

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 06/30/2010 3:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

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 15 Points)	15	_____
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	6
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	_____
7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	_____
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address	1	_____

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____
TOTAL	105	18

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #1:

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important 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.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

The applicant provides a well-written, well-documented, and informative research review that makes the case both for the importance of more rigorous academic high school opportunities for students and for the impact of early college high schools, of which it is an example. In addition, the applicant provides information indicating that the Bard early college model is particularly successful among early college high schools, including those Bard schools that have been set up in urban neighborhoods and serve largely disadvantaged students of color.

Weaknesses

The studies noted in the research literature review are not summarized, making it difficult without further investigation by proposal reviews to

determine whether the research cited meets the Secretary's criterion of providing Strong Evidence. The National Study of Student Engagement, for example, though it provides valuable information does not meet this criterion. Adelman (2006), provides strong evidence of the importance of a rigorous high school curriculum for college success, but though it is sophisticated methodology and a strong regression analysis, it is not an experimental or quasi-experimental study. One study cited (O'Brien and Nelson, 2004) does use comparison groups -- AP course takers and dual enrollees in high school and college -- to demonstrate that dual enrollees (as in the early college high schools) have better college outcomes than AP course takers. But this study is also not truly quasi-experimental because the treatment is not uniform. So far as this reviewer can determine from looking up the studies cited or information about them, none of the studies meets the criteria for Strong Evidence.

The narrative of the studies does not strictly include the effect size of the studies cited, although it includes some outcomes and comparisons of outcomes between Bard students and students from other high schools. The outcomes discussion is not as thorough and rigorous, however, as would be expected.

Also, although there are statistics given that support the superiority of the Bard early college high school approach above other such programs, there is no study cited as the origin of these statistics. It would be critical for determining the justification for scaling up the Bard program to have evidence of its effectiveness and superiority, but the evidence provided does not meet the Strong Evidence criteria.

Finally, the Bard programs studied constitute a limited sample, and it is not clear that the characteristics of the districts where they are located will be adequately representative of the districts included in the scale-up project. Thus, the external validity of the research included is in question.

Reader's Score: 6

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(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

Weaknesses

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.

(3) 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.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

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

(6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.

Strengths

The evaluation intends to conduct an experimental study, and the summary of the proposed evaluation capably addresses a number of methodological and logistical challenges the effort will face. The study targets the project implementation sites and should be sufficiently large to yield statistically significant findings that should provide guidance for further scale-up. The data to be collected are diverse and include quantitative and qualitative information on staff and students. These should yield rich findings, including findings about the impact of specific program features and of variations in program implementation.

In addition to the experimental study, the evaluation will address the implementation challenges for the program and use mixed methods to determine which program elements are most essential to successful implementation and effectiveness.

The evaluation narrative includes a thoughtful discussion of dissemination of evaluation findings in order to maximize its utility both for Bard network participants and other interested parties.

The estimated \$4 million dollar cost of the evaluation -- roughly 8.5 percent of the total estimated project cost -- seems to be appropriate for the scope and nature of the evaluation propose

The organization chosen to conduct the evaluation is independent, but the inclusion of more information (such as resumes of evaluation staff) would have provided additional evidence of independence.

Weaknesses

There are concerns about the validity of some of the outcomes measures proposed. Given the longitudinal nature of the data and the significant lapse of time between the treatment (the Bard program) and the effects to be measured, the threat of confounding variables is significant. This issue is not adequately addressed.

Somewhat more detailed information that includes a timetable for the evaluation (especially in relationship to the progress of project implementation) and some elaboration of instruments and methods to be used (perhaps in the appendices) would have been useful to affirm the adequacy of the evaluation proposed. Also, more information about the involvement of evaluation staff would have been helpful in assessing the adequacy of resources.

Reader's Score: 12

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(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 proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

Weaknesses

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

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

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

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

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

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

achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2010 3:29 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/03/2010 7:50 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

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 15 Points)	15	5
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	_____
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	7
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	5
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	4
7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	4
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address	1	0

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	105	25

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #2:

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

- (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,
(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

The model proposed by Bard College has shown success on three different campuses in different settings.
The project design begins with a needs assessment; provides training and assistance for staff; and includes a clearinghouse of best practices.

