for making adjustments. It will contribute to identifying the unique needs of ELL student and students with learning disabilities. The exclusive focus on math and its unique approach in providing professional development to facilitate the integrity of the proposed model program seem to be definite strengths.

**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**

Experience is more than adequate. The commitment from the NYPS to make use of the student performance reports will be a definite advantage in the further development and implementation of this program. The ARIS system has been developed and used city-wide for the past several years. Moving forward on this project seems appropriate and the experienced staff should be able to carry this off.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 25**

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

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

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.**
- (2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.**
- (3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.**
- (4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.**

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

**Strengths**

The focus on further developing this program and expanding in within the City of New York contributes to the potential for bringing this program to scale. Additional adoptions should contribute to reductions in overhead costs.

**Weaknesses**

Anticipated plans and details are somewhat vague. The array of partners, while supporting current efforts, may add to the challenges of duplicating the project in other and multiple sites. Carrying on an effective professional development component seems particularly challenging. Details about the current PD component are not adequately presented its cited that "an experienced person" will serve as the PD director, but its nor clear who that person will be and what experience and talents will be expected.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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**

With community-based organizations and support from City officials, this project has a good chance to be sustained and replicated within the system. The structure that is being developed will be a good foundation on which to build. Having direct access to such a wide range of project partners in both the public and private sectors should continue to support and help sustain its development.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths**

The management plan is detailed and adequate for the tasks that need to be successfully accomplished. Sufficient details are provided about the schedules, activities and respective role of key staff and contributing partners. The staff is well-qualified and experienced in working with the City's school system and its teachers.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Competitive Preference**

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

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

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

programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

This competitive priority was 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**

Success of this project would contribute to improvements in reducing school dropouts and increasing graduation rates.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths**

The program is directed to low-income and minority children in NYC and it would address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including a significant number of ELL students and those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards.

**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**

If this project is successful, there is a strong indication that it will address the unique challenges of high-need students in rural schools.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 1**

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 0:11 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

**Reader #3:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS 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	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	7
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	3
<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	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>67</b>

---

## **Technical Review Form**

**Development 27: 84.396C**

**Reader #3:**

**Applicant:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396C100941)

### **Summary Statement**

#### **1. Summary Statement**

A specialized tool is being addressed for complete development to assist with more individualized differentiated instruction in the classroom of a rural community.

### **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**

So1 is an innovative tool that will be infused in middle school framework to effectively increase achievement in mathematics and for future college success. It would be an excellent tool for IEPs for students with disabilities or needing ELL support. LEP and rural areas are addressed in this proposal. The student's daily excerpt helped to visualize the use of the tool better. Two pilot phases have occurred.

### **Weaknesses**

Data for So1 is limited currently and not user friendly. Access for this program will be limited to schools that meet the specific criteria for technology.

**Reader's Score: 23**

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

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

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

### **Strengths**

Effective strategies are in line with the increased achievement of the pilot programs. Google is lending support for this innovative proposal with financial funding. Support for this unique technology is impressive in the letters provided, including from Microsoft, Wireless generation, Teaching Matters, McGraw Hill, PBS to name a few. Expertise is evident for this applicant in the area of large scale projects. Data supports improvement in achievement gaps of in math, reading, graduation and college preparedness page 19.

### **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**

3000 students will be served from this project. Appendix indicates specific allocations of funds for personnel and funding per student. Cost of expanding the schools is minimal after initial startup. Technology and Educational partners will help to continues support, only if this grant is successful. However, replication is dependent on a variety of options that are not detailed. Dissemination will be hosted via web and press, but most importantly the stakeholders are involved.

**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**

A multitude of substantial grant funding has been provided from the stakeholders (as mentioned on other sections). Support from school principals is documented. The fact that Time magazine states this is the most innovative tool that has come about" was astonishing and worthy of the innovativeness of this tool. This tool may have merit to evolve teaching once again!

**Weaknesses**

NYCDOE will only invest if this program deems to be successful. Community support will also be important in future investment of this program. Teacher support will be crucial for this to continue. Strategies are in place to expand this project in three phases that are clear and concise.

**Reader's Score: 7**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths**

The two key management personnel are discussed; responsibilities are listed in detail. Expertise for both key parties are appropriate for this large scale grant. It was mentioned in another section about consultants for So1 being utilized for their own purposes.

