

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2012 09:18 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Reader #1: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 25 | 25 |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 35 |
| Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel | | |
| 1. Management and Personnel | 20 | 19 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 79 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority | | |
| Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes | | |
| 1. CPP 6 | 1 | |
| Innovations that Support College Access & Success | | |
| 1. CPP 7 | 1 | |
| Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs | | |
| 1. CPP 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Improving Productivity | | |
| 1. CPP 9 | 1 | |
| Technology | | |
| 1. CPP 10 | 1 | 1 |
| Sub Total | 5 | 1 |
| Total | 105 | 80 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Full Development Panel - 3: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design 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 applicants 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.

(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:

Targeting populations of students with learning disabilities and those that are ELL is a strength of this proposal. The STEM Delivery Pyramid (Fig. 1, p. 1) provides a coherent overview which allows the reviewers to get the big picture of the foundation for the proposal. The tiered level of involvement (e.g. level 2 involving weekly meetings with professionals, STEM Club, Summer Camp, etc.) seems to be an excellent way to continue and extend student involvement for those interested in STEM. All costs are outlined and appear reasonable. The multiple partnerships with STEM related professionals and organizations support the idea that the activities begun through this project would continue following the end of funding.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of 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 potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(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 continuous support provided throughout this project and the strong partnerships with community professionals are indicators this project will be successful. The authors provide appropriate research that supports the foundation of the proposed project. Cogent arguments of how the outcomes of this project will lead to positive impacts on student achievement and closing achievement gaps are provided.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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:

Project staff are experienced in their content areas and with past grant projects. Clearly defined responsibilities, time lines and milestones are presented and are achievable. The partnering institutions (e.g., Cleveland Clinic, DCC Architects, First NV, etc.) will provide expertise and essential services to the project that will include internships, materials and supplies, and volunteers. These types of community partnerships help make projects like the proposed successful endeavors.

Weaknesses:

Staff experience in STEM and in students with disabilities and ELL could be stronger. The qualifications within the vita presented have very few references to experience with ELL and are none are found pertaining to work with students with disabilities. If these are the populations of the target group of students, then it would be important to have the staff well experienced with these populations.

Reader's Score: 19

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data

and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

NA scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

1. 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 - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. 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 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

1. 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:

A large number of students will be invited to participate and a portion of these will be students with disabilities and ELL. However, it is unclear how specific accommodations will be made for the unique needs of these learners. It was mentioned that information will be translated for ELL, however, this is not sufficient.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Productivity

1. 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 - Technology

- 1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

The applicant plans to incorporate various technology applications (e.g. 3D modeling, robotics) and continue their use through multiple grades. For this application, this is a positive as this incorporation reinforces skills and applications of these technologies.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: **1**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/24/2012 09:18 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2012 10:26 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Reader #2: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 25 | 0 |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 0 |
| Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel | | |
| 1. Management and Personnel | 20 | 0 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 19 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 19 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority | | |
| Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes | | |
| 1. CPP 6 | 1 | |
| Innovations that Support College Access & Success | | |
| 1. CPP 7 | 1 | |
| Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs | | |
| 1. CPP 8 | 1 | |
| Improving Productivity | | |
| 1. CPP 9 | 1 | |
| Technology | | |
| 1. CPP 10 | 1 | |
| Sub Total | 5 | |
| Total | 105 | 19 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Full Development Panel - 3: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design 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 applicants 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.

(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:

N/A -- Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

N/A -- Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of 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 potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(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:

N/A -- Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

N/A -- Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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:

N/A -- Scored by another reviewer

Weaknesses:

N/A -- Scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The evaluators will employ a quasi-experimental design with a control group of nonparticipant schools, who share similar size, scores, socioeconomic characteristics, and ELL composition (e35). In total, 4 participant schools and 16 control schools will take part.

The evaluation questions are solid (e38) and test for actionable outcomes. The summative questions are

notable for their segmentation of subpopulations of students.

The use of 3-level HLM will examine Science CRT scores and student survey data, as well as 8th grade Math and Reading and student outcomes (as reported by surveys assessments.) As the proposal suggests, a small sample size may limit some of the usefulness of the analysis (e37), but the analysis will still provide reasonable trending results at this phase of the project's lifecycle.

Further, the HLM will utilize a measure of the level of implementation to try to measure how the degree of implementation affects results (e39). The team will measure implementation fidelity through modification of an established definition (e38) .

The evaluation team will offer quarterly and interim reporting (e33), which will provide an ongoing feedback loop to team members and teachers.

The team expresses a willingness to share project data (e26).

WestEd will serve as the external evaluator; West Ed's team has evaluated NEA, Chicago Public Schools, and California educational initiatives (e32). The proposed budget seems reasonable.

Weaknesses:

More detail around how a "positive student/teacher" outcome will be measured would be helpful to the proposal.

