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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. Utilizing human subjects in a study enhances the results obtained for various reasons, such as teacher professional development, student interventions, informing teachers and making valuable suggestions to them regarding student growth, etc., and the fact that the Internationals Network for Public Schools has numerous protocols in place to guarantee that student identification will not be disclosed, and personal test scores will be safeguarded throughout the study process, enhances parent permission for their student to receive services. (e-14)

2. The Project Design clearly addresses the dilemma of English Language Learners entering high school and establishes Goals in Project Realizing International Supports for English Language Learners (RISE). These goals are: 1. Collaborative interdisciplinary teaching teams responsible for 2. The same heterogeneous group of students will support enhanced teaching effectiveness to 3. Integrate language and content in 4. Collaborative experiential projects across the curriculum, resulting in high educational outcomes for English language learners. (e-18) The Objectives which are also addressed are 1. The creation of an integrated development process to implement Project Strategies in PLP Sites 2. Successful implementation of RISE at 2 Persistently Low Performing (PLP) schools with large English learning language populations 3. Improved English language learners outcomes and 4. Communicate findings to the field to ensure English language learners are full beneficiaries of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) implementation. The intended project outcomes are 1. Supports designed to increase teaching effectiveness, English Language Learners achievement and capacity of site based personnel to sustain work, 2. Successful implementation of their key elements and trained school and district personnel to sustain instructional and structural model, 3. Increased teaching effectiveness and measurable gains in English language learners students achievement and 4. Nation-wide dissemination of best practice plans and tools for model implementation are noted throughout the proposal. The goals, objectives and outcomes are aligned to Competitive Priority 4 through a targeted approach, which supports English language learners. (e-18).

3. The focus of this proposal is to improve the opportunities for 1,100 at-risk students (English Language Learners) that attend school in Persistently Low Performing Schools (PLP) to graduate from high school, meet the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and pass all necessary state examinations to obtain their high
school diplomas and gain entrance into a two or four year college. (e-18)

4. The Internationals Network for Public Schools addresses scaling up its project from 1,100 students to the required 100,000, 250,000 and 500,000 in a unique fashion. It looks at costs associated with student learning and scales costs based on development of materials, testing implementation and evaluation. The Internationals Network for Public Schools also scales up the starting costs and provides a 2% Cost of Living in its calculations. The costs are reasonable when considering the - $627 per student to deliver such a labor intensive program. (e-31)

5. Internationals Network for Public Schools has planned for the incorporation of its project purposes, activities and benefits into its ongoing work, as well as its partners' work, at the beginning as well as at the end of the development grant. The information provided in the Appendices through this proposal such as Charts that address the reduced lunches, student populations by ethnicity, graduation rates, learning gaps for students in English Language Arts and mathematics, Regents Scores, College Acceptance Rates High School Dropout Rates, student enrollment in courses such as Pathways by school, and credits earned by high school is rich and supports the developmental grant's initiative. (e-50-e-58)

Weaknesses:

1. Internationals Network for Public Schools utilizes acronyms prior to identification in the narrative and continues throughout the proposal making it difficult to follow. (e-13)

2. Empowering teachers to make a difference for at-risk students is a fantastic attitude; however, after providing teachers with professional development to implement the goals and objectives of RISE, the assumption of long-term sustainability resulting from the building of district capacity should result in a more cost effective participation in facilitated peer structures for leaders and faculty, but does not always happen. Internationals Network does not indicate how it will deal with such a situation should it occur. (e-32)

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:

1. The proposal points out that English Language Learners are at risk because these students are in large classes and that over 30% of all school in the national that do not reach Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) fall within this specific student population. Both the fact that these students are English Language Learners and are enrolled in large sized classes contribute to the risk factors that each encounters. This research supports the stand that Internationals High Schools is taking to meet the needs of this specific at-risk population. In New York, students must pass a rigorous Regents Examination to obtain their high school diploma. Many of these students have not been in the country for 4 years or more and continue to have difficulty reading the Regents Examination. The research provided within the proposal not only supports the priorities but also supports students being able to be successful. (e-33)
2. This project utilizes the Common Core State Standards as the primary teaching and learning tool for student success. The results gained from this proposal should advance theory, knowledge and teacher practice. (e-34-e36)

