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**Applicant:** New York City Board of Education (U411C110284)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Statement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need for Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Need for Project</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Project Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Management Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of the Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Priority Questions**                         |                 |               |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 6**          |                 |               |
| Competitive Preference Priority 6              |                 |               |
| 1. Competitive Preference 6                   | 1               |               |
| **Sub Total**                                  | 1               |               |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 7**          |                 |               |
| Competitive Preference Priority 7              |                 |               |
| 1. Competitive Preference 7                   | 1               | 0             |
| **Sub Total**                                  | 1               | 0             |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 8**          |                 |               |
| Competitive Preference Priority 8              |                 |               |
| 1. Competitive Preference Pr                  | 1               |               |
| **Sub Total**                                  | 1               |               |
| **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 Priority 10          | 1               |               |
| **Sub Total**                                  | 1               |               |

10/28/11 12:51 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - 84.411C Panel - 15: 84.411C

Reader #2: **********
Applicant: New York City Board of Education (U411C110284)

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:

STEM innovation in a NYC educational pipeline to address the discrepancy between educational goals and the proposal fully explains the case for "suitable software" to increase student achievement. Current services are amidst targeting the high needs population. A clear, innovative "ecosystem" request to survey and match software for application. Large scale targets are identified serving 1, 600-10,000 students initially. The research scrutinizes for specific technologies for the participants. It encompasses a learning challenge identification process with an item analysis of math/science data interviews with both teachers and students.

There is a clear intention for the creation of new software to meet its unique needs. Partners are product developers (i.e. ImagineK12, Games for Learning Institute, EdTech Entrepreneurs) to develop quality STEM products for program use.
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:
In essence, the proposal seeks to create the ideal technological platform to meet needs of unique learners & improve student achievement within a diverse school system. Rigorous plan to reach the desired number of students evident. The project details specific timelines and activities by key personnel to reach the greatest potential of students.

Weaknesses:
no comments

Reader's Score: 25
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:
Quite extensive credentials and expertise across the predominant fields necessary for project sustainability and scaling up. A goal to examine the level of fidelity are new interventions implemented in science and math classes and how different are these interventions from sci/math classes that are otherwise available. Scaling up costs per student are reasonable. The strategy for capacity to "further develop and bring to scale," (p. 25) seems realistic.

Weaknesses:
It is unclear if the members who join the "system" are piloting innovation, creation, or funding. Partners are identified in conjunction with additional funding.
In addition, it is unclear if the members who join the system are piloting innovation creation, or funding.

Reader's Score: 19

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:
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:

Not specifically addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

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:
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:

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:

The project specifies a desire to match technologies and digital tools to address STEM components reflective of strategies and frameworks within the curriculum. A rigorous tier system to implement interventions across testing grades.

Weaknesses:

no comment.

Reader's Score: 1
Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York City Board of Education (U411C110284)
Reader #3: **********

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Need for Project</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Project Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of the Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Competitive Preference 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Competitive Preference 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Competitive Preference Pr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Competitive Preference 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10
1. Competitive Preference 10  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Review Form

Panel #15 - 84.411C Panel - 15: 84.411C

Reader #3: **********
Applicant: New York City Board of Education (U411C110284)

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 applicant has provided a strong need for the project through its research and interpretation of the grant application. The applicant identified a network of schools, instructional designers, and investors who have the capacity to build and implement this program in New York. They completed a gaps analysis to identify the misconceptions and skills deficits when choosing the students to be served in the program. This is a strength because the applicant is not being presumptuous about the needs, but identifying them ahead of time. They stated that 10,000 students who benefit from participation which is a high number of students to be served, building a pipeline of STEM educated students. They also translated the STEM challenge into prioritized solutions, based on the needs assessment for underrepresented minorities. The research presented in the proposal clearly identifies the need for the project based on NAEP scores and other statistical information as it relates to STEM careers. Finally, proposal identifies the goals, objectives and strategies for efficacy and incentives for participants. They identified successful programs, similar to model they plan to implement.

Weaknesses:
None noted.
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 quality of the project design exceeded standards. Using a research education institution to oversee the evaluation of the program provides an unbiased review of program outcomes and the true success. Based on the requested budget, costs seem feasible for start-up, capacity building and implementation for the four years, with continuation once the funding year is complete. They have identified 2 major outcomes, with additional evaluation on the cognitive, emotional and psychological development of students. Mixed methods research allow for additional perspectives. The project management has the knowledge and work experience to coordinate and implement a project of this magnitude and size. The chart of milestones clearly identifies the timeline and momentum points they will use to start and complete the project.

Weaknesses:

None noted.
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 project management has the knowledge and work experience to coordinate and implement a project of this magnitude and size. The chart of milestones clearly identifies the timeline and momentum points they will use to start and complete the project.

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:
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:

The applicant addressed college access with reference to algebra in the introduction, but the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to support receiving points in this area.

Reader's Score: 0

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:

Reader's Score:
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:

The applicant addressed technology in the grant but sufficient evidence of promoting technology was not addressed in the application.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/20/11 12:00 AM
Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New York City Board of Education (U411C110284)
Reader #1: **********

Questions

Summary Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection Criteria

Need for Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of Project Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of the Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points Possible</td>
<td>Points Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive Preference Priority 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive Preference Priority 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive Preference Priority 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive Preference Priority 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Competitive Preference 10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reader #1: **********
Applicant: New York City Board of Education (U411C110284)

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:
   A strength of the applicant's proposed project was the interest to evaluate the effectiveness of the current STEM program and to develop solutions that will help students overcome specific learning challenges. Another strength of the project is that it targets groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM in grades 5-12 and find ways to adequately prepare them for postsecondary schools or careers in STEM.

   Weaknesses:
   Based upon the statement that the applicant made about the project having been done before (on a smaller scale) with proven results, having more statistical data to support this claim would have made the argument stronger and would have provided more support for a project of this magnitude.

   Reader’s Score: 30

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 a clear set of goals that appeared to be aligned with the STEM priority that the applicant is seeking to 
meet as well as a list of well known STEM Partnerships listed. Plans and cost to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500, 000 
students nationally are also included on page 29.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader’s Score: 25

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 qualifications and experiences of the project director and key personnel seemed to be sufficient to manage the scope of the proposed project. The cost of the project appeared to be reasonable.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader’s Score:

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:
A strength of the proposed project is upon evaluation, the applicant would be able to develop a curriculum that would help students overcome the specific learning challenges that inhibit their success in STEM courses and excel in STEM careers.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

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:

Reader's Score:

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:
The design of the project is to improve student achievement by way of program/material effectiveness. The applicant proposes to increase the supply and demand for impact learning technologies, instructional models, and professional development.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1
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