Weaknesses

The applicant seeks to address Absolute Priority Three (Innovations that Complement the Implementation of High Standards and Quality Assessments) but there is no mention of assessments of high quality being implemented. Tying the quality of the project to the absolute priority would strengthen this application.

In the beginning of the application, Bard Early College High School is described as "selective" which leaves the reader with the impression that only motivated at risk students will be admitted to the program. The large unmet need in this country is how to motivate the unmotivated at risk students.

The early college high school is a concept that is being utilized in many communities in America. The approach used here utilizes a Liberal Arts program to prepare students to be successful in college. It would be helpful to have data comparing the Liberal Arts model to other early college high school models in order to understand how the applicant's approach is one not widely adopted.

The claim that since the model has worked in three different locations it will be successful elsewhere is questioned in the proposal on p.12. The claim that it is likely to work in many others as well causes the reader to wonder if enough research has been conducted to determine the efficacy of translating this model at this time.

The application includes conflicting statements regarding design of the early college high schools. On page 21 it states that the "greater the degree of management support and design specificity; . . . the better the odds that the model will be able to replicate high-quality results in new locations. Further down on the page it states, . . . school designs need not be spelled out in every detail in order to be specific enough to ensure consistency." These two statements render it difficult to understand what the applicant is proposing.

Reader's Score: 5

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important 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.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(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 implemented several localized projects in New York City and a Master of Arts in Teaching program in California.

The proposal states the experiences of the applicant are in working with and supporting at risk young adults in prisons or in preparing them to attend college successfully. This experience provides support for working with at risk populations.

The applicant provided information that the Bard High School Early College model performs better than other early college high school models in regards to higher rates of college credits earned and AA degrees while in high school. The applicant also stated that students in the BHSEC model have greater rates of college acceptance and enrollment rates. The success of the model with the selected students lends support to their experience.

Students selected for enrollment in the BHSEC model have a higher graduation rate (92%) compared to the national average of 69%. This data provides support for the notion that the applicant has experience working with selected at risk students.

Weaknesses

There is little evidence provided that speaks to the applicant's experience in implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects. The evidence is presented in the extension of the early high school college to two locations in the same state. Providing evidence of implementing rapidly growing projects needs to be emphasized in this section.

Data were not provided to substantiate the statements made regarding the BHSEC model gains as compared to those of other early college high schools. The inclusion of data would strengthen the position of the applicant regarding the impact of this model.

The data provided are not from independent organizations and do not have any demographics attached to them to determine if the comparison groups are matched. Inclusion of this demographic information is key to determining if the data can be compared with similar groups.

Reader's Score: 7

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.**
- (2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.**
- (3) 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.**
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.**
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**
- (6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.**
- (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 proposed project's demonstrated**

success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

The proposal plans to impact 75,000-100,000 students by year 5 of the grant. This is a substantially larger number than currently in the early college high school programs.

Bard College will offer an annual conference, seminars, workshops and regional consulting free of charge during the life of the grant (estimated costs are \$450,000). This allows the expertise of the college personnel to be shared.

The proposal lists the cost per student as \$630 with a startup cost of \$200,000 the first year and \$400,000 per year thereafter. The lower amount in the first year is due to support provided by the college and allows for the school to become operational and seek private funding.

Weaknesses

The capacity of the applicant to reach the proposed number of students is not demonstrated in the application. To date the applicant has experience in implementing the model at two sites in the same state.

In reviewing the resumes of the personnel, only one individual has experience implementing a grant. Large scale projects are not listed in the resumes of the key personnel responsible for this project. Financially, one of the project personnel has extensive background and experience in fundraising. The partners in this project with the college are the two early college high schools in New York. Evidence of experience in large-scale implementation has not been included in the application.

The applicant did not provide any evidence of relative ease or user satisfaction regarding the model being proposed for implementation.

No mention is made of who will offer the conferences, seminars, workshops, and regional consulting after the life of the grant. A statement as to the support and cost offered after the grant period would be helpful in determining feasibility of project replication.