3. The project as proposed should have a positive impact on all student achievement. While this project focuses on English Language Learners, the Internationals Network for Public Schools clearly states within its proposal that it will share results enabling other schools to adopt the curriculum to their populations as well. Rich data and research is provided that support this statement. (e-35-e-37)

Weaknesses:
1. While the proposal indicates that one major cause of English Language Learners inability to perform within the school day is because students are heterogeneously grouped with a large number of students, the proposal does not indicate any form of support (additional teachers) working with the English Language Learners during class time. Also, there is no budgetary provision to add any additional teaching staff. (e-22; e-134-e-147)

2. The focus of learning is authentic assessment through projects that will support students communication skills listening, speaking and writing. More samples of the intended projects would enable the reader to see the benefits of such projects for all learners and not just the focus group of at-risk learners. (e-34-35)

Reader's Score: 33

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. The Management Plan is adequate to meet the objectives as noted in the proposal on time and within budget. The responsibilities of the individuals and the time within which they are to be met are noted by year. (e-37-39)

2. The Internationals Network for Public Schools has established a highly qualified group of professionals to implement its proposal. The individuals have experience in managing projects of this scope and size. Many of the individuals who resumes are provided have experience working with students who have underperformed because of language barriers. This project will not only address a specific group of English Language Learners but will also provide the means for these students to be successful. (Appendix F, e-40-41)

Weaknesses:
1. The individual responsibilities are noted within the proposal's Management Plan, but there is a concern as the oversight for teaching and learning within a school lies with that school's principal. While each and every learning community is different, the Management Plan has left the school principal out and he or she needs to be part of the initial planning. (e-37-39)

2. The proposal would have been strengthened if, in the Management Plan's individual roles, milestones and
training modules could have been in place. This information would have greatly enhanced the proposal. The applicant would have done well to provide an explanation of why they were left out. (e-38-40)

Reader's Score: 18

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 applicable.

   **Weaknesses:**
   Not applicable.

   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:**
   Not applicable.
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 Internationals Network addresses students preparedness and will provide not only students but parents with workshops related to college entrance and retention.

Workshops will be provided for students and parents on how they, too, can afford college and how the financial aid system works in the United States.

The support will come in the form of workshops where qualified individuals will assist students and parents in making the college application process easier while providing students with a goal to obtain.

(E-21-22)

Weaknesses:
None are apparent.

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:
ALL students will utilize the Common Core of State Standards to learn through authentic means. Students will learn through projects and engage in listening, speaking and writing about topics that address career-readiness, high school graduation, college readiness, etc., thus increasing high school graduation rates. (E-22-23)
Weaknesses:
None are apparent.

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:
Not applicable.

Weaknesses:
Not applicable.

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:
Not applicable.

Weaknesses:
Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0
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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. The proposed project will implement a targeted reform model to increase teacher effectiveness, school and district leadership and increase student achievement, graduation rates and college readiness for English language Learners (ELL) within Persistently Low Performing Schools based on a whole school reform model that has been implemented successfully across 16 schools.

2. The proposed project will work with 1100 ELL students within two school districts, the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) and San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), that will provide two very different perspectives on what is required for successful implementation within Persistently Low Performing Schools. As described on pages e26-27, these districts were selected based on previous collaborations with the organization, the opportunity to implement in different size urban districts, different numbers of ELL students, different local policy and reform contexts and similar implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

3. The reform model as described on pages e24-e27 will determine the effectiveness of changes in structure by having teams of teachers work with heterogeneous groups of students, using new instructional practice with the integration of language development through content and project-based learning, and extensive professional learning in accelerating ELL student achievement.

4. Project objectives include extensive evaluation and re-design of a current whole school model for ELL students to a targeted school approach for a Persistently Low Performing School structure which is a critical aspect that is many times overlooked as an essential component for successful implementation. As described on pages e27-e28, products under consideration include professional development modules, teacher goal setting, observation and feedback tools, coaching models, access to curricular lessons and content, and institutes for teachers and leadership.

