

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 07/02/2010 11:58 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

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	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	1
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	1
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	2
7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	1
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	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With	1	_____

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 13

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #1:

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

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

This applicant's plan to implement and test an extended learning time model of intervention for high need students is seemingly in alignment with best practice for this school transformation strategy. (p. 12)

The unmet need (i.e., programs that support increased college readiness and persistence among low-income, high need students) is well documented on page 4 and the program model described by the applicant to address it is exceptional in its alignment of in-school and out-of-school time program elements.

The fact that the enrichment activities to be delivered by Big Buddy are aligned to the core curriculum for the district schools is a positive element.

In addition, the range of enrichment is good, covering the arts, athletics, college readiness, life skills, and social/emotional skills.

Weaknesses

Insufficient information is provided on page 7-9 to determine if the proposed project has the right elements to meet its goals and objective. For instance, the applicant does not provide enough detail to be sure the type of professional development being provided is likely to result in more engaging and effective instruction. There is insufficient discussion as to how formative and summative data will be incorporated into cluster/grade group planning and reflection.

There is not much discussion of project-based learning approaches and strategies for supporting teachers in developing their skills in this area.

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

Limited information is provided on the experience of the applicant and its

partners.

Weaknesses

Insufficient evidence is presented on the experiences of Big Buddy or its partner, Advance Baton Rouge (ABR), to date in implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects. ABR only has 5 schools that are significantly under-enrolled (e.g., 50%, p. 28). Big Buddy only serves 5000 students in small metropolitan region (i.e., Baton Rouge).

The evidence provided that Big Buddy has achieved positive impacts on students through similar programs is insufficient to determine if the applicant has significantly improved student achievement in the past. ABR has only been in running the schools for one year and very limited evidence (p. 18) of their impact is provided.

Reader's Score: 1

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 cost estimates for this project, and to scale it, for the youth development portion are within acceptable ranges for per student costs for youth development programs and fairly low for school-based interventions. High touch, year-round youth development programs typically cost around \$3,000 per student, so the \$1,795 start-up cost estimate and the even lower figures for years 2-5 provided by the applicant seem reasonable.

Weaknesses

Insufficient evidence of capacity is provided to support scale-up at a state, regional or national level.

The feasibility of the project being replicable based on the knowledge and capacity built via this grant is unlikely because the proposed project is too small and the applicant and its partner lack sufficient prior experience with state-level work.

The mechanisms discussed for dissemination on page 27 are weak (e.g., newsletters, conference presentations, informal sessions, journals) in their intensity and do not account for the technical assistance that other locations would need to bring up similar programs with fidelity.

The costs described for this program do not include district costs for the extended day and year. No discussion of how these will be covered (and sustained) is provided.

The cost estimates to scale this program to 100,000, 500,000, and 1,000,000 are not in alignment with the per pupil costs provided (i.e., the math appears off by a factor of 1000).

Reader's Score: 1

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 plan to sustain this project using 21st Century funds is plausible given the applicants positive track record in securing these grants, provided that grant program is continued.

The applicant provides some information regarding how the project purposes and activities will be incorporated into its service delivery model (p. 29).

Weaknesses

Since this project has no track record per se and all the positions for this project at Big Buddy are covered by the grant, it is unclear if the partner organization or Big Buddy will continue the project beyond the grant period if the 21st Century grant funds do not come through. No multi-year financial and operating model or plan is provided for after Year 5.

It is unclear if the teacher professional development provided during the i3 grant period would be sufficient to sustain the school-based aspects of this program.

Reader's Score: 2

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 application provided limited information on the management plan and the qualifications of the project director, key personnel, and the evaluator.

Weaknesses

The program director's resume does not demonstrate experience implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

Insufficient evidence is provided to demonstrate that the personnel assigned to this project will have the appropriate experience because too many of the key positions for the project are unfilled and therefore lack resumes.

