

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2012 02:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

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	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	80
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	1
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	2
Total	105	82

Technical Review Form

Panel #11 - Full Development Panel - 11: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

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 applicant established a clear set of goals, objectives, outcomes, and related actions that detailed an obvious strategy for addressing Absolute Priority 4 by working to turnaround persistently low performing schools; Competitive Preference Priority 7 by addressing preparedness and expectations for college; and Competitive Preference Priority 10 by creating a technology infused learning environment [Page e24-e29].

The applicant's estimated costs are reasonable because the project involves implementing a new total school reform model rather than implementing an existing model. The new model has a relatively low per student cost of \$850 and future scale up costs of approximately \$437 per student [Pages e29 e30].

In addition, the costs for this new proposed model seem very reasonable and below estimated costs for existing whole school reform models. The expenses are based on a completely new model of school reform [Page e30].

The potential for incorporating the project into ongoing work seems feasible because of the utilization of a sustainability planning process involving each project school, the CCAP, CPS, and school leaders [Page e30].

Weaknesses:

N/A

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 applicant presents an exceptional approach to whole school reform that integrates digital media arts, media literacy, and media-centered professional learning communities for whole school reform. This project should yield an authentically innovative model and that effectively and efficiently address Absolute Priority 4, Competitive Preference Priority 7, and Competitive Preference Priority 10 [Pages e31- e35].

Comprehensive implementation of the applicant 's proposed project should advance theory and knowledge in fields of study related to school turnaround in general as well as integrated arts-based whole school reform models, and media-centered learning communities [Pages e34-e35].

The magnitude of the project 's positive impact on student achievement was effectively estimated by the applicant. The proposal provided performance data from various digital media and integrated arts whole school reform model projects [Page e35].

Weaknesses:

N/A

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:

The applicant 's management plan is more than adequate for carrying-out the project ' s objectives and incorporates detailed Goals, Activities, Milestones, Timelines, and Responsibilities [Page e37].

The qualifications of the project director are outlined in the application. Moreover, key project personnel are listed and have the qualifications needed to carry-out their proposed duties. The Principal Investigator for the Project, has the qualifications and experience needed for the project and the proposed FTE seems reasonable to successfully implement the model outlined in the application. In addition, position descriptions are provided for new positions [Pages e38 e39].

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 20

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.

General:

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

Weaknesses:

N/A

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:

The applicant's description of Convergence Academies addresses: cognitive strategies, academic content knowledge and skills, as well as academic behaviors that would prepare students for college and introduce realistic expectations related to higher education in general [Page e21].

The applicant's description of quarterly informational workshops should address the issue of students better understanding college affordability issues [Page e21].

The applicant's description of Columbia College faculty mentoring should effectively address peer and adult support issues [Page e21].

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 1

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

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

Weaknesses:

N/A

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's attempt to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through high quality digital tools or other technology is adequately addressed because the proposed project will employ high level technology in the form of digital media arts [Page e22].

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2012 02:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2012 09:37 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	19
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	71
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	1
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	2
Total	105	73

Technical Review Form

Panel #11 - Full Development Panel - 11: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

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 applicant has a clear set of three goals, aligned objectives, and specific, measurable outcomes. The strategy is to be implemented in two schools (an elementary and high school) for about 1,200 students. Some of the noteworthy digital activities are: the creation of a K-16 media learning continuum, integrate curriculum units with media and digital coaches supporting and collaborating with teachers. Most of the costs are reasonable.

Weaknesses:

The project is the development and testing of a completely new model (page e30) . They also write there are currently few whole school reform models that focus on technology and digital media and no whole school reforms have integrated digital media arts specifically (page e33). The design lacks sufficient evidence that the proposed outcomes will be achieved. Moreover, the two schools have yet to be identified. None of the goals/objectives clearly state that, after three years, how the schools will be significantly turned around, as defined in USDE Absolute Priority 4. Also, the discussion about incorporating the project into the ongoing work of either the applicant or partners is minimal.