The applicant did not include a cost estimate for reaching 100,000 students but included costs for reaching 250,000, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students. Inclusion of each of the specific amounts requested would be helpful.

Dissemination of project information will occur via a web site and print materials. Elaboration on how this information would be shared with those that may not be aware of the work in order to seek out the website would add to the feasibility of replication.

Reader's Score: 5

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

The applicant maintains that the schools will be sustainable primarily by public funding with support from the network for college credit at Bard College. This is a strong point of the application to be able to offer college credit.

Bard will offer training to new schools on how to fund services beyond the public school funds. Bard has an excellent record of obtaining private funds from supporters for the operation of the two schools in New York. This is a very positive aspect of the proposal in that the funding process will be shared.

Weaknesses

The stakeholders that have committed support to date are the New York City Department of Education (in the form of memoranda of understanding for the two current sites of Early College High School) and the New York State Education Department in the form of a letter of support for the i3

grant). Providing additional support that is broader than New York would provide a critical mass for long-term success.
The 20% funding match comes from Bard College in the form of tuition matching for students. This aspect of the grant seems to indicate the lack of a broad base of support for this project outside of the college as evidenced by a lack of organizations providing funds.
No mention is made in the application as to how the college credits will be funded outside of the grant period. Including a statement as to how college credit will be provided for the new sites outside of the five year period would clarify this area.

Reader's Score: 4

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.**
- (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.**
- (3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.**

Strengths

The management plan provides for a large number of individuals to support the grant over the five year time frame. Curriculum, finance, web support, and research are all areas proposed to provide the necessary support for this project.

Weaknesses

No detailed multi-year project plan or financial breakdowns were included in the application. The roles, specific timelines, and milestones were not available. Including these items would help provide an understanding of how the project will be monitored at each milestone over the five year

period.

The Project Director is serving part-time and has other college responsibilities. Although the individual will have four regional directors it would be helpful to provide additional information as to how the responsibilities of the Project Director will be shared by the four regional directors.

The resumes and descriptions of the experiences of the Project Director do not directly align to managing large, complex and rapidly growing projects. Inclusion of experience by this individual in managing the scaling-up of a model would strengthen the application.

The applicant did not include the qualifications of the Principal Investigator from the independent evaluator, Metis Associates. The inclusion of experience of the individual serving in this capacity would provide the information regarding the expertise and experience of this individual.

Reader's Score: 4

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 by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success

(0 or 1 Point)

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

The proposal indicates that the high school early college programs currently in existence serve a "growing population of public-school students, many of whom come from underserved middle schools and low income neighborhoods" (p. 3). It would strengthen the proposal to put in percentages of students who are classified as low income to determine if this program represents a model that will address this population.

It is not clear if all students are accepted to the programs or there is a set of criteria that allows the school to grant or deny enrollment. Clarification as to whether the school has admission requirements would be helpful.

The word "many" is used throughout the proposal in reference to students (" . . . moreover, many of our students would be unable to complete college without generous financial aid . . ." p.4). It is difficult to gauge whether this proposal to provide access and success can be replicated for all students or a select group.

Support structures are in place to assist students to meet the challenges of the program, especially those who enter the program under-prepared(p.5). The continual reference to students who are not in the same educational or social strata as other students leaves the reader to wonder if this program is designed for at risk students. Clarity of the rationale for the ongoing comments about the growing population of public school students would be helpful to determine whether the proposal fully meets the requirements of this priority.

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

Priority not addressed by applicant.

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

Priority not addressed by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/03/2010 7:50 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/02/2010 10:19 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

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 15 Points)	15	7
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	_____
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	5
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	7
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	5
7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	4
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address	1	0

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	105	29

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #3:

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

(1): The applicant presents a clear need to better prepare students for college readiness by restructuring the traditional high school model by providing an Associate of Arts degree for qualifying students with a BA following in two years.

(1): The Early College high school model presented in this proposal targets all students in the identified partner schools therein prompting thinking for various populations of students as to their readiness and preparation for college. The "all students" for consideration was a particularly strong point of the proposal because its approach was inclusive and sought to identify disenfranchised high school youth.

