

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/10/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Success for All Foundation (U411C110042)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	23
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	78
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. Competitive Preference 6	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. Competitive Preference 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. Competitive Preference Pr	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. Competitive Preference 9	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 10		
Competitive Preference Priority 10		

1. Competitive Preference 10

Sub Total 1

Total 85 79

Technical Review Form

Panel #32 - 84.411C Panel - 32: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Success for All Foundation (U411C110042)

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

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

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

Strengths:

The project narrative is well written and includes an intensive focus on student data from multiple sources, and is specifically focused on data derived from the STF program components. Applicant substantiates comprehensive accountability as a framework for its case by including documentation from previous projects, strategies and practices as noted on pages 2-9. Applicant shows deference and high regard to the importance of formative and summative assessment data subject to critical and public scrutiny. Applicant presents a cogent and persuasive argument that the addition of multimedia to its already successful SFA programming will further promote content core comprehension small children. Applicant shows a significant focus on the transfer and application of validated research-oriented knowledge, proven to close technology gaps as well as gaps in other academic area. Well thought out proposal narrative with significant detail.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design to be conducted 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 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 Development 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.

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

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

Strengths:

Applicant goes into great detail explaining how the project will be developed and how it will work. Cost estimates account for differentiation between programs already using Curiosity Corner and Kinder Corner and those that do not. The electronic incorporation of professional development draws from research substantiating exposure to online classes significantly augments time management concerns. With the bulk of the funding being applied to professional development and delivery, applicant successfully argues the case that students may become more responsible for discovery and self-learning while teachers take on the role of facilitator.

Weaknesses:

Although applicant includes cost estimates in B (2), p. 12, the lack of expansion in real numbers leaves an unclear picture of actual cost to include all partners and activities. Because the proposal lacks a detailed breakdown of costs, the extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project seems to be elusive. Reviewer notes breakdown of non-federal and federal budget summaries (p. e6-7)

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 projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Applicant provides a comprehensive view of what it takes to successfully manage large, complex contracts and projects. The contributing program directors, managers and staff are a team of experts, with extensive experience in program delivery, with specialized knowledge in current educational research and implementation. Each educator vitae contributes some proven best practices to achieve superior performance results.

Applicant includes exhaustive accounting of tools and techniques to help practitioners identify, assess, and mitigate risks while maximizing the potential for positive outcomes. Applicant exhibits in-depth understanding of the contractual, financial, schedule, and technical aspects of risks when dealing with highly regulated U.S. government contracts and projects.

Weaknesses:

The timeline seems cursory and does not seem to contribute to current accountability, data driven research: to assess and assess often. Applicant denotes annual milestones as sufficiency for program monitoring (p. 19). Applicant may want to consider a more frequent, comprehensive breakdown of program data assessment on a more than annual basis.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Competitive Preference Priority 6 - 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:

Applicant has developed a comprehensive multi media literacy program geared at stepping up reading skills in young children. The spiral curriculum in which students beginning at 3 years old repeat the study of a subject at different grade levels, each time at a higher level of difficulty and in greater depth. As well, the recognition

and inclusion of professional learning for the purveyors of the program, teachers, is key and research based for the success of the students (p. 11-12).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not expound on particular practices for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students. Although applicant will work with Allentown, PA, applicant does not specifically cite the treatment and its intended results for that particular population.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/10/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/7/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Success for All Foundation (U411C110042)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	23
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	78
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. Competitive Preference 6	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. Competitive Preference 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. Competitive Preference Pr	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. Competitive Preference 9	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 10		
Competitive Preference Priority 10		

1. Competitive Preference 10

Sub Total 1

Total 85 79

Technical Review Form

Panel #32 - 84.411C Panel - 32: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Success for All Foundation (U411C110042)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Excellent proposed project to support increasing early literacy for students.

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

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

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

Strengths:

1. The project, Around the Corner, is based on extensive prior randomized studies of the literacy program entitled, Success for All (SFA), which has been implemented across 48 states and 1000 Title I schools with positive outcomes in improving literacy as cited on pages 7-9 and 13. Current research cites the critical importance of improving early literacy as a major factor to be considered in tackling the lack of reading proficiency and the achievement gap across the country, especially in the urban core.

2. The description provided in the project provides an explicit, well thought out approach to taking highly successful components of the early childhood curriculum from Success for All, the literacy programs for Pre K and for Kindergarten and adding a multimedia technology component for enhanced early literacy achievement. The project cites on pages 7-9 extensive rigorous evaluations on both programs. Curiosity Corner, the Pre K component that has been evaluated by the USDOE Preschool Curriculum Evaluation Research (PCER) Consortium across 18 sites and had a medium effect size with positive significant effects at the end of Kindergarten; KinderCorner, the Kindergarten curriculum, has been evaluated across multiple sites with positive effects on early literacy. Additionally, Preliminary results of embedding multimedia into early literacy programs have shown positive trends in achievement as cited on pages 7-8. SFA has completed two large randomized studies that found that the addition of multimedia to the SFA grade 1 curriculum increased reading outcomes.

3. Using the SFA program as the backbone of the intended approach with the extensive prior research and data documenting the implementation across multiple states, with multiple populations of students from high

needs schools supports the confidence that this project will be successfully implemented as intended.

4. The project elements are clearly defined on page 2-3 and are based on an extensive research base that include extensive professional development, comprehensive, rigorously evaluated programs, cooperative learning support and an on-going formative assessment process for continuous improvement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design to be conducted 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 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 Development 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.

