

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - 84.411B Panel - 6: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U411B110116)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(3) 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.

Note Linking Magnitude of Effect to Presented Evidence: The Secretary notes that the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project is relevant to addressing the third factor of Selection Criterion A and, therefore, will be considered by the Secretary in evaluating the importance and/or magnitude of the impact expected to be obtained by the proposed project.

Strengths:

n/a -scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a -scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

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

Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both

(a) To assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and
(b) To understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Validation grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

(5) 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 Validation grant.

Strengths:

n/a -scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a -scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or a well designed quasi-experimental study.

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

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

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

Note: We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers.

Strengths:

The application identifies specific, measurable objectives that address all components of the proposal. The language of the questions lend themselves to quantitative and qualitative measurement.

The number of participant schools and students is adequate to account for possible attrition and to address the complications of type 2 error.

The instruments and methods identified for use in the proposed project appear to address each of the identified questions. The discussion of specific analysis and purpose for each strongly supports the appropriate use each instrument and method.

The quasi-experimental design for years 3-5 builds on measures identified in years 1-2. The data gathered through the instruments will address all of the key elements of the proposal.

The mixed-methods design is divided into two phases demonstrates a commitment to effective implementation and follow-through. By focusing efforts in the first two years to formatively address the process, the final phase will be more likely to produce a stronger effect.

The clarity of the instruments, measures, and goals will allow others to easily replicate future research and study.

The proposed budget for the evaluation should ensure that [REDACTED] et al will be able to address the key components of the grant.

Weaknesses:

The project discusses the use of formative evaluation measures to gauge the effectiveness of the program but there is no discussion of what those would look like and how they would be used. It would be helpful to have these measures identified and indicate how they would be tied to the evaluation of the project.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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 complex projects.

(3) 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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

n/a -scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a -scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one 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:

Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one 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:

Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one 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:

Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing,

implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/13/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - 84.411B Panel - 6: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U411B110116)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(3) 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.

Note Linking Magnitude of Effect to Presented Evidence: The Secretary notes that the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project is relevant to addressing the third factor of Selection Criterion A and, therefore, will be considered by the Secretary in evaluating the importance and/or magnitude of the impact expected to be obtained by the proposed project.

Strengths:

The magnitude of the need for this project is well described through the proposal's description of the declining ability of students in our nation to maintain a global role due to declining student achievement. This declination has created a large number of students who are not prepared for post-secondary colleges or STEM related careers (p. 5). Due to the challenges of adopting the Common Core (i.e. how mathematics is taught and expectations for student learning), the applicant is faced with the need to change assessments, curriculum materials, professional development programs, and teacher evaluation systems (p. 6). The applicant serves the Nation's largest and one of the most diverse districts in the Nation, NYC. The achievement gap is remaining steadfast at 30 to 40 percentage points lower for students from the African-American and Hispanic populations when compared to their white classmates (p. 7). The project proposes the following approaches for addressing the magnitude of need: a summer professional development followed by weekly training in math instruction, inquiry teams which analyze student data to identify student needs, formative assessment lessons, and student self-reflection of work, gap analysis, and ongoing modifications (pp.8-9). The project will be taking standards beyond a list and implementing them into classroom practices that will enhance student achievement. Ultimately, the project proposes support in mathematics instruction to 30 high-need

NYC schools over a five-year grant period.

Local and National assessment data justifies the need for developing math skills for both teachers and students in order to strengthen the K-12 connection with higher education opportunities which lead to STEM careers for students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) 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, and

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

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

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

Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both

(a) To assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and

(b) To understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Validation grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

(5) 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 Validation grant.

Strengths:

The project design allows for a gradual progression into project implementation by taking on ten schools per year while gathering formative assessment data to strengthen the project along the way. The project's design is further strengthened by a leadership component to create and sustain the conditions for supporting continuous improvement throughout the life cycle of the grant. The goals/objectives as outlined on pp.10-11 provide reasonable activities that are supported through leadership participation, student goals that are set at attainable levels (75-90%) and through the development of a Dissemination & Knowledge Management Center. The grant also proposes the development of city and state networks of schools to a total of 60 networks (p. 11).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (1) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or a well designed quasi-experimental study.**
 - (2) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
 - (3) **The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.**
 - (4) **The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Note: We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers.

