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

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/6/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative (U411C110293)
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	21
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	16
	Sub Total	80	72
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
1. Competitive Preference 6		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
1. Competitive Preference 7		1	1
	Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	1
	Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
1. Competitive Preference 9		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 10			
Competitive Preference Priority 10			

1. Competitive Preference 10		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
	Total	85	74

Technical Review Form

Panel #44 - 84.411C Panel - 44: 84.411C

Reader #1: **********

Applicant: Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative (U411C110293)

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 proposes STEM education (Absolute Priority 2) and addresses Absolute Priority 5 for 42,470 rural students enrolled in grades 8-12 in 33 local education agencies in 112 schools in partnership with Green River Regional Educational Cooperative in the service area. All 18 participating local education agencies in the Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative are rural, and 10 of 15 of the participating local education agencies in the Green River Regional Educational Cooperative are designated as rural. WIN has committed to provide the 15% matching funds (p. 4).

   The applicant proposes four specific strategies to increase access to and success in college for students in grades 8-12 in rural local education agencies. These strategies include use of software concerning workforce trends and requirements, customized career exploration software, integration of web-based software focused on workplace and college success skills, and provision of a variety of support services (p. 2).

   The applicant proposes use of the WIN Career Readiness Courseware because it allows tiered learning levels in Applied Mathematics, Reading for Information, and Locating Information which will allow accommodations for the unusually high number of students with one or more disabilities, which is as high as 11.5% in some of the participating counties (p. 3).

   The applicant proposes a project designed to demonstrate the relevance of education to a career path, whether directly into the workforce or to college. In some of the participating counties, the percentage of students who do not complete high school is as high as 57%. The applicant identified a goal of increasing

graduation rates from 76% to 90% with implementation of the proposed project (p. 4).

The applicant presents evidence of the need for the proposed project, including poverty data, which documents that four of the nation's five poorest counties are participants (p. 6).

The applicant proposes a project that supports students' exploration of STEM opportunities by integrating a focus on exploration of college and career options in secondary education, soft skills development, and melding opportunities for students to pursue both post-secondary education and employment (p. 6-7).

The applicant provides research and data to support the integrated e-Learning solutions that are proposed for the project (p. 7-8).

Weaknesses:

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:

The partnering districts have agreed to integrate the proposed e-Learning solutions into existing school curriculum, affording all students the opportunity to participate (p. 10).

The applicant identifies four specific, observable and measurable targets to guide implementation of the project (p. 10-11).

WIN, a web-based software, is proposed for collection of community data and identification of job opportunities in high demand categories at the local district or school level. Applications and usage may include a regional econometric study, policy research, professional development for teachers and counselors regarding career exploration and postsecondary career development strategies, and career exploration for students with teacher guidance (p. 11-12).

The WIN software will allow students to complete direct instruction modules to earn more than 26 career readiness certifications. Another WIN component addresses soft skills needed for success in school and the workplace (p. 12).

The applicant proposes creation of a new career readiness course and a required 12th grade course focused on soft skills, integration of new projects, assessments, and skills review into existing academic courses, creation of a Career Readiness Portfolio by students (p. 13).

The applicant proposes development and delivery of two-hour synchronous webinars to feature high-demand jobs in the state. Mentors and presenters will participate in a half-day training. Both business and college mentors will be involved, and webinars are proposed for delivery the first Tuesday of each month, beginning September 2012 with summer webinars available as well (p. 14).

The applicant proposes a Career Awareness Week to be held each spring in the participating districts at all middle and high schools. The week-long focus will include job fairs, industry booths, college recruitment booths, assemblies, an evening open house event for parents and families, and students' participation in a Career Exploration Project (p. 14-15).

The applicant estimates the cost per student to be $49.98 per year for the project, and suggests the costs will decrease 10% with scaling due to site licensing rather than per-pupil licensing for e-Learning software. Estimated costs are provided for 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students (p. 15-16).

The application has the full support of the Kentucky Education Commissioner which bodes well for its integration and sustainability (p. 16).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant proposes a four-hour, hands-on exploration of the WIN system with plans for ongoing training, the applicant does not address how the ongoing training would be accomplished or how teachers' needs for further training on the software would be assessed (p. 13-14).

The applicant does not address how participating students would be able to create "individualized career pathways" with use of software and participation in the new initiatives.

It is difficult to determine how the implementation of the e-Learning solutions would be enacted at the local educational agency or school site level.

It is not clear how two new courses can be added to the secondary curriculum. Additional information is needed concerning the Career Readiness Portfolio requirements, as well as the school structures that would facilitate implementation of the proposed initiatives.

