

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

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	34
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	24
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	0
Sub Total	1	0
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	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	79

Technical Review Form

Panel #23 - 84.411C Panel - 23: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

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 Ounce of Prevention Fund (OPF) and the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) are requesting i3 funds to further develop and evaluate the Ounce Professional Development Initiative (PDI) to improve both classroom instruction and leadership in four community-based early childhood settings in Chicago. The need noted by the applicant is indisputable - improve both the scale and quality of early childhood education in the United States, align actual instruction more effectively with instructional standards for early childhood learning and elementary school readiness and develop a research-based repository of knowledge about how to improve instruction at scale in community-based settings. This project addresses, in particular, the "urgent need" to raise the achievement of young, high-needs students before they enter CPS kindergarten, and strengthen collaboration between early learning and K-3 schools to sustain these early gains.

Based on an " independent evaluation of Educare (which includes the PDI component) an early childhood program focused on high needs pre-schoolers in multiple sites, the applicant hypothesizes that where early childhood classroom and instructional quality is high, children who participate in the program will enter kindergarten achieving near national norms (p. e31) - the results found for children entering Educare at a very early age. The applicant proposes to replicate the core design elements of the PDI, iteratively adapting them and their implementation to the prevailing conditions in community based early childhood settings.

The children served at community based early childhood learning centers are, according to the applicant, "the places that currently engage the majority of low-income pre-school children" (p. e28). Specific community-based program sites are not named but 90% of children in programs to be served will live below the poverty

line and 10% will be students with disabilities. The gap nationally for high needs children entering Kindergarten is that they fall one full standard deviation (on average 15-18 points) behind their more resourced peers in literacy and mathematics; in CPS only 2% of 700 pre-school classes provide what the applicant and researchers suggest is "high-levels of instructional support" to high needs children.

The plan to tightly align research to practice while being attendant to context variables in community based settings and continuously adapting processes based on the results of ongoing research is exceptional. Improving educational outcomes for pre-schoolers primarily by focusing on the professional development of teachers, leaders and coaches in a purposefully iterative process of adult development is, if not unique certainly unusual and has the potential to improve student achievement and close learning gaps across the youngsters early school career.

Weaknesses:

Other than noting that reading ability in the first grade is a powerful predictor of educational achievement and that gaps which exist in 3rd grade reoccur in 5th (suggesting the need for earlier intervention), there is limited data concerning long term effect of quality pre-school experiences.

Reader's Score: 34

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 hypothesizes that the PDI structure can significantly elevate early childhood instruction in community-based settings, where the majority of early childhood education opportunities for low-income children in Chicago currently occur. The applicant notes a "reasoned hypotheses about the key differences between the conditions of the Educare early learning setting from those prevailing in normative community-based settings" (p.e75). The goal is to raise the quality of instruction, leadership supports for effective teaching, and children s achievement in community based early childhood settings while simultaneously preparing the PDI for an efficacy evaluation in community-based settings in the near future. The need for quality professional development in preschools, most especially in community based preschools is well documented and the adaptations to both the design and implementation of PDI in these settings represent a marked improvement over current conditions.

The PDI approach will be implemented in four early learning programs in Chicago which will be selected through a well thought out procurement process focused on identifying programs with the capacity and commitment (and the demographics) to participate in and benefit from PDI. The model includes an important and often overlooked feature - kindergarten transition which focuses on building connections and ensuring curricular articulation between the early learning teachers and elementary teachers.

The goal is to raise the quality of instruction, leadership supports for effective teaching, and children s achievement in community based early childhood settings that are based in Illinois Early Learning Standards (IELS). This represents an important leap in expectations for both teachers and early learners. Simultaneously the PDI program/process will be prepared for an efficacy evaluation in community-based settings. This is a strategy that, if results are positive, may well result in scaling of the approach to other programs.

The PDI strategies, cycles and content are sufficiently detailed and clearly presented and aligned to the goals and objectives stated in the application. The proposed work is tightly connected to the ongoing work of the Foundation. It is relevant that the strategic emphasis on both teachers and leaders, as well as the prominent use of coaches, is well supported in literature and practice as a means to improve teaching and learning.

