

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/17/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fresno County Office of Education (U411C110425)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	80
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	82

Technical Review Form

Panel #24 - 84.411C Panel - 24: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Fresno County Office of Education (U411C110425)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

The applicant outlines an innovative course, that has strong potential to reduce the need for remediation in English for first-year students, deploys cutting edge reading pedagogy, integrated writing assignments, and Aristotelian rhetoric to develop students' critical reading and writing ability.

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:

A.1

The applicant has selected to address Absolute Priority 3: Implementing High Standards and High Quality Assessments (Abstract and pages 1-3). It seeks to enhance and scale up the Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC). This innovative course, designed by the California State University (CSU) to reduce the need for remediation in English for first-year students, deploys cutting edge reading pedagogy, integrated writing assignments, and Aristotelian rhetoric to develop students' critical reading and writing ability. The project proposes to expand, update, and refine the curriculum; increase the scope and effectiveness of professional development; establish intensive implementation classrooms, and investigate the effectiveness of the ERWC. The ERWC complements the implementation of high standards, both the recently adopted Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English Language Arts and the prior English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools by emphasizing the frequently under-taught areas of expository (or informational) text and argumentation in reading, writing, and speaking. The ERC was developed with the goal of preparing students to read, write, and think at levels needed to achieve college success and completion.

A.2

The applicant identifies remediation as weakness resulting from inadequate services, and opportunities (pages 4-7). Students who enter college needing remediation are not eligible to enroll in credit bearing or transfer-level courses and therefore lack the opportunity to avoid additional costs for non-credit bearing classes. High need students risk not transferring to a four-year college or completing a four-year degree. Rates of remediation nationwide for students entering four-year and two-year public colleges are estimated at 29% and 43% respectively. Additionally, although over 6,000 California educators have participated in professional development for the ERWC, only 278 schools (22.3% of the state's 1,246 comprehensive high schools) have adopted the ERWC as a full-year course, representing a gap in available services.

A.3

The project is likely to increase student achievement, help close the achievement gap, or decrease dropout rates among the target population of high need students. The results of evaluation studies that examined quantitative and qualitative outcomes for schools with large numbers of teachers participating in ERWC professional development show the rates of gain calculated on the percent of college ready students (as measured by the Early Assessment Program (EAP) test in 11th grade), and the percent of students proficient upon entry in the CSU (as measured by the CSU English Placement Test (EPT)) from 2006-2010. The schools participating in ERWC showed more improvement than all schools at the state level (pages 7-8). The results suggest that the project, if funded, is likely to have a positive impact by reducing the need for remediation in English and increasing college completion.

Weaknesses:

A.1

No weaknesses noted.

A.2

No weaknesses noted.

A.3

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.

Weaknesses:

B.1

No weaknesses noted.

B.2

No weaknesses noted.

B.3

No weaknesses noted.

B.4

No weaknesses 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:

D. 1

The applicant outlines a management plan that is sufficient to guide staff in the management of the project (page 35). The management plan for the proposed project is reflected in the Logic Model (see Section B) and detailed in the Project Work Plan (see Appendix J). The Work Plan specifies the tasks, responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for each of the project's goals, objectives, and actions for the four years of the grant. The Work Plan will be used by the project's co-directors and evaluators to monitor the progress of the goals and objectives to ensure that project objectives are accomplished on time and within budget.

D.2

The applicant identifies key staff assigned to work on the project. Key staff comprises a senior-level FCOE leadership team that will manage the project in close cooperation with leaders from the CSU Chancellor's Office, including the Center for the Advancement of Reading, and the outside evaluation team led by WestEd researchers. Each individual identified on the team has demonstrated experience and qualification as evidenced by the descriptions provided and the Resumes provided in the Appendix.

Weaknesses:

D.1

No weaknesses noted.

D.2

No weaknesses 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:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

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 outlines how the project will adequately address Competitive preference 7. The ERWC was created in response to those concerns with the goal of preparing students to read, write, and think at levels needed to achieve college success and completion (Competitive Preference Priority 7) (page 3). It is aligned with both college-level expectations and content standards, and the curriculum matches with the Common Core State Standards emphasizing a range of order to achieve high standards and success in college. The ERWC helps adolescents accomplish this by building task persistence and competence through engaging module topics, such as racial profiling, fast food, and juvenile justice, and appropriate instructional scaffolds. Support will be provided to students in the areas of college access by adults volunteering from higher education institutions to include the financial aspects of college (Appendix J).

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 to address Competitive Preference 8 through its efforts to meet the needs of English Language Learners (pages 1, 3 and 4). Modifications of the ERWC curriculum based on the English-Language Development Standards for California Public Schools have recently been created to help teachers modify instruction to address the unique learning needs of English language learners who range from the intermediate to advanced levels of English proficiency. To help meet student needs the first semester of the course is supplemented by text-based grammar lessons which uses curriculum readings and students own writings to build competence in writing conventions and rhetorical power in language use. Taken together the existing text-based grammar supplement and the new document, modifying the ERWC Assignment Template for English Learners at the Intermediate and Early Advanced Levels, provide significant resources to teachers to support students acquiring academic English.