The applicant does not clearly present how the proposed project will result in more students enrolling in STEM courses, completing high school requirements, or pursuing post-secondary career or education options other than participation in career exploration experiences.

The applicant does not address how funding for the project would be continued and sustained after the completion of the grant.

Reader's Score: 21

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 applicant has a history of collaboration with the partnering educational cooperative and communication and management processes are already in place (p. 20).

WIN, the e-Learning software provider, has committed the required 15% funds for the private sector match (p. 20).

The applicant will serve as the management and fiscal arm of the project but a Project Board is proposed to facilitate collaboration with the Green River Regional Educational Cooperative. Monthly meetings are scheduled between the two advisory groups for the educational cooperatives using distance technology (p. 21) as well as production of a monthly newsletter (p. 24).

The applicant has a 34 year history of service to schools and districts in Kentucky, and it has successfully managed large-scale federal grants from the United States Department of Education (p. 22).

The applicant provides brief biographical sketches and resumes for all key personnel to document its experience and expertise necessary to implement a project of this magnitude and scope (p. 23-24).

The applicant presents a summative implementation timeline on p. 24-25.

A statewide report, known as the Kentucky College and Career Readiness High School Feedback Report, is generated for each high school and can be used to provide data to inform the project's successes and progress as it moves toward sustainability and scalability (p. 25-26). Additionally, the applicant and its partner are members of the Association for Educational Service Agencies (AESA) which includes members in 45 states and another vehicle to disseminate findings and share the project successes (p. 26).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant suggests that top-down model of management is conducive to clear communication regarding benchmarks and project implementation, it is not conducive for provision of feedback from participating school sites and districts.

While a memorandum of understanding is provided by the applicant, as well as numerous letters of support from local school districts, Congressmen, and universities and colleges, it is striking that a proposal focuses on career exploration and career readiness does not include any letters of support from area employers and businesses when they are critical to the project's success.

The cost proposed for the independent evaluation seems extremely high at $701,000.

The applicant proposes production and delivery of two-hour webinars, but it is not clear how these will be funded or created in the budget.

A more detailed plan of implementation is needed to delineate the action steps and coordination efforts

required to create a successful approach.

Reader's Score: 16

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:

This CPP was not scored.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

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:

The applicant proposes four specific strategies to increase access to and success in college for students in grades 8-12 in rural local education agencies. These strategies include use of software concerning workforce trends and requirements, customized career exploration software, integration of web-based software focused on workplace and college success skills, and provision of a variety of support services.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

The applicant proposes use of the WIN Career Readiness Courseware because it allows tiered learning levels in Applied Mathematics, Reading for Information, and Locating Information which will allow accommodations for the unusually high number of students with one or more disabilities, which is as high as 11.5% in some of the participating counties (p. 3). The software also allows responsiveness for ESL students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

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:

This CPP was not scored.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

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:

This CPP was not scored.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/6/11 12:00 AM

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative (U411C110293)
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	24
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	18
	Sub Total	80	77
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	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	1
	Sub Total	1	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 10		1	1
	Sub Total	1	1
	Total	85	79

Technical Review Form

Panel #44 - 84.411C Panel - 44: 84.411C

Reader #3: **********

Applicant: Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative (U411C110293)

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 application addresses both Absolute Priority 5 and Absolute Priority 2 in a rural area of Kentucky. Data are provided from the 2010 Census to document the poverty characteristics of the region.

   Both CPP7 and CPP8 are addressed (pgs.2-3) throughout the proposal.

   The approach was developed by the applicant and partners to increase achievement and graduation rates of this rural and very poor student population using technology tools with a desired goal to increase graduation rates from 76% to 90%.

   Two STEM strategies are proposed. The three primary approaches proposed have great potential for making a positive difference in this targeted area.

   Five empirical studies are cited which provide evidence of the rationale, and an exceptional approach for the proposed innovation. Dropout prevention and academic achievement are discussed as well as increased college and career readiness.

   There is a focus on the relevance of academics to success in the future.

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:

Six goals with specific measureable targets are stated (p.10) and are directly tied to the stated regional needs.

Implementation and activity processes are discussed in relation to the technology tools and skills needed for student success. Three implementation models have been developed to meet LEA needs including a course related to soft skills which support career success. Students with special needs are provided with accommodations to allow them to participate in this project design.

E-Mentoring Webinars allow business volunteers and the Project Advisory Board to train mentors from the community.

Project appears to be very cost effective at $49.98/student/year.

Scale-up costs are projected on page 16.

Job webinars which feature careers available in state are proposed and other career awareness activities.

Support from state government officials is an aspect that will assist with their success.

Weaknesses:

It is not clear that the activities will be long enough in duration to have a lasting impact though the likelihood of success is great.

