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**Applicant:** Search Institute -- , - , (U396C101107)

**Reader #1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary Statement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>5</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>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>1</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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant, Search Institute, proposes to use a development grant to replicate and expand the Building Assets-Reducing Risks (BARR) Program. BARR focuses on first year high school students and proposes to increase their achievement through asset building in order to reduce academic failure, increase attendance, decrease disciplinary incidents, and decrease substance use. By addressing non-academic barriers to learning, the program increases achievement. They plan to expand to 10th - 12th grade at the original site in order to demonstrate that this program increases and supports college access. The program will be replicated in rural LEAs in Maine and a suburban-urban LEA in Hemet, CA.

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 need for the project is clearly evident as demonstrated by data on the schools proposed for the development study and by the data demonstrating prior success and results from the project. (pp e 4 and 5). The goals are clear and there is an explicit strategy with objectives and measurable outcomes linked to the priority of turning around low performing schools. There is both replication and expansion of the program design in the application. All components of the category are addressed.

**Weaknesses**

Reader's Score: 25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths**
The applicant has twenty years of experience in implementing the project and has provided results that demonstrate their success and record of work with schools and LEAs. They have been successful in closing access gaps and achievement gaps in the high school in St. Louis Park. Their past performance and results demonstrate their ability to successfully implement a project of this size and scope. The size and scope of the project is meaningful to extend the work to additional grade levels which the applicant is prepared to include.

**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 project will reach 7,500 students over the four years and the applicant has the fiscal resources and the organizational infrastructure to bring BARR to scale. They have worked in 2,500 communities in the U.S. and administered millions of surveys. They have distributed nearly 20 million units of publications and have relationships with America's major organizations to influence the development of strategies to positively affect youth on a very large scale. They included all the factors requested in the proposal. The estimates on scaling to 100,000 to 500,000 Students are included for high schools of approximately 2000 students. They use both print and electronic media to disseminate their programs and activities. They train hundreds of educators annually.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 5**

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

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

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

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

**Strengths**

The applicant has the fiscal, capital, and human resources to sustain the project beyond the grant period. They fully intend to incorporate the project into the ongoing work of their organization and the work of their partner organizations. The LEAs also appear to be committed to sustaining the project and incorporating it into continuous school improvement plans.

**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 quality of the management plan is excellent. The plan includes all the components of that the grant application requested. The key personnel are identified and roles and responsibilities are described. BARR also has a manual which describes the roles of all school based personnel as mentioned on page e 23. Key personnel also have experience with projects of the size and scope described herein. The project is designed to achieve the objectives of BARR on time and within budget. The budget allocates many resources to the schools and LEAs to actually implement the project successfully. BARR will be building capacity in the school personnel through their management activities.

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

Priority Not Addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant clearly addresses college access through Admission Possible.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

Priority Not Addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

**Strengths**

The applicant addresses two schools in rural Maine to improve student achievement and increase high school graduation. The applicant has a previous relationship with Maine and commitments from many officials to support the development of the program.

**Weaknesses**

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
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**Technical Review Coversheet**

**Applicant:** Search Institute -- , - , (U396C101107)

**Reader #2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statement</th>
<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>

**Selection Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>5</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>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Preference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>1</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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Statement
1. Summary Statement

   The applicant made a consistent effort to thoroughly address each section of the i3 grant application. The proposed project was well planned and presented.

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

   Proposed project identifies set goals and explicit strategies, see BARR Logic model (appendix H, pg. e0-e2)
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 provided strong evidence (see pg. e11-e14)

- 20 years experience working with large districts (e.g., New York, Seattle, Minneapolis, San Jose, etc.) with more than three million students in grades 4th - 12th)

- greatest gains are in the area of student achievement (see pg. e8-e9)

Weaknesses
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

| Applicant presented clear evidence to address all aspects of the section (see pg. e19-e21). |

Weaknesses

| |

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)
In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant successfully demonstrated capacity to sustain the project (e.g., the Search Institute resources and support of multiple stakeholders to sustain the project beyond the i3 grant).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milestones, timelines, key personnel, and roles/responsibilities are identified in the Management plan (see pg. e23-e25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The flowchart (see appendix H, pg. e3) - Coordinator is positioned in a supervisory status to the vice principal - this organizational chart will be problematic in many school districts when replicating the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths
Applicant will provide college and career readiness for high-need student population through the BARR program with extended services at the St. Louis Park, MN location.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

priority not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths
BARR will be implemented in four sites, including two rural sites.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/28/2010 5:11 PM
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<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary Statement</strong></th>
<th><strong>POINTS POSSIBLE</strong></th>
<th><strong>POINTS SCORED</strong></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><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></th>
<th><strong>POINTS POSSIBLE</strong></th>
<th><strong>POINTS SCORED</strong></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>23</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>5</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><strong>Competitive Preference</strong></th>
<th><strong>POINTS POSSIBLE</strong></th>
<th><strong>POINTS SCORED</strong></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>1</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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Review Form

Development 60: 84.396C
Reader #3: 
Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396C101107)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Meeting the needs of the the students in this demographic area is a huge challenge. The project is organized where students can learn to grow, become self-sufficient, and be responsible young adults during and after high school. There is a great need for projects that will meet the need of at-risk beginning high school students.