Insufficient detail is provided to assess the adequacy of the management plan. The timeline lacks sufficient detail.

It is not clear from the information provided that the evaluator has experience in conducting large-scale experimental studies or deep experience with education research relevant to this proposed program's focus.

Reader's Score: 1

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

No strengths found.

Weaknesses

Scale of proposed project is too small and insufficient evidence of applicant's success to date in achieving significant impact for students in the area of college readiness.

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

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: 07/02/2010 11:58 AM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 07/06/2010 10:51 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

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	_____
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	5
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	6
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 the Unique Learning Needs of Students With	1	_____

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 11

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #2:

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

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

Discussion is provided of some research related to increased learning time (Proposal p. e10 and e11) and extended school year (Proposal e11 and e12).

Proposal indicates that there would be an expectation of at least moderate effects (Proposal p. e13) and that prior Big Buddy programs have had positive impact on test scores.

Weaknesses

Proposal indicates that high quality research to support proposed innovations is not available (Proposal p. e3).

There is a lack of detail in discussion of research. It is not clear that the research summarized relates directly to the proposed treatment proposed by Big Buddy Program. (Factor 1).

Discussion of the Mass 2010 student performance gains does not directly link to the extended day with tutoring proposed by the Big Buddy program.

The discussion of research in the proposal is not sufficient to find the high internal and high external validity needed as a justification for the step-up grant.

Strong evidence is not detailed in the proposal that would support the impact of the ELA, Math, Arts instruction, summer program, or tutoring. Individual tutoring is mentioned but not detailed in the proposal or in the research review.

There is no specific discussion of potential effect size in prior research to support the claim that at least moderate effects would be expected.

There needs to be stronger evidence (Factor 1) and additional evidence (Factor 2).

Reader's Score: 5

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 Policy & Research Group (PRG) identified as the independent evaluator has had prior experience in the evaluation for supplemental education programs and with the Big Buddy Program after school tutoring programs.

Program evaluation will use standardized test scores to compare growth over time between participating and non-participating students.

A phased implementation is planned with implementation taking place in two schools during the first year of the project (one elementary and one middle) and the remaining two schools in the second year of the project.

Programmatic effects will be estimated based on a regression model that

predicts post-program academic and engagement outcomes with a number of control variables. Long term evaluation will be based on a time series design based on observation of student academic performance each year before and after program exposure. HLM will be based on nested data over time within schools and classrooms. In addition, a multi-level path model will be used to examine improvement in student engagement and motivation. Control variables will include free and reduced lunch status, age, gender, race/ethnicity, and past academic performance.

Information on implementation will be collected from staff members.

It is indicated that an actual research design, instruments to be used, and detailed timeline of evaluation activities will be prepared after the grant has been funded.

Resources allocated to the evaluation appear to be adequate.

Weaknesses

The quasi-experimental time series design does not provide for the random assignment of subjects or the direct comparison of individuals who have not been exposed to elements of the proposed program. This is a weakness.

Specific cognitive assessments to be included in analysis are not discussed. Differences in assessment content across the grades may affect the validity of using simple score transformations to standardized scores as the basis for the examination of growth from grade to grade. Additional discussion is needed of the specific scores to be used and the extent to which they are appropriate as a growth measure.

Use of small groups of students that have not been randomly selected limits the value of the powerful statistical analysis proposed and the ability to draw causal conclusions from the potential findings. There is a need for a discussion of the power of the analysis and potentially confounded nature of the findings.

It is not clear how the proposed HLM model would make use of nested classroom data in the evaluation. More discussion was needed on the potential problems with numbers in the various groups. More discussion was needed of the method to be employed in this specific case.

It is not clear how the evaluation will capture the specific instructional changes and impact on individual students of the double bloc schedule and tutoring activities.

It is not clear how the evaluation would provide adequate support the scale-up nature of the grant.