(2): The proposal has set clear goals and strategies to achieve its anticipated goals.

Weaknesses

(1): The early college high school model has been adopted in many states.

(2):

a. The applicant did not develop steps wherein it would systematically align its priorities with its stated goals for students.

b. The explicit strategies listed did not take into consideration how partnering states and high schools could sustain the number of courses and achieve an Associated Degree to meet the goals and objectives listed. The ability of the applicant to achieve its goals does not appear to be realistic based on the design proposed.

Reader's Score: 7

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important 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.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(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

(1): The applicant has a good history of collaborating with multiple states

with programs related to the goals of the application.

2(b): Pages 29 and 30 discuss a demonstrated track record for both low and high achieving high school students. The Bard Institute of Writing offers courses to over 800 teachers in over 16 states.

Weaknesses

(1): The applicant's experience and performance related to expanding Early College to proposed national levels was not fully developed.

(2b): The applicant did not provide sufficient data regarding how student achievement was impacted nor the percentage of students fully participating in the initiative. In addition, Bard's four-year high school graduation rate is 92% compared with the national rate of 69% but the data do not list the number of students starting the program and completing. Nor is there good overall data that describe overall improved student achievement within the partnering high schools or how this effort has increased teacher retention and involvement in the model.

Reader's Score: 5

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.

(3) 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.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

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

(6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(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 proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

(1): The applicant specifies that the number of students served by the end of year five will be 75,000 to 100,000 at a per student cost of \$630.

(2): The applicant's capacity was presented and evidence of state partnerships was documented.

(4): The proposal includes a cost per-student for bringing the project to scale for one million students and a step by step approach to promoting early college as a key component of a national strategy to reform public education in America (page e43).

Weaknesses

(2): The Project Director is proposed at a part-time level and the overall program responsibilities are assigned to the Provost of Bard College. Full scale-up would be challenging without a full time person assigned to the scale-up of the proposed early college network that will initially cover four states.

(3): The proposed initiative does not provide suggested steps to influence rethinking high school design nationally. The proposal assumes an early college high school model which is an excellent approach but the nature of "college readiness" and a deep approach to that end was not defined.

(5): There was not a description or plan provided in the application that defined mechanisms by which the model would be broadly disseminated to support model replication.

Reader's Score: 7

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

(1): The narrative on page e44 describes Bard's commitment to early college.

(2): The applicant will provide a network of contacts with foundations and corporations. Additionally, the \$630 per-student cost supports the incorporation of the project into the ongoing work of the applicant and any partners at the end of the Scale-Up grant.

Weaknesses

(1): Incorporating state agencies and LEAs in sustainability is both an asset and a weakness. There are so many variables that influence a state's ability to commit long term to such agreements, and such commitments are easily deterred with new leadership or changes in local and state administrations. The proposal does not address these variables.

(2): The proposal does not fully describe the long term impact on sustainability of early college on the institutions of higher education working within the partnership. The long term costs of students taking the first two years of early college for little or no cost was not adequately addressed.

Reader's Score: 5

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

(1): The management plan and the range of proposed positions present a tiered approach to meeting the proposed timelines and tasks at the college, state and regional levels.

(2): As provost, the Project Director will carry the influence necessary to

inspire the level of commitment at the college level and will be influential at the state and local level as well.

(3): The independent evaluation will be directed by Dr. Alan Simon, Vice President of Metis Associates.

Weaknesses

(1)The Project Director will serve part-time and there is no description of what role will be played with state, local, and regional efforts to impact high school redesign efforts with the proposed regional positions (p.e47)that will support long term sustainability and scalability. The time commitment of the Project Director may present a challenge to maintaining the necessary levels of communication across the partners at various levels.

(2): The proposed project director has many responsibilities and an initiative of this magnitude will require a full time person at least until the four regional directors are employed.

(3): There was limited information included in the application regarding the overall credentials of Metis Associates regarding their capacity to evaluate a project of Scale-Up proportions.

Reader's Score: 4

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 was not addressed by the applicant.

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 proposal addresses the area of preparedness and expectations related to early college and a four year degree.