Similarly, sample size information would be helpful. How large, for example, will the "case study" sample be.

The team states a willingness to share data with other districts (e26), but does not provide information on how the results will be disseminated.

Reader's Score: 19

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

1. 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 - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. 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 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

1. 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 - Improving Productivity

1. 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 - Technology

1. 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: 09/19/2012 10:26 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2012 08:51 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Reader #3: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 25 | 0 |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 0 |
| Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel | | |
| 1. Management and Personnel | 20 | 0 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 19 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 19 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority | | |
| Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes | | |
| 1. CPP 6 | 1 | |
| Innovations that Support College Access & Success | | |
| 1. CPP 7 | 1 | |
| Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs | | |
| 1. CPP 8 | 1 | |
| Improving Productivity | | |
| 1. CPP 9 | 1 | |
| Technology | | |
| 1. CPP 10 | 1 | |
| Sub Total | 5 | |
| Total | 105 | 19 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Full Development Panel - 3: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design 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 applicants 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.

(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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of 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 potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

This grant proposal has several strengths in the quality of the evaluation design. One of strongest features of this evaluation plan is the considerable capabilities and experience of the combination of the evaluators and researchers that will be managing, implementing, and conducting the evaluation of this study. A related contributing factor and huge benefit of this proposal is long term experience and involvement of the program evaluator, West ED, with program evaluation research. The evaluation program timelines are clear-cut and

explicitly stated. The evaluation activities are embedded in the overall project timelines and this suggests firm collaboration and cohesiveness between the project team, the evaluation team, and the other project consultants.

There is a rich discussion on interim reporting and sharing of the evaluation data and findings. There appears to be both formative and summative evaluation activities and a solid implementation plan that imply high-quality implementation with fidelity.

The evaluation methodology is a robust research design utilizing a quasi-experimental design approach and matched group comparison. It is an additional strength to quote previous studies and apply those results to this study. The use of multiple rigorous data analysis tools to measure indicators of project success such as multivariate statistics and HLM. Well-known researchers cited such as Shadish, Cook, and Campbell on page 20 and Randenbush and Byrd on page 21.

Weaknesses:

The applicants were not explicit and specific on what evaluation activities justifies the 9% of the project budget requested for the program evaluation on page 40. Also the proposal would have been strengthen should an evaluation log map had been included which would add inputs, outputs, outcomes, and long and short term evaluation goals.

Reader's Score: 19

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

1. **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 - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. 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 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

1. 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 - Improving Productivity

1. 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 - Technology

1. 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: 09/24/2012 08:51 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2012 10:54 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Reader #4: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 25 | 25 |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 35 |
| Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel | | |
| 1. Management and Personnel | 20 | 14 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 74 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority | | |
| Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes | | |
| 1. CPP 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Innovations that Support College Access & Success | | |
| 1. CPP 7 | 1 | 0 |
| Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs | | |
| 1. CPP 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Improving Productivity | | |
| 1. CPP 9 | 1 | 0 |
| Technology | | |
| 1. CPP 10 | 1 | 1 |
| Sub Total | 5 | 1 |
| Total | 105 | 75 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Full Development Panel - 3: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design 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 applicants 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.

(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 overall strategy is supported by goals, objectives, strategies / activities and outcomes that are aligned with the established priority. The applicant can achieve the intended goals, objectives and outcomes.

Per student / per year cost estimates associated with the execution of this project are reasonable, as well as the scale-up cost estimates. Costs also are expected to decrease as resources are invested in the program and the number of students served increases.

The applicant indicates that the proposed project is designed for sustainability. As project outcomes are validated there will be grounds for soliciting support, through community partnerships, to incorporate the activities and benefits in the work of the applicant and its partners.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of 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 potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

(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 proposed project exhibits the vital importance of a multifaceted approach to promoting STEM education with an appropriate emphasis on teacher development, learning networks, and administrative support. The delivery model that the applicant advocates targets students at the entry point of the STEM pathway and supports science achievement while simultaneously recruiting students to pursue STEM studies.

As the applicant notes, evaluating the effectiveness of this practical STEM delivery model might advance the theory, knowledge and practice, which concern the "structures and supports necessary for a STEM education framework that is rigorous, accessible to all students, and stimulates and sustains progressively deeper involvement in STEM" (Page 15).

There is good evidence that the applicant can use the Project-Based Learning model described above to have a positive impact on student achievement, dropout rates and other.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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:

Project oversight rests with the school district's management, which selected personnel with relevant research, educational and project management experience to implement the proposed project. This ensures, as much as possible, that the project is successful -- fiscally and programmatically.

The applicant has provided a very general project timeline that includes dates, milestones / activities, and assigned project personnel.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant has provided information on the experience and qualifications for some of the key project personnel, there are missing details about specific duties that are germane to ensuring that the project will be carried out successfully (Pages 15-17).