Project costs are estimated at \$3,773 per student during the development phase, but at scale-up costs decrease to \$1,369 per student. A six month ramp up period is included in the budget during which hiring of staff and an introduction of program teachers and staff to the project will occur. Community based early childhood programs participating in the program will, according to the applicant, be provided i3 funding based on their current infrastructure and practices. It is anticipated that 912 students will be impacted over the course of the grant period. Costs seem reasonable particularly upon scale up.

Weaknesses:

The proposal essentially focuses on reproducing the PDI component in the four settings absent the Educare model itself. While the PDI model is intuitively sound and is based on an understanding of the principles of PD in general it remains unclear whether PDI in itself, can replicate the gains reported for Educare programs.

Professional development, in tight budget periods is frequently eliminated as a cost saving strategy. This raises some concerns regarding the sustainability of a model focused almost exclusively on PD.

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:

The Ounce of Prevention Fund partnered with CPS to launch the first Educare early learning school in 2000 and the proposed project will leverage the knowledge, expertise and experience of staff who have been leading the professional development work with early education programs in Illinois and nationally for more than a decade. Ounce has 29 years of leadership and experience in early childhood education practice, professional development, and research impacting hundreds of staff and thousands of children. The applicant has budgeted for existing and experienced leadership, and professional development providers, as well as new staff who will expand capacity to implement the proposed project in the four i3 supported community based programs. The Project Team includes two Co-Project Directors, two PDI Managers with expertise in content and teacher development in 0-3 and 3-5 classrooms, eight PD Coaches, an Operations Manager, and an Administrative Assistant. Appendix J provides a project management plan detailing activities, timelines, and staff accountable for key project tasks. The project organizational chart and position descriptions provide a clear picture of accountability as well as channels of support. Current leadership are both experienced and qualified and it appears they have managed projects of this size and scope. As the application states: in the most recent fiscal year which ended June 30, 2011, the Ounce secured approximately \$16.7 million (or 36% of our overall budget) through private sector grants and other philanthropic contributions which included nearly \$6 million to support professional development initiatives at the local, state and national levels.

Criteria for choosing i3 sites are delineated and appear to encompass staff and site readiness.

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 is proposing a program that is singularly focused on improving young children's school readiness and aligning K-3 programs.

Weaknesses:

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: 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: 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: 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

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

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

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	34
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	79
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	
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 10

Sub Total 1

Total 85 80

Technical Review Form

Panel #23 - 84.411C Panel - 23: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This was the best written, most comprehensive and well-integrated grant I have ever read. The applicants clearly understand grant writing, but more importantly have a deep understanding of the early childhood landscape. They have learned to "put first things first". The power of this proposal is in its focus, and that the applicant has created a space for school and center leaders, and teachers, to systematically learn and gain skill in producing outcomes for children. The applicant is effectively writing themselves out of a job with the organizations they will serve, which leaves them with the time, resources and experience to build capacity somewhere else.

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:

(1) The project represents an exceptional approach in that professional development is provided to teachers, leaders, and trainers through a reflective, iterative process (pp. e162-164).

(2) The applicant clearly highlights the gap in services provided to infants, toddlers and preschoolers from low-income backgrounds and who are dual language learners (pp. e36; pp. e61-62). The applicants demonstrate the weakness in provider education and training for these students who need the most support (pp. e36-37). The applicant's plan to create the three-pronged professional development program addresses the gaps and weaknesses strategically and systematically, and in a manner that empowers teachers and leaders to understand, evaluate and improve their own practices (pp. e78-80).

(3) The applicant demonstrates through data on classroom quality and student achievement that their three-pronged PDI approach supports teacher development and student learning (pp. e86-e90) in similar settings to those described for the current project (pp. e91-92). The project thoughtfully planned for context-specific program adaptations, rather than a "one size fits all" approach, which increases the likelihood of site-based

participation and buy-in. Reflective and responsive implementation also increases the likelihood that staff will maintain practices following project implementation, since they will have ownership over the process and outcomes.