Reader's Score: 6

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 10:51 AM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 07/03/2010 0:22 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

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	_____
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	3
3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)	15	_____
4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	6
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 the Unique Learning Needs of Students With	1	_____

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 9

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #3:

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

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 literature review suggests that the proposed intervention might yield some positive impact.

Weaknesses

A plausible hypothesis is sufficient for a development grant. Scale up requires strong evidence which is not provided for the efficacy of this intervention. The only empirical evidence is provided by the experience in Massachusetts which the applicant states produced minimal results ("... the program had a significant "educationally meaningful" positive effect on 5th grade standardized science test scores. No other statistically significant effects were found on other standardized test outcomes... - p13). The statement (pg 13) that "anecdotal Mass 2020 results suggest..." underscores the weakness of the available evidence.

Reader's Score: 3

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 proposal provides for a potentially rigorous evaluation which is independent and adequately funded. The use of standardized LEAP scores is a strength. Intends to employ a well designed HLM and multipath analysis methodology in this quasi-experimental longitudinal study.

Weaknesses

There is no indication of sample sizes or time frames for the evaluation. There is an inadequate explanation of how non-participant comparison groups will be selected. Will there be any students who never receive the intervention in addition to the use of phased in intervention as a control? The plan for "high quality implementation data and performance feedback" (pg 24) is very sketchy and undeveloped. A number of measures/surveys are proposed to be developed for this evaluation but there is no indication that there will be an assessment of the psychometric quality of the instruments. The measure of self reported student college preparedness is problematic - how will middle school and high school students know how well prepared they are for college? A prioritization of objectives which define success would be helpful. For example, if student engagement increases but academic indicators don't improve would the intervention be considered a success?

Reader's Score: 6

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: 07/03/2010 0:22 AM

Status: Submitted
 Last Updated: 07/07/2010 11:22 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

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	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	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	1
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With	1	0

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	34

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #4:

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

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 Increased Learning Time Model (ILTM), presented in this application, is innovative because it moves beyond the traditional voluntary, add-on after-school time program and seeks to lengthen and restructure the entire school day for all students enrolled in the four schools. With 1.5 more hours per day and five additional weeks in the summer, time spent in instruction in core academic subjects can be increased, arts, recreation, health, and counseling programs can be part of the school day, and teacher planning and collaboration can be job-embedded.

Another innovative approach is the sharing of responsibilities for the organization of the program by the charter public schools involved and the community-based organization, Big Buddy. As a result, the most highly trained professionals, teachers, have responsibility for instruction and specialists from the community-based organization bring their expertise to the work of providing enrichment activities.

The inclusion of field trips to colleges and universities, workshops for students and families on financial aid resources available for higher education, and mentoring by adults, as part of the program in the two middle schools in the project, responds to an unmet need to increase college enrollment and completion for students in high poverty and/or high minority communities and schools.

Weaknesses

While the applicant provided clear goals and objectives and included indicators of success as achievable targets for each objective, the approaches and actions leading to the accomplishment of the goals are not well-described. For example, given the information provided in the application, it is difficult to find a credible connection between some project activities, such as, increased teacher planning time and the Teacher Advancement Program, and the goals the applicant is seeking to achieve without more explicit detail. The application would be enhanced by a fuller description of the content and activities teachers will engage in to improve their content knowledge, pedagogy, and repertoire of strategies to reach all learners in their classrooms and the methods the agency will use to insure teachers receive the training.

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

The applicant has an extensive 30-year history of providing out-of-school time services to schools and possesses past experience in providing leadership for complex, large, rapidly growing projects. For example, the agency has provided programming in 32 schools, has sole responsibility for administering after-school programs at nine sites, and implements specific programs in 15 others. In addition, the agency has managed multi-year, multi-source budgets of over \$1.5 million annually.

Weaknesses

The applicant does not provide evidence that it significantly improved student outcomes for achievement, attainment, and retention. Some evidence is presented that a partner non-profit organization, ADVANCE Baton Rouge (ABR), the charter management organization for the four schools in the project, has seen improved academic outcomes in the four schools. However, since ABR is just beginning its work in the four schools, this information is not compelling and does not strongly demonstrate significant progress.

