

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 1:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	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	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0

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

Technical Review Form

Development 66: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant seeks to address teacher quality head on and on a large scale,

with the aim of reaching thousands of students.

The program components focus on human capital - teachers and principals, and will measure impact on student achievement.

Targeting early childhood grades, it is ambitious in scope, seeking impact where research indicates the longest range impact can be realized.

The program adds an early childhood specialization to the Teacher Fellow Master program, building on the masters program's foundation to address the need for more effective early childhood teachers. This represents a new strategy with strong potential for wide adoption in the field.

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

Miami Dade and the University of Florida bring large institutional strength to the proposed program and have successfully worked together to develop and maintain the Master teachers Initiative and the Principal Fellows program.

The school system has made progress in recent years in closing the achievement gap for minority students.

A local nonprofit partner ready Schools Miami is dedicated to piloting and implementing programs that improves outcomes for children from birth to age 8. It has successfully linked schools to agencies providing health and other services.

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 goals of the plan are to go to scale very quickly. They include wide dissemination of the resources developed to educators, IHE's, foundations and others. (Narrative, page 7)

The Master teacher program has grown quickly. The University has managed to successfully replicate in several Florida LEA's .

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

All partners have ability to fund or obtain funds to further expand the programs. Steady growth in the Teacher Masters program has been managed by the university and includes funding partnerships with local districts.

The partners are committed to identification of ongoing public funding for the project and have secured public funding from a state children's trust fund, the legislature and the university's partnership with local school systems.

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 leadership at the university and local school system has successfully implemented, funded and managed the training programs and are well positioned to manage further growth, which includes the early childhood masters.

Partnerships are in place between the university, school system and local community (Ready Schools Miami).

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

The application's focus in improved early learning outcomes and address the most important resource - quality teaching.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

NA

Reader's Score: 0

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

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that

are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

Weaknesses

NA

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 1:22 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 8:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	20
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	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students	1	0

(0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	71

Technical Review Form

Development 66: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The proposal is for four years and requests five million dollars. The applicant proposes to increase student achievement by improving teacher capacity for high learning educational programs specifically targeting early childhood educators. The proposal will positively impact over 30,000 students. The proposal address the Absolute Priority 1 (innovations that support effective teachers and principals) and competitive priority 5 (improving early learning outcomes).

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 will reach students early to ensure higher achievement as they matriculate through the educational system.

The achievement gap begins early in the life of a child; therefore, the proposal focuses on early intervention.

Weaknesses

The goals of the proposal need a specific expected outcome with baseline data. The measurement of the goals is too subjective.

Reader's Score: 20

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant has great partnerships.
The district is making positive achievement gains.
The district has a 'B' rating.

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 proposal will serve up to 30,000 children.

The applicant has the capacity to further develop and implement the project.

The cost is very reasonable.

The proposal will directly serve 584 teachers and indirectly serve 30,000 students at the cost of \$211 per student.

The applicant has a good plan to disseminate information on the project. The plan will support replication of the project.

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 proposal has a good sustainability plan. The applicant has partnered with an institution of higher learning to impact instruction. The proposal will continue to produce an increase in teacher capacity after the funding has ended.

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 applicant submitted a good management plan and will be able to achieve the goals of the project. The goals, objectives, budget, and timelines are clearly defined.

The key personnel are qualified and have the experience necessary to implement the proposal.

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

The applicant targets early learning outcomes through increasing teacher capacity at the college level.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference point.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference point.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not apply for this competitive preference point.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 8:18 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 4:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	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	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	8
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students	1	0

(0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	80	71

Technical Review Form

Development 66: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396C101305)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant's grant is impressive and works to boost a, if not the key area that is know to increase student achievement: teacher quality. The potential impact of the project could be quite strong, but the replicable nature of the project would quite difficult if there were not willing and able partners, such as described in the application.

Selection Criteria

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant demonstrates the need in addressing teacher quality-- a critical human capital issue. Although the proposal is not a direct school wide intervention, it's impact is potentially broad, and it is an innovative approach as described by the goals (p. 7) and programming (p. 4).

Weaknesses

The application could be strengthened by adding a clear narrative (i.e. adding an explicit strategy to accompany the outcomes listed), expanding on four key outcomes described on page 6.

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 applicant presents strong evidence of positive reforms and demonstrates clear progress in reducing the achievement gap (p. 14). In addition, project partners, including the Kellogg Foundation, the University of Florida and the Early Childhood Initiative Foundation all have experience in managing projects similar to the proposed, and moreover, are part an existing consortium called Ready Schools Miami.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

The applicant clearly lays out the strategy and future capacity to bring to scale; however, one consideration with other districts replicating the idea would be contingent on the strength of the local university system

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 and partners provide strong evidence of sustainability, with a wide range of support from the district leadership, administrators and most importantly, teachers. The potential for planning between partners for ongoing work appears strong, given the existing relationships that have been formed through past efforts such as the creation and development of the Lastinger Center.

Weaknesses

The applicant may consider adding more details of the projected funding to sustain the project to "increase public investment and expansion of this work," as alluded to on p. 23.