Reader's Score: 19

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 project represents an exceptional and unique approach to turning around lowest performing schools because of the incorporating technology into the curriculum. The partnership of the college and school district is a strength, as evidenced by the detailed letter of agreement (page e133) and substantial letters of support. Moreover, Appendix C and the Bibliography includes a wealth of research studies, previous technology projects, evaluation reports and related publications that support the potential of the project to contribute to the knowledge and practices in this reform project.

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:

Generally, the management plan appears to be strong because it includes a management group, a steering committee and project advisory council. The management plan is outlined in Table 1 by goals, activities and milestones. The qualifications of project staff are presented in the narrative and nine resumes and these demonstrate that they have the training and experience to effectively manage the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

The management plan (Table 1) would be strengthened if it clearly included all of the objectives and measurable outcomes presented in the Design section. It appears that all the members of the management group are college staff. School district representatives are on the steering committee, but do not appear to be on the management group (page e36). Including school district members on the management group would strengthen the partnership and improve communications and likelihood that the school district will be willing and able to continue the sustainability and scale up when the grant funds end.

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:

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

Weaknesses:

N/A

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:

They will implement innovative practices to assist students to enter colleges. They will have college readiness workshops, portfolios, mentoring (page e147) and academies. Topics of college affordability and financial aid are included.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 1

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

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

Weaknesses:

N/A

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:

High quality digital tools, materials, technology are paramount in the proposal. These include multiple tools, such as digital media, film, interactive games, photography and social media. A goal is to infuse technology into student school activities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2012 09:37 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2012 05:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

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	18
Sub Total	100	18
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	18

Technical Review Form

Panel #11 - Full Development Panel - 11: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

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--scored by other reviewers

Weaknesses:

NA--scored by other reviewers

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--scored by other reviewers

Weaknesses:

NA--scored by other reviewers

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--scored by other reviewers

Weaknesses:

NA--scored by other reviewers

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 narrative provides a clear description of the quasi-experimental design, which includes random assignment of schools to treatment/control conditions.

--The evaluation questions are directly linked to the logic model presented in the narrative.

--The evaluation narrative presents a complete and thorough explanation of the assessment instruments,

including validity/reliability information, and frequency of administration.

--The narrative includes multiple methods for data collection from both teachers and students, including achievement measures (student), surveys (student and teacher), classroom observations, and self-assessment questionnaires (teacher). Thus, the evaluators will be able to triangulate information for different methods and sources in determination of project success.

--The evaluator contractor has extensive experience with projects of similar scope and type as the applicant. The lead evaluator is experienced with evaluating school reform initiatives.

--The resources budgeted for the program evaluation should be sufficient to complete an effective evaluation, with about 12% of the total budget allocated for evaluation.

--The activities and data collection for the formative assessments during implementation are varied, which should provide useful periodic information each year to monitor implementation and permit changes during the project, if needed.

Weaknesses:

It is not clear from the application what the total amount of funds is for program evaluation, as the budget narrative states \$95,000 and \$105,000 in various years, while the evaluation narrative specifies \$100,000 and \$110,000.

The budget does not specify the amount of time allocated for the project evaluation activities, either in terms of hours/days of staff or FTE of staff. Thus, it is difficult to determine if the amount of resources for the evaluation is adequate.

Reader's Score: 18

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: 09/21/2012 05:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/24/2012 08:42 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

Reader #4: *****

	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 #11 - Full Development Panel - 11: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

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:

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:

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:

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 proposed project has specified a set of two goals with seven associated objectives (pp. 4-6). These provide targets for the development of the evaluation activities. In addition the proposal includes three major research questions (p. 20) to provide focus to the evaluation design.

A quasi-experimental evaluation design will be used to control for threats to validity. A feature of the design is

the initial selection of a matched pair of elementary feeder schools and a matched pair of high schools. Once the pairs are determined, one school will be randomly assigned to become the treatment school.

The proposal contains a plan for dealing with an excessive attrition rate should it occur.