**Weaknesses**

Project timeline is not detailed enough. Other personnel including Director of Content, Director of PD, and others are not listed for expertise purposes.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**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**

Criteria met.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 1**

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

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement

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

**Strengths**

Criteria met.

**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**

Criteria met.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 06/26/2010 0:11 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 4:16 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396D100941)

**Reader #1:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	9
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	14
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	23
<b>TOTAL</b>	25	23

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D**

**Reader #1:**

**Applicant:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396D100941)

**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**

A good literature review demonstrated there were reasonable hypothesis and research-based findings that supported the proposed project, e.g., Fuchs & Fuchs (1986) and Barrow et al. (2007). Furthermore, the pilot study showed promising positive impact (e.g., 28 percentage point increase, p. 15).

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. The reviewer's scores reflect his/her professional assessment of the application with respect to these criteria.

#### **Weaknesses**

Although the applicant demonstrated that the proposed project likely would have a positive impact, they did not justify why an anticipated effect size would be between 0.25 and 0.5 standard deviations (p.17).

**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**

The clustering randomized block design with matched pair was appropriate for the evaluation (p.22-23). Given the small sample size (8 schools), this design can avoid unhappy randomization, i.e., make two groups more equivalent than without matching. The statistical power is one issue, but the applicant provided some solutions, e.g., using pretest as covariate (p.24).

In addition, the applicant proposed good plans to provide implementation data and analyze the factors mediated the program impact (p.25).

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. The reviewer's scores reflect his/her professional assessment of the application with respect to these criteria.

**Weaknesses**

Their power analysis was too optimistic, i.e.,  $MDES=0.25$  with power = 0.9 (p.24). With 8 schools, power = 0.9, alpha = 0.05, 2-tailed test,  $MDES=0.25$ , the ICC need to be smaller than 0.05, and the level 2 R-squared needs to be 0.9 (see Optimal Design Software or Bloom's MDES formula). These assumptions in school settings were unusual. The power analysis in developmental grant is not so important, but it should be reasonably presented if the applicant decided to present it.

**Reader's Score: 14**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/23/2010 4:16 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/23/2010 4:46 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396D100941)

**Reader #2:**

	<b>POINTS POSSIBLE</b>	<b>POINTS SCORED</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	11
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
<b>TOTAL</b>	25	18

---

## Technical Review Form

**Development Tier 2 Panel 04: 84.396D**

**Reader #2:**

**Applicant:** Board of Education of the City of New York -- Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One - Division of Talent, Labor and Innovation, Office of School of One (U396D100941)

**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 describes three different areas of research to support the project. The program was piloted on a small scale in 2009 (pgs. 14-16). Two groups evaluated their pilot study: one focused on the model and the second looked at student outcomes. Positive results as well as shortcomings were shared. Based on presented results of the pilot program, the applicant indicates that further study is warranted (pg. 17).

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. The reviewer's scores reflect his/her professional assessment of the application with respect to these criteria.

#### **Weaknesses**

The first area of research, use of paper formative assessments, does not specifically relate to the project's format (pg. 12). In the second area regarding differentiated instruction (pg. 13), the term "differentiated" can refer to meeting the needs of students with different learning styles, adjusting the size and scope of individual assignments, and so on, yet how the term

was used in the research was not defined. This project does not lend itself to these multiple aspects of differentiation because its focus is on differentiating content. Also, the discussion focuses on teachers yet not technology, which is the intent of this project. The pilot study featured student participation in summer and after-school (pg. 17), and so the attitude and motivation of these students, compared to the population in the pilot, may be dissimilar and affect results.

**Reader's Score: 7**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Strengths**

The evaluation will employ a cluster randomized control trial with eight schools. An explanation is provided for how random assignment and matched pairs will occur (pgs. 22-23). In addition to looking at benchmark and statewide assessments, the evaluation will examine student attitudes and behaviors and teacher beliefs. They will investigate whether the program effects vary across students and teachers. The budget portion allocated to the evaluation represents 7-8% of the total budget which seems sufficient to conduct the evaluation.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. The reviewer's scores reflect his/her professional assessment of the application with respect to these criteria.

### **Weaknesses**

It was not clearly shown how learning about student and teacher attitudes would help to improve or revise the program. The evaluation design does not include learning about the structure and implementation of the development activities, the process for space redesign, or site support and managing the technology platform. It was not clear if the purpose of the evaluation was to show the project improved student performance, or that the technology platform was ready for other schools to purchase.

**Reader's Score: 11**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/23/2010 4:46 PM