Strengths:

Scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

Scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (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 complex projects.**
 - (3) **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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.**

Strengths:

New Visions for Public schools has a rich history of successfully leading initiatives to improve educational opportunities and student achievement through a variety of projects including, Small Schools Creation, Inquiry Teams and the Scaffolded Apprenticeship Model, Urban Teacher Residency, School Support Structures and

Innovation Laboratory (pp. 16-17). The applicant has proposed the assembly of a distinguished National Advisory Committee that will critically review the instructional strategies and processes implemented through this project. This committee is representative of educators from various disciplines across the US, with each member committed to high expectations in teaching and in mathematics instructional practices (p. 23). Key factors are in place to take this project to scale and to maintain sustainability including, financial resources, partnerships and grant funding from the Gates Foundation and other philanthropies. The project will be managed and staffed by instructional specialists, leadership development facilitators, professional development facilitators, a project coordinator, a senior advisor, an assessment specialist, and a teaching residency (pp. 27-28).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one 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:

Not scored.

Weaknesses:

Not scored.

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one 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 proposed project addresses Competitive Preference Priority 7: College Access and Success through a project that is designed to assist high school students to become college bound through the Accessing Algebra through Inquiry program that purports to maximize student and teacher mathematics learning in 30 high-need secondary schools through teacher-led inquiry teams that are supported by intensive training and ongoing targeted professional development. The project proposes the utilization of research-based assessments and carefully designed and learner-responsive formative assessment lessons to ensure that students have the opportunity to learn the kind of mathematics they will need to succeed in higher education and in a more demanding work environment. Classroom instruction will be improved through teacher collaboration about the academic progress of students. The program is built upon the expertise around teacher inquiry as a means for school improvement coupled with assessment and focused planning that leads to refined instructional practices (pp. 1-2).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one 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:

Not scored.

Weaknesses:

Not scored.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Not scored.

Weaknesses:

Not scored.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Not scored.

Weaknesses:

Not scored.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/13/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - 84.411B Panel - 6: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U411B110116)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(3) 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.

Note Linking Magnitude of Effect to Presented Evidence: The Secretary notes that the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project is relevant to addressing the third factor of Selection Criterion A and, therefore, will be considered by the Secretary in evaluating the importance and/or magnitude of the impact expected to be obtained by the proposed project.

Strengths:

The inquiry approach to instruction provides a real world basis for students to understand mathematics and develop ownership of the learning process.

Learning teams as an instructional model have demonstrated their ability to help youngsters while they increase professional collaboration and change the culture of a school (Pg.3). They provide to teachers a forum to discuss formative teaching strategies inquiry learning design and improved assessment strategies.

The project focus will increase teacher understanding of math instruction by providing formative and summative assessment tools and STEM instructional resources, bringing them in line with common core standards and practice.

WEAKNESSES:

The project's focus is only on high school math and doesn't address, middle school articulation how school culture is changed or impacted on a larger basis.

Weaknesses:

The proposal speaks to broader application of inquiry learning techniques and learning teams as an instructional model for success but only addresses their application in Algebra and Geometry.

Reader's Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

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

Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both

(a) To assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and
(b) To understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Validation grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

(5) 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 Validation grant.

Strengths:

The project provides for intensive staff support and training for both teachers and administrators. Summer workshops focus on inquiry math activities and coaches/support systems are in place to augment teacher effectiveness.

The timeline ensures success and provides for capacity building of participants to insure long term success.

Video Media is used to demonstrate successful learning/inquiry team meetings and provide to new teams, strategies for conducting meaningful inquiry team sessions. In addition video media provides for the opportunity to review sessions and identify ways to improve team meetings in a real time environment.

The SVMl curriculum is complete and has a track record of success using both formative and summative assessment tools. Support materials are available to enhance teacher effectiveness and understanding of the inquiry process as well as the concepts of algebra and geometry.

Workshops and seminars are designed to focus on instructional deliver of formative assessment lessons using inquiry-learning techniques, understanding and aligning outcomes to state outcomes and developing/supporting school based learning inquiry teams.