5. The proposed project will work directly with the partner districts as described on pages e28-e29 to select the treatment schools, thereby ensuring the capacity to implement the project effectively. Initial activities will include conducting a needs assessment, conducting professional development and capacity building activities, setting goals and setting a timeline for implementation. Over the grant period the activities will be expanded to include curriculum development, job-embedded professional development and extensive capacity building to ensure sustainability after funding ends.

6. The proposed project will cost an average of $627 per student after initial development costs, which
are reasonable. The project reform model includes a very well-thought out plan for sustained capacity, effective implementation and scalability across multiple low performing schools under various contexts and policies with large student populations of ELL.

Weaknesses:
1. Even though the project provides an effective targeted approach to increasing ELLs achievement, the project does not take into account potential barriers that may affect implementation within the schools. The project would have been strengthened if the proposal clearly addressed, identified and documented issues that plague many Persistently Low Performing Schools and how the potential barriers would be effectively overcome if present. Barriers can include high teacher attrition, potential for high numbers of novice teachers at the school, possible scheduling constraints mandated through State and Federal policy, and leadership turnover due to low performance and burnout.

Reader’s Score: 22

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 proposed project provides specific strategies and reform structures to support increased ELL student achievement and increased leadership and teacher capacity as described on page e27-e29 and e32-e33 that can be overlooked as a key component to a school’s low performance and achievement gap. Additionally, the project targets high school ELL students to accelerate their achievement supporting increased graduation rates.

2. The proposed project is based on extensive research described on pages e25-e26 that demonstrates the effectiveness of grouping ELL students heterogeneously instead of homogeneously, teaching language acquisition through the context of specific content and projects and the importance of building capacity to ensure highly effective leaders and teachers within a low performing school.

3. The transition to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics will be particularly difficult for students in the process of language acquisition. Furthermore, with limited research on the impact of the CCSS on ELL and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) student achievement, effective reform strategies need to be tested and validated to ensure future student success. This proposed project will test the generalizability and scalability of a well-documented reform model within two new contexts to further the research base of effective strategies.

4. The proposed project provides extensive student achievement data documented on pages e50-e58 that supports the likelihood that this project will have a positive impact on student achievement, narrowing the achievement gap, increasing college readiness rates and graduation rates.

Weaknesses:
1. The project will re-structure classes by heterogeneous grouping; however, the narrative does not include information or budget implications (e23, e132-e147) on how this structure will impact staffing of teachers. If the narrative or budget would have included information for per student staffing ratio, it would
have strengthened the proposed project.

Reader’s Score: 32

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. The well-defined management plan described on pages e38-e39 will maintain timelines and budget by 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 management plan includes expertise based on the required activities: A Project Director, Director of Professional Development, Director of National Initiatives and the support of the American Institute of Research (AIR) for all evaluation components. This model will provide an effective framework for establishing clear roles and responsibilities across the implementation plan that will ensure alignment across teams.

3. The extensive expertise of the management team includes national leaders in ELL research and effective strategies, curriculum development, professional development and evaluation. The management team has an extensive background of implementing successful large scale projects.

Weaknesses:

1. The proposed project does not describe the role of the school site administrator for overseeing the daily implementation of teaching and learning for the targeted ELL students within the selected schools.

2. The proposed project does not clearly explain the monitoring plan to ensure effective implementation of the project.

Reader’s Score: 18

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 Applicable.

Weaknesses:
Not Applicable.