Weaknesses:

(1) None identified

(2) None identified

(3) A bit more emphasis on how teachers will be supported to make curriculum and data-driven instructional decisions would be helpful, especially for the birth to three teachers, who it seems from the application will have the least formal education and training (pp. e43-44).

Reader's Score: 34

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) Goals are clearly outlined in the narrative, and the project's program and evaluation activities (pp. e151-152, e173-175) are closely aligned with project goals.
- (2-3) The budget for the project is reasonable, addressing the three main goals of the project with sufficient staffing.
- (4) The applicant details cost absorption or elimination following the project (p. e46). A sustainability plan for the core program components is built into the project through scaffolded and gradual transfer of training to site leaders and staff (pp. e44-46).

Weaknesses:

- (1) None identified.
- (2-3) None identified.
- (4) None identified.

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:

- (1) The management plan is well-conceived to achieve program goals on time and within budget. There are clearly defined responsibilities (job descriptions e166-172; evaluator scope of work, e151-152), timelines and milestones (project management plan, e173-175). Tasks related to sustainability and scalability are built into the core program design, including a research-based transfer of training plan to build leadership and professional development capacity at participating sites (pp. e44-46).
- (2) The project leadership team already in place has exceptional experience and background knowledge relevant to this project, as well as broad expertise in research, pedagogy and professional development (resumes). The organizational chart (p. e165) demonstrates attention to detail, and provides clear channels for support, communication, and accountability for program outcomes. While some roles are to be filled, the focused job descriptions (pp. e166-172) will support leadership in identifying and selecting candidates, and in the ability to evaluate performance and provide constructive feedback to ensure personnel are achieving grant objectives.

Weaknesses:

- (1) None identified.
- (2) None identified.

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 Kindergarten transition plan included in the appendices is helpful for factor (c). The project supports birth through five providers related to factors (a) and (b), and will support development and alignment of standards across providers, as birth to three standards are not fully developed at the state/national level.

Weaknesses:

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:

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/15/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

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	33
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	18
Sub Total	80	76
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	0
Sub Total	1	0
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	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	77

Technical Review Form

Panel #23 - 84.411C Panel - 23: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Ounce of Prevention Fund (U411C110401)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This program focused on Professional Development and early childhood intervention is a commendable project and it may serve as a model for many other high poverty, low educational opportunities and achievement communities.

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:

This project is designed to respond to early childhood education opportunities for low-income children occur. The model focuses on Professional Development that will improve high quality services, classroom instruction, child achievement and family outcomes. There are two guiding objectives: to strengthen instruction and improve leadership in early childhood settings in high poverty, underserved communities; and to adapt its initiative to fit conditions found in community-based childhood settings.

The reasonable hypothesis with its two core propositions are insightful and logical perceptions of societal needs. The effect of this proposal is likely to have a long term impact on the educational opportunities and successes for at-risk communities.

The needs that are identified are compelling reasons for the improvement of Professional Development in early childhood education.

Weaknesses:

Additional documentation and statistical input for these needs would be helpful. Also, a specific connection with college and university preparatory programs for early childhood education would enhance the application.

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 references provided in this section are impressive. Sections specifically for teacher and leaders detail appropriate roles and responsibilities. The most telling data that showed high-needs children, including children with limited English proficiency, who enroll as infants, enter kindergarten with no gap in their achievement. This effect is likely the singular factor that will make great in-roads into the achievement gap.

Weaknesses:

This is a very powerful project. There are no discernible weaknesses.

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 team reflects experience and expertise. The timeline and budget are clear and give an insight into the quality of the program design.

Weaknesses:

The travel allowance seems unusually high based on the intent of the project.

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:

The strength of this program is its attention to this priority. All conditions of the priority are clearly addressed.

Weaknesses:

There are not obvious weaknesses for this priority.

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: 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: 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: 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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 9/15/11 12:00 AM