The proposed project has selected 0.25 as the minimum effect size that it wishes to be able to detect. A power analysis indicates a high degree of probability that this effect size will be able to be detected.

The proposed project has set 0.70 as the minimum validity coefficient and 0.80 as the minimum reliability coefficient that will be acceptable for the data collection instruments to be used in the study. The project expects to primarily rely on pre-established instruments for the data collection.

A formative component of the evaluation will provide information about the fidelity of the implementation. This information will be available to assist the project staff to determine whether the project is on track to provide the services as designed.

In addition to the formative evaluation information, the project evaluation will extensively document the processes that were used to develop the implementation. The outcomes evaluation will also examine which strategies had the greatest impact on student outcomes. This combined information can be helpful to those who might consider replicating the project.

The project has allocated \$305,000 over the three-year project for the support of the external evaluation. This represents approximately 10% of the total project budget and should be adequate to support the external evaluation activities for a project that will serve 1200 students and 50 teachers annually.

The external evaluation contractor has extensive experience evaluating school reform initiative and appears well-qualified to conduct this evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The proposed project plans to use graduate students assistants for data collection and administration of assessments. As they are "employees" of the project no information is provided about procedures that will be in place to ensure the integrity of the data that they will collect.

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 08:42 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/20/2012 06:10 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	23
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management and Personnel	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	78
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	1
Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs		
1. CPP 8	1	
Improving Productivity		
1. CPP 9	1	
Technology		
1. CPP 10	1	1
Sub Total	5	2
Total	105	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #11 - Full Development Panel - 11: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U411C120065)

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 proposed project provides a clear set of goals, strategies and actions aligned to meeting their goals to create whole school reform by focusing on digital media and technology. The actions steps are thorough and provide logical pathways to achieving their objective and outcomes listed on page 6. The costs are reasonable to achieve the project goals and implement the activities serving 1200 students and 50 teachers. The applicant provides cost estimates per student, start up and cost per 100,000, 250,000 and 500,000 students. The applicant provides a clear plan for integrating and sustaining the project after the end of the grant (pg10). The costs needed to meet the projects objectives and the potential significance of the proposed project is reasonable (pages 11 and 12).

Weaknesses:

While the project is infused throughout each grade level and uses research based strategies found in whole school reform, the applicant does not adequately address strategies for comprehensive whole school reform. The project is better aligned to targeted approaches to reform.

Reader's Score: 23

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 represents an exceptional approach to integrating 21st century higher order thinking skills into classroom curriculum and has the potential to advance the knowledge and practices of teaching students technology and multi-media art skills aligned with all areas of the core curriculum. The applicant has designed an evaluation plan that will adequately document the projects effectiveness and the lessons from their evaluation will be used to advance this field of study(page 13). The applicant provides adequate research to substantiate their project will have an impact on improving student achievement and increasing college enrollment rates. (pages 14 and 15)

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:

The management plan provides a very detailed timeline with milestones and persons responsible for each task in Table 1 on page 17. The management plan shows the objectives will be met within the proposed timeline and budget and estimates the growth in student and teacher outcomes over the three years. The applicant provides sufficient evidence, on pages 18-19, that the key project managers have the expertise and experience to manage a project of this size and scope. The Principal Investigator is an expert in the area of arts integration into school curriculum, and their key project leaders have the training and experience providing professional development to teachers and artists in residence and have had experience implementing three federally funded grant initiatives. Management will also occur at each school site using a Steering Committee composed of teachers, parents and the principal which will increase the schools commitment to implement and sustain the work once the project ends.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 20

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

Weaknesses:

na

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:

The applicant provides adequately addresses CPP7 through designing a new curriculum focused on strengthening students reasoning and analytical skills needed for college. The applicant will provide students support in understanding college affordability and the college application process and will provide student mentoring support from Columbia College students and faculty (page1)

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

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:

The applicant's goals, strategies and action steps are focused on infusing technology and media arts throughout the school curriculum. The project will build teacher and students skills in using technology to increase and enhance student learning and academic achievement.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/20/2012 06:10 AM