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

The program will serve 309 students in Year 1 and increase enrollment to 1,934 students by Year 5. The cost per student has been estimated at \$1,795 per student in Year 1 decreasing to \$777 by Year 5. These cost estimates are borne out in the budget calculations and seem reasonably related to project goals.

The applicant outlines a comprehensive set of dissemination mechanisms to provide information about the structure, practices, cost, and effectiveness of the project to a wide range of potential users. These include:

- 1) Redesign of the job description of the agency's Youth Development Resource Director to include dissemination responsibilities;
- 2) The agency's statewide network of after-school providers;
- 3) Presentations at local, statewide, and national conferences on out-of-school time programs;
- 4) The charter management organization's (ABR) network of public charter schools in the state;
- 5) Publications produced by researchers including newsletters and articles in peer-reviewed journals;
- 6) Information sessions throughout the parish.

To increase the likelihood that the project can be replicated successfully, the agency will develop materials to support and assist potential adopters of the program. These include print and online materials such as a program overview, a model handbook, a planning guide, and fidelity of implementation guidelines, requirements, and tools. The agency also indicated that program staff will be available to provide training. This effort makes project replicability more feasible.

Weaknesses

While a number of dissemination and communication strategies are outlined by the applicant, including the availability of project staff, the agency does not explicitly include direct technical assistance and follow-up services for potential adopters. As a result, dissemination efforts may be insufficient to insure fidelity of implementation and reliable results in project scale up.

The shift in the applicant's service delivery model - from delivering a wide range of services to a large number of students in many schools to providing comprehensive services to all students in a few schools - may compromise the agency's capacity to implement the project because it has far less experience in this area. Although the applicant claims that changing the delivery model will not affect the agency's performance on this project, no explanation or rationale to support this claim is provided.

Because its base of operations is in one parish in the state, it unlikely that the agency has sufficient internal capacity to enable it to go to scale at the state, regional, and national levels during the grant period or immediately following it.

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 applicant cites support from stakeholders and partners as a resource for implementing and continuing the project and indicates that one partner - the charter management organization (ABR) - will incorporate the Increased Learning Time Model in its future contracts with the state to manage other charter public schools. In addition, by establishing school-based project teams in each school, meeting weekly with the principals of each school, and directly collaborating with school faculty, the agency is attempting to build capacity for internal sustainability by school level staff.

Weaknesses

While the agency proposes to permanently shift its organizational funding stream, derived from federal, state, local and foundation grants if the Increased Learning Time Model is successful so that this project and others replicating it can be supported in the future, this is not a reliable remedy to the problem of sustainability. Federal, state, local, and foundation resources, although they can be considerable, particularly when aligned with a project and targeted for sustainability, are not a stable, dependable source of revenue. The agency needs a concrete plan to insure sustainability.

The applicant did not provide a multi-year financial plan for insuring the sustainability of the project beyond the grant period.

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 has a credible management plan that combines overall project management with local oversight at each school. A full-time project director will coordinate the project as a whole and will supervise a small, centralized team - a full-time finance/human resources manager and a full-time program/staff development coordinator - as well as a project team at each school. Each school-based project team will include two full-time project coordinators, three health and guidance instructors, shared arts instructors, and a shared arts coach.

The independent evaluator appears to have the experience to conduct large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies as outlined in this project.

Weaknesses

While the management team has a credible structure to lead the overall project and manage local needs, the applicant does not provide evidence for how efficient and effective operations will be maintained as the project expands. For example, provision for overall fiscal management will need to have more controls for such functions as grant administration and oversight,

budget reporting and monitoring, tracking and reporting on performance measures and disbursement of funds. One full-time position combining the multiple functions of finance and human resources may not be sufficient.