Reader's Score: 24

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 an MOU detailing roles of partners. Many of these relationships are long standing.

A management advisory board is proposed with key stakeholders and policymakers designated to become mentors.

Applicant demonstrates history and experience of managing projects of this type and size.

Qualifications of key personnel are provided on page 23 and supporting CVs are included in the appendices.

Scalability is addressed.

Weaknesses:

A more detailed timeline or chart would provide description of actual flow of activities. This would have strengthened the management plan.

Reader's Score: 18

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:

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:

Courseware has been selected for the high school curriculum that supports a commitment to learning for all students, including those with disabilities and limited English proficiency (LEP). Tiers and accommodations for these special needs students is commendable.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 1

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:

Proposed project is technology-intensive and maximizes effective uses of technology tools.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: **1**

Status: Submitted

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

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative (U411C110293)
Reader #2: **********

		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	25
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	19
	Sub Total	80	79
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	1
	Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	1
	Sub Total	1	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 10		1	
	Sub Total	1	
	Total	85	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #44 - 84.411C Panel - 44: 84.411C

Reader #2: **********

Applicant: Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative (U411C110293)

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 proposes the creation of a five year career and readiness initiative to commence in eighth grade and end at high school graduation with links between the educational and work worlds readily apparent at all levels. It will encompass 33 LEAs comprised of 112 school districts and 42,000+ students.
The applicant will involve the Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative and the Green River Regional Educational Cooperative as the grant partners because of their work with the 33 LEAs that wish to take advantage of this opportunity.
The applicant has included four clear strategies for students in this project: 1) early engagement in planning, 2) an understanding of the job market and how they fit into it, 3) foundational, behavioral, and attitudinal skills, and 4) support services to assure success.
The applicant will employ the use of special software to allow all students regardless of ability levels, disabilities, or language barriers to be able to participate fully in all career and college preparation activities.
With the research evident in the proposal the applicant believes that graduation rates can increase from 76% to 90% by the end of the five year cycle.
The project was developed to increase achievement and graduation rates of one of the poorest student populations in the nation.
The applicant proposes that schools will build the foundational skills and partner with business, industry, and college mentors to keep students focused and ready for a productive future after graduation.
In addition, the applicant also includes STEM discipline in this project to get students to explore life skills and make students aware of the real need for math and science in their lives through early engagment and nontraditional engagement in STEM pathways.

The applicant supports a high potential and untested model for systemic study with high needs students in an integrated approach to remove the distinction between jobseeker and student.
The applicant wishes to transform high school curricula to look at multiple ways for students to plan and envision their future.

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 applicant proposes a program that includes 33 LEAs and schools to integrate C3R project into school curricula so that all students will be included in early career explorations and engagement through graduation.
The applicant will include WIN products--Strategic Compass and myStrategic Compass for school and office data compilation, Career Readiness Courseware for Applied Mathematics, Reading for Information, and Locating Information, and Softskills Series for behavioral and attitudinal skills.
The applicant provides a sequential five year plan for all students that should help them devise a well thought-out plan for their life after high school.
The applicant proposes three implementation models based on LEA and school requirements: 1) New Career Readiness course, 2) Integration into Existing Class Structures, and 3) Student Career Readiness Portfolio, all which include ongoing professional development to increase teacher effectiveness and proficiency.

The applicant further proposes E-Mentoring Webinars year-round plus an annual Career Week to focus on job fairs, industry booths and college recruitment.
The applicant expects the emphasis on future career pathways will have a profound effect on students' directional path after graduation.
The applicant proposes costs that are quite low for the number of students involved ($49.98 per student per year) and the costs should decrease by 10% due to site licensing.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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 applicant has secured WIN, Inc. to provide the software, training, professional development, and technology support and training plus the 15% private sector matching funds.
The applicant proposes that Appalachian Teaching and Leadership Center will serve as the management and fiscal agent for the grant.
Provisions have been made by the applicant to manage the two separate areas of the state through virtual meetings to save time and money and monthly newsletters with vignettes and project information.
The number of key personnel (4) proposed by the applicant appears to be adequate for the services required and their vitae are included.
The applicant has proposed a timeline of sevices and events that should lead to a successful program.
The applicant has successfully managed large grants in the past and appears poised to perform the same level of service again.

Weaknesses:

The letters of support from the various LEAs appear with identical wording which causes concern.

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:

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:

The applicant will engage many agencies to work with students in all 33 LEAs to prepare students for college or work accessibility and success.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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:

The applicant will employ the use of WIN, career readiness software, which will deliver content to students with vision and hearing impairments, can be paced for students of low English proficiencies or learning disabilities, and comes in a Spanish version for students whose first language is not English.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 1

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