Although the applicant plans to serve students with disabilities (specifically learning disabilities) and English Language Learners, there is no evidence that there are project personnel who have expertise with programs that serve these two groups of students.

The applicant indicated that the project is designed for sustainability (Page 11); however tasks related thereto are not indicated.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

- (1) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (2) **The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.**
- (3) **The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Strengths:

N/A. Scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A. Scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes**

1. **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. Not selected by the applicant.

Weaknesses:

N/A. Not selected by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. 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:

N/A. Not selected by the applicant.

Weaknesses:

N/A. Not selected by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

1. 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:

There are no strengths.

Weaknesses:

The proposed project does not address the tenets of this competitive preference priority as indicated in its description.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Productivity

- 1. 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. Not selected by the applicant.

Weaknesses:

N/A. Not selected by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Technology

- 1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

The applicant has integrated high-quality digital tools, modeling software and other technologies for STEM teaching and learning that uses project-based learning. Teachers receive professional development in order to prepare to deliver technology-rich project-based curricula to link science with technology, robotics and engineering. The technologies are set to improve teacher effectiveness and spark students' interest and improve student achievement.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/24/2012 10:54 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2012 11:51 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Reader #5: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 25 | 24 |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 35 | 35 |
| Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel | | |
| 1. Management and Personnel | 20 | 17 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 20 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 76 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority | | |
| Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes | | |
| 1. CPP 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Innovations that Support College Access & Success | | |
| 1. CPP 7 | 1 | 0 |
| Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs | | |
| 1. CPP 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Improving Productivity | | |
| 1. CPP 9 | 1 | 0 |
| Technology | | |
| 1. CPP 10 | 1 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 5 | 1 |
| Total | 105 | 77 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Full Development Panel - 3: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Clark County School District (U411C120052)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design 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 applicants 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.

(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. P. 2 This project employs the use of two proven STEM education initiatives PTLW and GTT to provide hands on, authentic, problem solving curricula to middle school students. P. 3 The project provides specific examples of what types of activities the students will engage in (3D modeling/frequent field trips to reinforce classroom learning and link that to real world experiences) and provides a logical and seamless progression of curriculum delivery from grades 6-8 . The project has collaborated with community partners to the extent that they propose the specific activities and learning experiences that the partners will help provide.

2. P. 4 Students will participate in informal STEM learning through STEM club and summer camps. This offers long-term, ongoing, sustained exposure to STEM content in a variety of ways.

3. The project provides sustained STEM deliver into high school grades and also has outlined the depth of knowledge levels that will be applied. P. 5 Students will work beside STEM professionals and learn the hidden rules of work in a STEM context. P. 6

4. The project proposes long term and sustained training for teachers who will be involved in curriculum delivery and creates an avenue for the development of STEM professional learning communities. P. 7

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

1. There is no mention of how community partners such as university personnel and industry professionals who will direct student internships will learn skills for cultivating relationships with students analogous to the positive youth development training offered to the projects teachers p. 7. Teachers have extensive experience with PYD but industry persons may not.

Reader's Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of 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 potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.
- (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 a multi-level, multi-faceted approach to increasing student interest in the STEM disciplines, especially with underrepresented youth. Teachers will also be given the support needed to deliver the curricula in an appropriate manner.
2. The project provides reasonable scale up costs. P. 10-11.
3. The project provides a well established research base to justify the use of their proposed curriculum model. P. 12-13-14.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

1. None noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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. Project staff has extensive experience in grants management. P. 15-17. This demonstrated experience provides assurance that the project will be managed appropriately.
2. Project timeline provides a logical progression of activities to meet the objectives outlined in the proposal. P. 18-19. The project is well targeted and will provide substantial benefit to STEM content in the region.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

1. Only one member of the project staff has significant experience and training in STEM disciplines. It would be helpful if the project included individuals with a significant amount of teaching experience in STEM disciplines at the middle and secondary level on the management team. The project does not specify whether any person on the management team has substantive experience with programs such as Project Lead the Way. A sound foundation in the use of PTLW teaching techniques is critical to the project's success.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

Not part of my evaluation area.

Weaknesses:

Not part of my evaluation area.

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

- 1. 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 This CPP is not addressed in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

N/A This CPP is not addressed in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations that Support College Access & Success

1. 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:

N/A This CPP is not addressed in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

N/A This CPP is not addressed in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs

1. 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:

Provides authentic and engaging STEM experiences for students, extracurricular opportunities with community professionals and serves both English Language Learners and exceptional students.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Productivity

1. 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 This CPP is not addressed in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

N/A This CPP is not addressed in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Technology

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

The project intends to integrate education technology and information technology learning environments integrated with research proven engineering curricula such as PTLW.

Weaknesses:

none.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/24/2012 11:51 AM