Although a brief description of each position is included in the narrative, no qualifications for the positions are outlined indicating the criteria upon which candidates will be selected, supervised, and held accountable for project deliverables. It is unclear, not having this information, whether candidates to be hired will have the necessary training for and experience in managing large, complex, rapidly growing projects.

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.

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 inclusion of field trips to colleges and universities, workshops for students and families on financial aid resources available for higher education, and mentoring by adults, as part of the program in the two middle schools in the project, responds to this competitive preference priority to increase students' preparedness and expectations for college, to help them understand issues of college affordability, financial aid, and the college application process, and to have the support of peers and knowledgeable adults.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/07/2010 11:22 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/08/2010 3:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

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	10
2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)	20	0
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	0
5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)	15	1
6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	1
7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	1
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 the Unique Learning Needs of Students With	1	0

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	21

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 2: 84.396A

Reader #5:

Applicant: Big Buddy Program -- , - , (U396A100053)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

The 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

Increased learning time for students in low performing schools is not widely adopted in school districts throughout the nation. The proposal provides students in low performing districts an opportunity for increased time to meet with community members who could provide positive mentoring experiences. There is need for students in low performing schools to network with mentors who can serve as positive role models and further influence students to become productive literate citizens.

The applicant has a vision for how the project should be designed. The proposal outlines a clear set of admirable goals on page e9. They are aligned with meeting the needs of students in low performing schools. Goal 2 is aligned with the priority indication of preparing students for college readiness which is also outlined in the narrative. Goal 3 seeks to increase learning time at the 4 persistently low performing schools. Goal 5 defines the increased learning time model aimed again at students in low performing schools.

Weaknesses

There is no research documented in the proposal stating the number of programs that have implemented after-school/extended programs. The only evidence cited is the belief systems of those involved in the project.

There is not clear documentation as to what the content of the instruction will be and how the instruction will be delivered during the increased instructional time periods. As a result the successful achievement of the proposed goals and outcomes is questionable.

Reader's Score: 10

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

Not assigned to score Selection Criterion B.

Weaknesses

Not assigned to score Selection Criterion B.

Reader's Score: 0

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 30 years of experience administering a wide range of in-school and out-of-school programming to students. In addition, the applicant has been recognized statewide and nationally as a model program for how to create a collaborative relationship between a school system and a community-based organization resulting in improving academic outcomes for at-risk students.

Results of a study conducted by Jenner and Jenner in 2007 found that students who participated in schools sponsored by the applicant experienced more academic growth over the school year than did similar students who did not participate.

Based upon the test results from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills students who participated in Big Buddy programs displayed positive and statistically significant effects in core academic content areas of language, reading and social studies. Impact scores were strong and statistically significant for minority students.

Weaknesses

The proposal indicates that the applicant has served 5000 students per year over a 30 year period of time. This in itself does not verify that the applicant has extensive experience with implementing large, complex and rapidly growing projects.

There is no documented evidence within the proposal that extending or increasing learning time alone has increased student achievement or closed learning gaps.

Relative to the applicant's past experience with projects, the data presented did not show annual numerical scores for groups of or individual students. Data were presented very generically with an overall statement about student scores indicating achievement growth in limited content areas such as reading. Areas of student growth such as attendance are also stated very generically rather than presenting numerical data for each of the areas that were assessed. Specific raw scores or percentage assessment results were not used in the proposal. A chart or graph with specific scores charted annually would have presented stronger support for increases in student achievement.

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

Not assigned to score Selection Criterion D.

Weaknesses

Not assigned to scores Selection Criterion D.

Reader's Score: 0

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 project states it would reach 6,711 students in 4 school settings over a five year period of time. Based upon the amount requested and the proposed activities, the project could be maintained during the proposed five year period of time.

The applicant does address using newsletters, conferences, community and charter school networks, peer journals, and networking sessions for disseminating information.