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

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

Strengths:

1. The project clearly defines the goals of the project that will include the development and pilot of the intended new curriculum through creating the multimedia components, providing home support for parents, providing video-enhanced professional development for teachers, and provide a structure for a randomized experiment to evaluate program success.

2. The project will work across multiple states and school districts with large populations of students that have unique literacy needs, supporting multiple contexts for the effective implementation of the technology-enhanced program across multiple sites for scalability.

3. The project will include district participation in the development of the curriculum allowing for a stronger bridge between research and practice as stated on page 10-11. This process will also support building further capacity of district and school-site staff in effective literacy strategies.

4. Professional development will be implemented in various formats including group face-to-face by experienced SFA trainers and video vignettes will be developed that demonstrate actual best practices implemented by master teachers that can be used as models for effective implementation of the technology-enhanced program. Additionally, the videos will reduce the cost of professional development because they will be accessible 24-7 for teachers to view.

5. The Success for All Foundation has extensive capacity to provide scalability, based on previous and current implementation with 1000 Title I schools currently that will increase to 1100 by 2015 through additional funding. Currently the SFA program serves 500,000 diverse students.

Weaknesses:

1. The cost per student of implementing Around the Corner was not clearly delineated through the table presented on page 12. The table was not labeled so it was unclear if the amounts in the table were actual dollar amounts. Additionally, the lack of a detailed breakdown of cost on pages E6-7 for the project reduced the ability to evaluate reasonableness of cost for scale.

2. The additional costs associated with the implementation of the multimedia components on page 12 were not clearly defined. As an example, technology-enhanced professional development for teachers may cost district less money because of reduced substitute costs, the upfront costs are not described.

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 projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

1. The Success for All Foundation has numerous years of experience in successfully implementing programs with the size of this project and scale as stated and documented on pages 18 and 20-25. The SFA staff includes 120 professional developers, 40 program developers, an award winning video production staff and 22 publication professionals. Additionally, Johns Hopkins houses the Center for Research and Reform in Education (CRRE) and is a highly rated research institution.

2. The project will include a group that creates high quality multimedia resources winning multiple awards as cited on page 21. The current production entitled *Between the Lions*; a PBS show will provide the basis for the type of multimedia content that will be embedded within the program.

3. The project will develop specific Memoranda of Understanding with each partner to further delineate specific responsibilities, timelines and intended outcomes.

4. The qualifications of the project management team are extensive with both national and international

recognition. Each member has extensive expertise in the areas they will oversee and implement as documented on pages 23-24 and in the appendices with documented resumes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Competitive Preference Priority 6 - 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:

1. The projects specifically address early literacy for students of poverty. There is an extensive randomized research base that supports the success of the components of the Success for All Program being enhanced through the use of technology.

2. The programs will promote the development of the whole child by increasing skills that many students lack proficiency in and therefore lag behind in their reading achievement.

3. The intended project targets early literacy with a specific interventions intended for Pre K students and then Kindergarten students. The SFA program already developed will provide transition from K to grade 3.

Weaknesses:

1. The program does not address from birth to age three children.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Even though the SFA program is described on page 13 as currently being implemented across multiple states with data that documents a positive impact on struggling readers and up to a 50% reduction in ESE placement the proposal did not provide the description of explicit strategies that support diverse learners.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/7/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Success for All Foundation (U411C110042)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	23
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	78
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. Competitive Preference 6	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. Competitive Preference 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. Competitive Preference Pr	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. Competitive Preference 9	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 10		
Competitive Preference Priority 10		

1. Competitive Preference 10

Sub Total 1

Total 85 79

Technical Review Form

Panel #32 - 84.411C Panel - 32: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Success for All Foundation (U411C110042)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

The summary statement clearly spells out the goals of the project and identifies Federal Priorities

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

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

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

Strengths:

The development of the Around the Corner curriculum from previous successful activities represents an innovative and exceptional approach to address the learning needs of children(see pages 2-8). The gaps in children's abilities have been clearly identified and linked to the various components of the proposed new curriculum.

The past experiences and successes of the applicant provide ample evidence for demonstrating an impact on student achievement and development.

The specific gaps in students' abilities(reading, writing, etc.) have been clearly identified and linked directly to achievement gains tied to the innovative model(see p. 3-6)

Weaknesses:

none noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design to be conducted 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 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 Development 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.

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

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

Strengths:

The project has identified specific and clear goals based on the new Around the corner curriculum(see p. 10). The alignment of these goals with the identified past successes of Kindercorner and Curiosity Corner provide support for reaching the identified lowincome students(see p. 10-12). The cost of the project seem reasonable and the targeted number of participants identified are clearly laid out. The past experiences of the applicant withthese curricula provide supportive evidence of the ability to maintain the project at the end of the Development grant.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's use of data (see p. 12) does not seem realistic or reasonable. The costs illustrated in the implementation table do not seem reasonable or cost effective

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 projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The management plan is well spelled out and includes objectives, milestones, and timelines for the successful implementation of the project. Specific tasks are identified for each milestone and are tied to overall program objectives. The qualifications and experiences of the staff are relevant and related to the activities and objectives of the program.

Weaknesses:

none noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Competitive Preference Priority 6 - 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:

The applicant clearly identifies strategies for addressing school readiness and improving the alignment of curriculum and language programs. The identified curricula innovation, Around the Corner, is based on a proven track record of academic and school readiness needs of children.

Weaknesses:

none noted

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - 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:

The proposed activities are comprehensive in terms of curriculum and learning activities.

Weaknesses:

The project does not clearly spell out how activities, projects, curriculumetc. will address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities and limited English ability.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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