The strategy applied is not brand new but certainly is an excellent approach toward inspiring and preparing students for an early college experience that results in a four year degree.

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 was not addressed by the applicant.

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

Priority was not addressed by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2010 10:19 AM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 07/06/2010 11:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

Reader #4:

	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 15 Points)	15	_____
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	8
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	13
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	_____
7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	_____
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	_____
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address	1	_____

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	_____
TOTAL	105	21

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #4:

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important 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.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

The applicant cited well over 20 various research studies, state and national reports, and other publications that provided findings and statistics and were used for comparing the population and the need the proposal is addressing (Absolute priorities 3 and 6). These studies, although not all research studies that meet the most rigorous criteria for strength, present a coherent, longitudinal, and compelling support for the proposed program and the success of the current program and similar programs in various regions of the country.

The reported studies represent comparisons with state and national data bases which support the generalizability of the project and the evaluation study. Although the growth of early college high schools nationally has been rapid in recent years (almost 200 in 8 years), it still remains an innovative

program with much promise for student achievement among minority groups students, which the presented studies indicated were the group of students that improved the most in these early college high school settings.

The studies and reports indicated greater increases for those students in Early College schools on traditional academic measures such as graduation rate, dropout rates, state tests, number of college credits earned, etc.

Weaknesses

The research that is presented in Section B is comprehensive and addresses a diverse population of students and a number of geographical regions as well as national samples and populations. However, the data do not present measures of probability for the research studies included in the application and, more importantly, no measures of effect size are included for any of the research presented based on What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards. None of the studies represent an experimental or quasi-experimental design. They are all descriptive in nature. Even when comparisons are made to other high schools no data regarding the sample size, statistical analysis, or statistical significance levels that may have been reached are presented. Although the section is comprehensive it represents a strong review of the literature as opposed to strong evidence that indicates that replicating the Bard Early High School will produce statistically significant results of the magnitude that would decrease drop out rate, academic achievement or close the achievement gap.

Reader's Score: 8

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(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

Weaknesses

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.

(3) 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.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

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

(6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.

Strengths

The proposed evaluation will use an experimental design with random assignment of students to the treatment (enrollment in the BECHS). The students who will not be assigned to the treatment group would not be receiving the treatment due to lack of slots for admission to the ECHS based on a random lottery admissions process. The design has built into in a

process with the cooperating schools to follow those students who have not been selected. The proposal discussed and proposed possible solutions (statistical and procedural) (page 35-36) to threats to internal and external validity.

Other components of the evaluation plan will utilize longitudinal tracking of students to examine traditional achievement measures by creating a data base for both control and treatment groups. The evaluation will track each school that joins the project annually as it scales up to 75,000 students over the duration of the grant.

The evaluation plan includes a formative component for providing feedback to the project staff regarding program performance based on questions that address both implementation and outcomes (page 37). The questions address challenges, differences in implementation designs, the core implementation elements, staff satisfaction and input, and differences between new and existing schools (pages 37-38). The traditional evaluation activities of observations, interviews, focus groups and document review will be conducted to develop responses and findings for the implementation questions. The feedback and findings will assist in identifying successful components for program implementation and components that should be avoided or eliminated (page 40).

The outcomes questions will be addressed by implementing the experimental design regarding student achievement and determining any differences based on the various implementation designs. To correct for any initial differences between the treatment and control groups, researchers will apply sophisticated statistical analyses such as HLM to ensure equivalent groups. Other multivariate analysis will be applied to eliminate threats to validity and to control for the clustering effect and multiple covariates. These analyses will also be used to compute effect sizes to determine the practical importance of the evaluation findings, which is a major WWC criteria for ensuring that a study represents strong evidence (page 39).

Collectively the proposed evaluation will provide solid information for scaling up this project at various sites, regions and states and will provide evidence of impact on at-risk students, minority students and students from low-socio-economic households.

Weaknesses

Although implied (pages 37-39), there is little detailed discussion about the processes for providing continuous feedback for program modification as the program progresses through the scale-up process.