Weaknesses:

The project is intensive and only reaches 30 schools. Coaches, trainers and support systems built into the model provide for the development of quality inquiry based math instruction however the project does not speak to building the capacity of participants to take over these roles at the end of the grant cycle in order to sustain the program after the project

Reader's Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or a well designed quasi-experimental study.

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

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

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

Note: We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers.

Strengths:

Scored by another

Weaknesses:

Scored by another

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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 complex projects.

(3) 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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

New Visions is an experienced organization and has rich history of program implementation. They have established clearly defined responsibilities and a variety of tools available to them to that support project activities including peer coaches, online professional development, and summer institutes (Pg. 23).

The project team and its partners represent a wide array of players in the education hierarchy. Their expertise helps to insure that tools are available for student and teacher success.

The project staffs are highly qualified math instructors and have training as well as outreach expertise.

The management plan is complete and quality resources are available to ensure success in adopting schools.

Creating a virtual resource center will provide broad-based dissemination of materials and allow access to quality learning materials.

Weaknesses:

The model for replication and expansion and a to larger population is people intensive and requires new resource identification. Expanding the resources of the virtual resource center proposed in the grant and testing a model of technology use for broader program replication would have strengthened the expansion process as well as better supported the ongoing program (Pg. 25).

Reader's Score: 24

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one 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:

Not Scored

Weaknesses:

Not Scored

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one 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:

By using inquiry-based teaching, the proposed project expands student thinking while also providing basic higher math skills to students preparing them for the world of work, college access, and success. Online teaching resources matched to student needs encourage higher order thinking strategies while providing hands-on experience for students using tools that will be required at the college level.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one 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:

Not Scored

Weaknesses:

Not Scored

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Not Scored

Weaknesses:

Not Scored

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Not Scored

Weaknesses:

Not Scored

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/14/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - 84.411B Panel - 6: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U411B110116)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(3) 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.

Note Linking Magnitude of Effect to Presented Evidence: The Secretary notes that the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project is relevant to addressing the third factor of Selection Criterion A and, therefore, will be considered by the Secretary in evaluating the importance and/or magnitude of the impact expected to be obtained by the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant articulates the need to address underachievement in mathematics education among minority group members in high schools in New York City. The New York City Department of Education and the Silicon Valley Mathematics Initiative have partnered to develop a pilot program that will improve student achievement in mathematics as they implement the new mathematics Common Core Standards. According to the applicant, the current graduation rate in New York City Public Schools is around 60%, despite varied and extensive reform efforts (page e17). The largest achievement gap for students is in the area of mathematics. This project's approach to addressing this deficiency by implementing a program in which all minority students will enroll in inquiry-based instruction focused on preparing them to enroll in Algebra I and Geometry in the ninth and tenth grades is innovative and will be very interesting to follow. Increasing the number of minority students in advanced math classes has been a goal of many organizations for many years. The success of such programs have been good, therefore there is great potential for this project to yield significant results.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

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

Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both

(a) To assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and
(b) To understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Validation grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

(5) 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 Validation grant.

Strengths:

The applicant's design for the project includes a comprehensive approach to using evidence-based assessments and lessons correlated to the Common Core standards. The teachers in the project will receive professional development in developing and implementing new Common Core Standards lessons to improve their effectiveness in the classroom. The applicant plans to hire math Instructional Specialists to work with teams of teachers to help them become comfortable with the math to be taught as well as learn new strategies for classroom instruction. Development facilitators, data specialists, and community engagement teams will work with building principals to ensure successful implementation. This comprehensive approach of supporting instruction with specialists and involving the community in the process is impressive and should help build a culture of expectations that should last beyond the scope of the round of funding. Successful implementation of the program will be determined by a change in how students are scheduled for classes, an increase in enrollment of the targeted students in upper level math courses, and a change in students' attitudes concerning attending college and having career success beyond high school.

Weaknesses:

Usually planning for advanced math courses occur in the middle grades with students completing pre-requisite courses and testing into advanced math. This proposal does not discuss in detail how these students are being prepared for these advanced classes prior to high school.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or a well designed quasi-experimental study.
 - (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
 - (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.
 - (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers.