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
Meeting the needs of the students in this demographic area is a huge challenge. The project is organized where students can learn to grow, become self-sufficient, and be responsible young adults during and after high school. There is a great need for projects that will meet the need of at-risk beginning high school students.

**Weaknesses**

This is not a new approach according to the applicant. The applicant has already started the prototype in a high school setting. Page e0

**Reader's Score: 23**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths**

The Search Institute has a long track record of success with implementing such projects.

Pages e11-e14

**Weaknesses**
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 organization has proven itself to be capable of continuing the project in many areas and on a higher level. The Search Institute has replicated similar projects successfully throughout the United States. Pages e19-e20

Weaknesses
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**

Evidence of support is attached to this grant from senators to members of the school. The Search Institute will build the efficacy of all stakeholders through continued training and coaching.

**Weaknesses**

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 institute's management team is comprised of experts in the area of student achievement that will be relevant to the success of the project. The institute has experience in handling such a project of this size.

**Weaknesses**
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

Priorities not addressed

Reader's Score: 0

(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**

This project will allow at risk students the opportunity to create a successful future by equipping them with tools such as, talking to adults successfully, filling out paperwork properly, making contact with adults in a positive manner, and being a encouraging leader for others.

**Weaknesses**

**Reader's Score: 1**

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

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

**Strengths**

**Weaknesses**

Priorities not addressed

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

This project will be generate positive effects in various high school areas such as rural LEAs. This will allow for the continuity of success throughout the area.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2
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**Development Tier 2 Panel 10: 84.396D**

**Reader #1:**

**Applicant:** Search Institute --, --, (U396D101107)

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

   The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout
rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

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

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths

This project intends to replicate and expand the Building Assets-Reducing Risks Program (BARR) developed by the Search Institute. This program is listed in the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices. Research studies to support the need for this project and its significance are provided on pages 1-4. The research to support the use of BARR have all been conducted by the same two investigators - Benson and Scales. Therefore, there is value in investigating this program in other settings and with the assistance of an independent evaluator.

Weaknesses

Admission Possible will partner with the Search Institute on this project by developing a school-wide college access and success program for the BARR expansion. There is little information provided about this organization or studies on this program.

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 project evaluator is an independent consultant, formerly a research scientist for the Minnesota Institute of Public Health. Researchers from the Search Institute will provide assistance to the project investigation. The research questions, process and outcome measures for the project are discussed on pages 15-17. The instruments to be used and the scales for the School Climate Survey have previously been validated. (p. 17) Table 2 on pages 6-7, presents the objectives for the replication sites and the expansion site.

**Weaknesses**

The amount of funds dedicated to the external evaluator do not seem sufficient for the scope of this project. The project would be enhanced by adding an additional independent evaluator since Dr. Sharma has worked closely with the school district on a number of grants and evaluation.

Reader's Score: 9
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Reader #2:

Applicant: Search Institute -- , - , (U396D101107)

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**

Support in the literature for the theoretical framework of BARR (i.e., the Developmental Assets Model) was well documented. Compelling evidence exists that the BARR program has promise of efficacy (p. 3-4). As the team asserts, subjecting the gains observed in the past to comparison to another group would be an appropriate test. A caution here is that there may already be demonstrated promise of efficacy and that this project is actually beyond the development stage and is ready for a full experimental trial.

Given that the team is proposing to replicate a program with positive effects documented in the past (with similar support), it is somewhat likely to have positive impact on students.

**Weaknesses**

There is a lingering concern about the new student populations in Maine and California. It is not clear if they are similar enough to the St. Louis Park SD students to constitute a true replication. FRL rates are similar, but there is a 24% difference between SLPHS and Hemet HS (p.4). This second BARR project has some elements of scale up.

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 evaluation questions and corresponding measures are described fully in the proposal.

Implementation data (for teacher's use of new instructional strategies) will be collected. One evaluation question is dedicated solely to this task.

The lead evaluator chosen is experienced and has built good relationships with school district personnel. This should help in gaining access to schools for critical data collection tasks.

Weaknesses

At no point did the proposal indicate the design of the evaluation. One can surmise that a pre-post design will be used, but it is not completely clear for all measured outcomes. According to the proposal, the final design had not been conceptualized. The proposal identifies a need for further study to include comparison groups but that element was not included in the evaluation plan.

Methods for collecting and the foci of implementation data are not described.

The team discusses collecting student data to facilitate development and replication. Implementation data from program delivery staff should be in the mix of data sources here.

The proportion of the budget allotted for external evaluation is 6%. This is acceptable but probably marginal.
Reader’s Score: 8
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