Reader's Score: 13

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(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 proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the

project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

Weaknesses

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

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

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

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

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

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in

this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2010 11:57 AM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 07/03/2010 6:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

Reader #5:

	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 15 Points)	15	8
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	_____
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	8
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	8
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	5
7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	5
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address	1	1

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0
TOTAL	105	35

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #5:

Applicant: Bard College -- Bard College at Simon's Rock, - Bard College at Simon's Rock, (U396A100008)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

The Bard College proposal is to expand a current effort that is working with students at the high school level around improved student achievement and college readiness. The proposal is designed to scale up this effort into a multi-state program for large numbers of students.

The proposal is strong some areas, including experience of the eligible applicant. The areas of weakness include sustainability and aspects of the management plan.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 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 actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

The proposed project focuses on Absolute Priority Three: innovations that complement the implementation of high standards and quality assessments. In addition, the proposal focuses on Competitive Priority 6-College Access and Success. The need for such an effort is well laid out, backed up by numerous research studies, and supported historically and in recent efforts led by the Gates Foundation and the National Governor's Association.

This project, based on past performance, appears to offer a reasonable and innovative approach related to the priorities of the proposal.

Weaknesses

The proposed goals, objective and outcomes are not explicit and needs further clarification around implementation issues.

The strength of the exceptionality of this approach is in question as well-while the current effort appears to be very successful, the extent of the Early College High School as a long-term exceptional strategy appears to be limited.

Reader's Score: 8

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the 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 is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important 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.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 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 large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(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 experience of the applicant in implementing large, complex projects is a strength, given the past performance, level of growth, and multi-state involvement generating positive outcomes. The nonprofit has demonstrated significant improvements in student outcomes, including achievement, college readiness and success, reduced drop outs, and other positive outcomes for students.

Weaknesses

The nonprofit's impact in improving student outcomes, (including achievement, college readiness and success, reduced drop outs, and other positive outcomes for students) appears to be mixed. These results are not significant improvements for all subgroups.

Reader's Score: 8

4. 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 will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.**
- (2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.**
- (3) 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.**
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.**
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**
- (6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, 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 bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(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 proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, 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, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

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

Strengths

A total of 500 new students will initially be served, with the total by year five of the grant to reach 75,000-100,000.

The applicant's demonstrated success in managing multi-state efforts has been well documented based on a research and evaluation strategy that has allowed the applicant to take this effort from a two-school model to a multi-state effort. Throughout the previous work, student outcomes have continued to be extremely positive.

The proposed costs are outlined in the budget and appear to be reasonable for the complexity of scale-up project and the number of students being served. Personnel costs may need to be carefully reviewed, but overall the

costs appear reasonable. The cost per student of \$630 appears to be reasonable.

Weaknesses

Dissemination information is limited, and thus it is difficult to assess the dissemination strategy in specific detail. More information is needed to adequately determine the strength of dissemination strategies.

The proposal does not address the cost for reaching 500,000 or 1,000,000 students.

The personnel discussed in the proposal appear to have excellent resumes, but the role of many of these individuals (eg Provost) are questionable, in terms of project management and implementation on a large scale.

Reader's Score: 8

6. 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 to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(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 Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

The strategies to be employed to achieve sustainability include partnering with the private and foundation sectors, and the University is committed to the effort.

Weaknesses

The proposal states that sustainability will largely be related to SEA and LEA commitment. This is a vague commitment that raises questions about

sustainability. Strategies such as a network of contacts, foundations and corporations are vague and demonstrate no concrete commitment to sustainability.
Little is discussed in the proposal regarding planning for the end of the grant cycle, thus raising further questions of sustainability.

Reader's Score: 5

7. 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, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

The project plan focuses on the qualifications of key staff. An Advisory Board to guide the design and implementation is also mentioned.

Weaknesses

There does not appear to be a specific management plan presented in this section of the grant proposal; details are limited.

Reader's Score: 5

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 by this applicant.

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 proposal addresses student preparedness and expectations related to college attendance.

Weaknesses

The proposal does not address requirement(c) of this priority (providing support from peers and knowledgeable adults).

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

The proposal addresses the needs of special education students.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

This was not a priority the applicant chose to target.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/03/2010 6:11 PM