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 applicant lists and describes key personnel, which all appear to be exceptionally strong and quite capable of managing a project of this magnitude. (p. 23-35)

Weaknesses

Given the scope and magnitude of the undertaking, the applicant would benefit from articulating the details of the management plan. Since there a number of very large organizations involved, a detailed explanation of objectives and benchmarks would certainly increase the strength of the application.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

The application supports the early learning outcomes criteria by significantly

boosting the human capital quality of it's early elementary staff.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

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

Strengths

n/a

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

students.

Strengths

n/a

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

n/a

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2010 4:29 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:35 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396D101305)

Reader #1:

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

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396D101305)

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

**1 STRENGTH OF RESEARCH-BASED FINDINGS OR REASONABLE HYPOTHESES
STRENGTHS**

1. In the abstract and on page 8 the applicant listed several studies directly related to two main elements of its model - teacher quality and school leadership. These findings were clearly detailed and research-based. They were tied directly to the hypothesis of the applicant.
2. On page 8 the applicant cited a study that indicated that school leadership explained 20% of the variance in test scores. This directly addressed a key element in the model of the applicant.

**2 PROPOSED PROJECT ATTEMPTED PREVIOUSLY WITH PROMISING RESULTS
STRENGTHS**

1. On page 9 the applicant cited several studies that documented improved student performance and related indicators of attendance and suspensions.

These are keep components of the proposed model.

3 PROJECT LIKELY TO HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT AS MEASURED BY THE EFFECT, ON IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, CLOSING GAPS, DROPOUT RATES, GRADUATION RATES, COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS, COLLEGE GRADUATION.
STRENGTHS

1. On page 9 the applicant notes that it has documented previous academic performance success. Given the model's prior successes the program does appear to be likely to have a positive impact on student performance.

Weaknesses

1. There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

1 METHODS OF EVALUATION ARE APPROPRIATE TO THE SIZE

AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

STRENGTHS

1. In the Human Subjects section the applicant clearly and concisely detailed all the methods contained in the evaluation. These were very comprehensive and seem appropriate to the project.
2. In the Human Subjects section the applicant indicated it will use a randomized control selection procedure for the teachers in the masters program. This was well thought out and will include data from the control group for effective comparison with the treatment group.
3. On page 17 the applicant noted assignment challenges to the assignment of teachers to the control group. This was an acknowledgement of the inherent bias in attempts to randomly matching teachers. However, the applicant came up with two workable solutions which will strengthen the validity of the analysis.
4. On page 18 the applicant indicated it will conduct a power analysis to determine the sample needed to obtain the desired effect size and the corresponding sample size for the control group. This reflected a comprehensive and detailed understanding of the importance of determining the sample size to obtain better analysis outcomes.

2 METHODS OF EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION DATA AND PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK, AND PERIODIC ASSESSMENT

STRENGTHS

1. On pages 17 and 18 the applicant listed a number of activities that will be assessed and evaluated in a timely manner. With the ongoing involvement of the external evaluator this appears to be high quality analysis that will provide very timely and useful performance feedback and periodic assessment.

3 THE EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE KEY ELEMENTS AND APPROACH FOR REPLICATION OR TESTING

STRENGTHS

1. On page 19 the applicant explained the data analysis techniques included the analysis of three covariates. This was another indicator of the thorough and comprehensive thought that went into the design of the evaluation to maximize meaningful information that can provide insight into the many variables involved in the analysis.
2. On page 4 the applicant indicated that a unique component of the masters degree program will be the professor-in-residence who will work alongside the teachers and administrators within the participating schools. This will assist in having the teachers test out and obtain immediate feedback regarding implementation of theories learned in the classroom.

4 THE PROJECT INCLUDES SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR
CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION EFFECTIVELY
STRENGTHS

1. In the budget narrative the applicant provided a listing of funding allocated to the external evaluation and the funds seemed sufficient. The resume of the lead person with the external evaluator was also included and the resume details extensive experience in conducting evaluations.

Weaknesses

1. There were no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:35 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 10:33 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396D101305)

Reader #2:

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

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida -- Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration - Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Services, Grants Administration (U396D101305)

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

Strengths: The applicants cite credible literature that supports the underlying hypothesis and the core features of the program (pgs 8-9).

The project has been piloted and preliminary results suggest it is effective (pg 9).

The proposed project has potential to have a positive impact on a large number of elementary school students by improving both teacher quality and school leadership (pgs 7-8). It may potentially impact student achievement and close achievement gaps.

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

Strengths: The applicant is proposing to contract an external evaluator to test the program using an RCT design to test the impact on teacher knowledge and performance, school culture, and student achievement (pg 15).

The design includes a formative evaluation that will be used to identify problems and provide feedback for midcourse corrections and program quality enhancement. The formative evaluation plan includes multiple measures and data sources (pgs 15-16) and qualitative and quantitative data. The summative evaluation design is strong (RCT; 50 schools) and includes multiple measures and outcomes (pgs 16-18). It includes testing a 3-level HLM model (pg 19).

The evaluator will prepare annual reports and assist the applicant partners with disseminating the program and results with a broad audience (pg 19).

The evaluation will be conducted by SRI International. A sufficient amount has been budgeted each year to cover evaluation costs (budget narrative).

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: No weaknesses have been identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 10:33 AM