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:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

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:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/17/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/19/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fresno County Office of Education (U411C110425)

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	23
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	78
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. Competitive Preference 6	1	
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

Sub Total 1

Total 85 80

Technical Review Form

Panel #24 - 84.411C Panel - 24: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Fresno County Office of Education (U411C110425)

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 need for the project is documented with substantial, relevant evidence of student performance data both at the pre-college and college entry level. The program to be developed builds on and improves a design that has been implemented in schools since 2006 with outcomes that document its early efficacy and promise. The program is aligned with California State standards and several other assessments used by high schools and California State colleges to predict students' readiness for college. The proposed project would revise and further develop the program in substantive ways such as alignment with Common Core Standards, modifications to better meet the needs of English language learners and to introduce the program at earlier grade levels, ie., prior to 12th grade. The original program and the proposed enhancements will be developed through collaboration between college faculty and school personnel, especially teachers, to meet clearly defined student and teacher needs. The proven effectiveness of this approach to program development and implementation is well documented in research literature.

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 goals, objectives, and projected outcomes are aligned with the purposes of the project. The teacher professional development plan is content-driven and incorporates practices such as modeling, coaching and opportunities for teacher collaboration that have proven to be effective to promote and support change in teacher practice. The applicant identifies the major categorical costs and explains how the student cost estimate is derived both for the development project and to scale up the project. The opportunity to duplicate instructional materials and to offer professional development workshops in collaboration with the State University helps to contain costs.

Weaknesses:

There is reference to a strategy to "Develop opportunities for teachers in earlier grades whose students feed into the course at the 12th grade level" (p13) but there is no further information to suggest what grade levels are under consideration, how those teachers might be involved, or how the impact of that strategy might be assessed.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The management plan provides the level of specificity about responsibilities, tasks, milestones, etc. to show how the project is expected to function to meet objectives for accountability purposes. Project management will be shared by stakeholders from the school district and its primary partner, CSU. Key personnel include a mix of experienced administrators and content experts, several of whom helped develop the original project. While the continuing implementation of the original project is a good indicator of the potential for sustainability of the enhanced project, the applicant also has partnered with a non-profit organization that has a track record of fundraising to support effective education reform initiatives (pp23-25)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposed project will improve students' academic literacy which is a key factor in raising overall academic performance. In particular, the project proposes to improve the reading and writing skills of 12th grade students so they are better prepared for entry level college courses without the need for remedial English courses. The project also will help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes through advising and other support activities and collect data on students' enrollment, matriculation and performance in freshman composition courses (p.7,13,Appendix J).

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 proposed project will modify the literacy curriculum to meet the needs of English language learners and incorporate strategies on how to use these modifications in the teacher professional development component (pp12-13).

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: 9/19/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/23/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Fresno County Office of Education (U411C110425)

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	22
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	77
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	79

Technical Review Form

Panel #24 - 84.411C Panel - 24: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Fresno County Office of Education (U411C110425)

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 proposal seeks to address the relevant role that its Expository Reading and Writing Course(ERWC) will have upon under-represented minority and ELL students in the California State University (CSU) system. Further, the proposal clearly identifies areas of weakness relative to student performance not only in English Language Arts but other content areas as well. Further, the FCOE clearly discusses the need why early intervention of its ERWC program is vital to the academic success in not only increasing its high school graduation rates but also increasing college retention and graduation rates as well.

Lastly, it is very clear that the Fresno County Office of Education (FCOE) seeks to raise the academic achievement of all students through its ERWC program.

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 ERWC proposes to build upon the curricula and professional development framework that the state has in place in an effort to achieve its desired outcomes relative to the implementation of this project. The FCBOE clearly outlines its goals and objectives that are aligned with the states identified priority problems needed to address the implementation of high quality standards, ensuring college success, and meeting the needs of its ELL students. The ERWC's logic model has provisions for tracking outcomes of this project; particularly, through the use of its grant evaluators. The estimated costs presented in this proposal are reasonable and allocable as the requested funds will be used to supplement the professional development already received by CSU teachers. Further, the ERWC has been noted as an exemplar of an existing program being fully aligned to the Common Core Standards, as noted by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC).

Weaknesses:

Per the proposal, the FCOE clearly states that it can not guarantee the sustainability of this grant beyond the initial 20-hours of professional development. Further, the FCOE is plagued with exploring ways in which it can sustain advanced professional development and coaching components in an effort to provide on-going supports to ensure the objectives outlined in this proposal are met with the fullest fidelity.

Reader's Score: 22

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 work plan submitted in this proposal provides a clear direction of the stated timelines and responsibilities for implementing this project. Further, per the proposal the FCOE insists of its ability to sustain the ERWC based upon established relationships that will be instrumental in infusing this model statewide to address its states pervasive priority problems. The FCOE provided the relevant supporting documentation that ensures that it has personnel in place with the required skills and expertise needed to implement the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)**

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 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:

Per the proposal submitted, the FCOE purposes to devise a pre-collegiate support team comprised of members of its management team to expose its students to pre-collegiate activities that will focus on the following: college affordability, financial aid process, college admissions process, as well as adult and peer mentoring on expectations of college life.

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:

This proposal seeks to address the needs of ELL students and remediate them in the area of English Language Arts in an effort to close existing achievement gaps, high school graduation rates, as well as college and career readiness.

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:

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: 9/23/11 12:00 AM