Weaknesses

Since there were only 4 schools with past experience, there is no evidence of fidelity with targeted school populations as to how to reach students for a large scale project.

Relative to dissemination of the project, there are minimal means of dissemination of information to replicate the project on a large scale. There is no plan for how to provide best practice processes and strategies to

demonstrate that dissemination of information will result in effective institution of the project with fidelity and efficiency on a large scale basis.

The applicant is requesting nearly \$6,000,000 for the project. To go beyond the five year proposal for sustaining the project to a state and/or national level at a cost of \$777 per student would amount to costs that exceed the proposal funding request.

The partner schools involve two elementary and two middle school settings in the same regional area as the proposed location. The after-school planned activities are being conducted regionally on a small scale basis. Implementing the activities with the limited budget and resources that are currently being proposed would not provide for successfully bringing the project to scale on a national or state level.

Reader's Score: 1

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 proposal states that 98% of the partner school teachers are committed to participating in the professional development component of the proposal. Professional development for teachers is a component of the project. It is important that the teachers who are stakeholders have buy-in into the project.

Weaknesses

A multi-year budget is proposed. However, there is no clear evidence that the financial and operating model will sustain success on a long-term basis.

The proposal states on page e28 that the programs are operating at 50% capacity. There is not an action plan that indicates how the applicant plans to fill the programs to 100% capacity during the grant timeline and at the end of the scale-up grant.

On page e29, the proposal mentions hiring of a high-quality workforce. There are credentials cited for identifying a workforce; but there is not a clearly defined process for how to guarantee that the workforce that is hired will be of high-quality. There is no process for evaluating and retaining a high quality staff during and beyond the span of the project. The proposal states, "we will be able to hire and maintain full-time specialized staff who will be paid to work part-time across multiple schools." The proposal does address the number full-time specialists that are needed to reach and sustain the program for the 6,711 students that the applicant hopes to reach during the 5 year life of the program - but does not provide for staff and resource costs that would be needed to sustain the activities for years beyond the life of the project.

Reader's Score: 1

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 applicant provided a detailed chart outlining the timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

The project does provide for an independent evaluator with experience for designing and conducting experimental and quasi-experimental studies of

educational initiatives.

Weaknesses

There are no clearly defined plans for accomplishing tasks related to sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

The majority of personnel that are needed for the project have not yet been hired. The proposal does not provide documented evidence that new personnel will have appropriate experience in managing large, complex and rapidly growing projects.

The \$6,000,000 that is being requested does not align with the cost of hiring and sustaining highly-qualified personnel over a five year period of time. Reaching 6,000 students at \$777 would cost nearly \$5,000,000. This does not account for unexpected expenses, economy downturns, inflation, etc.

The application did not provide the credentials for project coordinators or key personnel that would show that they have experience in conducting and managing large-scale, complex and rapidly growing projects.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference

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

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

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

Strengths

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

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

Strengths

The application listed an objective on page e9 and e19 for increasing college preparedness of middle-school program participants. On page e2 the proposal states that project practices will include "visits to local universities and colleges trips to out-of-state colleges and workshops on college searches and college applications." In addition the proposal indicates holding "financial aid workshops for students, Free Application for Federal Student Aid workshops and information sessions on the financial aspect of college attendance, and providing workshops on savings in financial products that are available to help make college affordable."

Weaknesses

The project addresses college readiness only at the middle school level. In the project narrative on page e2, the application states that "The proposed project will implement innovative practices designed to enable participants in pre-kindergarten through eighth grade to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two-or four-year college." The overall span of the project does not follow students after eighth grade. Even though financial aid workshops will be offered along with visits to colleges, there are no plans to gather data for students in grades 9-12 to assess that the strategies

implemented as part of the Big Buddy program will demonstrate that students will be ready for and/or succeed in post- secondary education institutions.

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

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

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

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

Strengths

Priority not addressed.

Weaknesses

Priority not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted**Last Updated:** 07/08/2010 3:38 PM