Strengths:

Scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

Scored by another reviewer.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (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 complex projects.
 - (3) 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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

The applicant has an extensive background in writing grants and receiving funding for various types of educational programs. The applicant's track record for successfully implementing grants and getting results is evidenced by their success in working with small schools and developing an inquiry-based Scaffold Apprenticeship Model for training principals (page 16). The plan for providing staff development for teachers by implementing a coaching model should prove effective. In many instances, teachers are asked to perform a new instructional technique and are left on their own to figure it out. By having a coaching mentor, teachers can get instant feedback on their delivery and/or implementation. Additional follow up training (if necessary)

could take place during non-student days so that the teachers can provide feedback to one another. The plan also covers all of the financial and human resources responsibilities such as hiring employees and providing training for those in key positions. A timeline for implementing the project is included showing the three major phases of implementation. This plan does a good job of detailing responsibilities and milestones for success.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant has assembled an impressive grant proposal, the costs associated with the project make it very expensive. The applicant plans to hire approximately 25 individuals to implement and administer the project. This is a large number of people to employ to work with on a project of this size and duration.

Reader's Score: 24

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one 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:

Not scored.

Weaknesses:

Not scored.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)

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

(a) address students preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students' from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

The applicant has an innovative and impressive program for preparing students for college and career success. The project's intent to increase the number of students matriculating to college by enrolling more of them in advanced math classes has the potential to be successful. The project plans to target an equal number of male and female students and through the implementation of the common core standards movement, students will see dramatic change in the manner in which instruction is delivered in their schools. These changes should yield significant results in preparing targeted students for college and successful careers later in life.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one 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:

Not scored.

Weaknesses:

Not scored.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Not scored.

Weaknesses:

Not scored.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Not scored.

Weaknesses:

Not scored

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/14/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - 84.411B Panel - 6: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: New Visions for Public Schools, Inc. (U411B110116)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(3) 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.

Note Linking Magnitude of Effect to Presented Evidence: The Secretary notes that the extent to which the proposed project is consistent with the research evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project is relevant to addressing the third factor of Selection Criterion A and, therefore, will be considered by the Secretary in evaluating the importance and/or magnitude of the impact expected to be obtained by the proposed project.

Strengths:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

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

Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both

(a) To assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and
(b) To understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Validation grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

(5) 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 Validation grant.

Strengths:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or a well designed quasi-experimental study.

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

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

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

Note: We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers.

Strengths:

The external evaluator has been identified. The evaluation plan includes measures to determine the impact of the A(2)I program on teacher attitudes toward teaching mathematics, their content knowledge and frequency of assessment, and their use of learner-centered teaching practices. These plans were guided by a series of five focused research questions on page 18 (e36). The plan uses a two-phase approach, with an Implementation Study phase designed to develop valid indices to evaluate the implementation of the project and the Quasi-Experimental Study phase design to evaluate the A(2)I program. The two phases are based on published research models (theory-of-change and outcomes-based models) to establish what is impacted by changing the school culture to be inquiry-based. The Implementation Study will use an established process for identifying "critical components" of the program and a series of data collection tools followed by an appropriate data analysis method. These tools include observation protocols, interviews and focus groups, teacher and student surveys and measures of students learning to obtain a broad assessment of the impacts of the project activities. The data collection tools are either based on or use existing instruments (e.g., MQI and MTEBI). Objectives 3 and 5 are partially addressed by the Algebra I and II Regents scores collected during the Quasi-Experimental Study. The data collection tools from the Implementation Study will continue to be used during the Experimental Study.

Weaknesses:

On page 10 (e28), the applicant lists six project objectives, several of which are not directly addressed by the evaluation plan. In particular, the plan does not include measures to determine if all principals in the A(2)I schools incorporate the effective use of inquiry and algebra formative assessment lessons into teacher evaluation, and it does not include activities to address if 90% of the schools involved will use what they have learned about formative assessments and inquiry into work in other departments or academic areas. Although several of the questions identified on page 18(e36) directly relate to teacher performance, the evaluation plan does not investigate the impact of using teachers' use of inquiry and algebra formative assessments as part of teacher evaluations. The teacher and student surveys to be used in the Implementation Study will explore "capacity" among inquiry team members, etc. but it is not clear what "capacity" refers to.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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 complex projects.

(3) 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 State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one 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:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)

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

(a) address students preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students' from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)

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

Strengths:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

n/a scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/14/11 12:00 AM