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:
Not Applicable

Weaknesses:
Not Applicable

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:

3. The reform model as described on pages e24-e27 will determine the effectiveness of changes in structure by having teams of teachers work with heterogeneous groups of students, using new instructional practice with the integration of language development through content and project-based learning, and extensive professional learning in accelerating ELL student achievement, thus improving college readiness and graduation rates.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

The targeted reform model proposes to increase teacher effectiveness, school and district leadership and increase student achievement, graduation rates and college readiness for ELLs within Persistently Low Performing Schools. The project will work with 1100 ELLs within two school districts, the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) and San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), which will provide two very different perspectives on what is required for successful implementation within Persistently Low Performing Schools, thereby providing different potential models that can be replicated. The proposed strategies will include new structures and grouping of ELL students into heterogeneous groups, extensive professional development and language development through the context of content and project-based learning. These strategies will accelerate academic language development because the students will be in classes with their English-speaking peers, build capacity of the teaching staff, and provide ELLs with the opportunity to make connections through authentic activities.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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.
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:
Not Applicable

Weaknesses:
Not Applicable

Reader's Score: 0
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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

Weaknesses:
N/A

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.
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

Weaknesses:
N/A

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 applicant provides a satisfactory evaluation plan. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected from surveys, interviews, focus groups, and student records. Staff will use propensity score matching of students in participant and comparison schools to form groups. An interrupted time-series analysis will be used to determine impact on student outcomes (p. 24). Evaluation results will be made available through research briefs during the project and one summative report at project end (p. 25). The plan includes...
satisfactory resources to conduct the evaluation. The project will contract with American Institutes for Research (AIR). The staff has extensive experience in educational research, with specific emphasis on the academic achievement of English Language Learners. Sufficient funds have been allocated to support the evaluation.

Weaknesses:
The plan does not clearly propose evaluation questions, so the focus of the evaluation was not clear. Also, it was not evident how the evaluation was designed to deliver information that can assist with development, replication, or testing in diverse settings, such as how successful project implementation results would be summarized for future use by other entities. And, requested funds for evaluation fees were high considering the proposed plan and methods (three points not awarded).

Reader's Score: 17

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
provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:
N/A

Weaknesses:
N/A

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:
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:
N/A

Weaknesses:
N/A

Reader's Score: 0
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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
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  1. CPP 8                                        1
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Applicant: Internationals Network For Public Schools (U411C120051)

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

Weaknesses:
N/A

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.
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

Weaknesses:
N/A

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 evaluation plan was tightly knit to the project's goals and objectives. The formative evaluation was particularly thorough and included a close monitoring of project products and training. The plans are set up to give feedback about every aspect of grant activity. The reports are timed to coincide with project planning. The evaluation is staffed by an impressive team of qualified experts, both in terms of the subject matter and evaluation methodologies.
Weaknesses:
The evaluation would be strengthened by clear evaluation questions. The project's plans to disseminate beyond the project itself were extensive but evaluation didn't appear to be a part of that (p. 11 & 19). The addition of propensity score matching (p. 25) seems tacked on, in that there is little explanation of the matching variables to judge their adequacy, which is important for a population such as that being treated. Despite the detailed and extensive evaluation plan, the budget is high.

Reader's Score: 17

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:
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## 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              | 1             |

**Improving Productivity**

1. CPP 9                                        | 1              |               |

**Technology**

1. CPP 10                                       | 1              |               |

Sub Total                                       | 5              | 2             |

Total                                           | 105            | 75            |
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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. The applicant provides clear and concise goals for the design of an English Language Learners (ELL) focused high school using the Internationals model. (pp. e23)
2. Sufficient data is provided to demonstrate a gap in student graduation rates with NYC ELL students having lower graduation rates than NYC and INTLS NYC averages. (pp. e24)
3. The applicant proposes a plan to transition new International Intensive Institutes (IIIs) with scaffolding support over a period of a year and a half with implementation beginning in SY 2014-15. (pp.e28-e29)
4. Actions are well aligned with Priorities 6 and 7. (pp. e30-e31)
5. The estimated annual operating cost per student is $627 including an annual cost of living increase in salaries and benefits which is deemed reasonable for the level of support provided for students. (pp. e31)
6. Start-up cost and scale-up are reasonable and in line with the proposed activities and level of student support. (pp.e31)
7. The International High Schools are a probable and reasonable addition to the participating districts high school offerings and will increase options for students and families making the program appealing.

Weaknesses:

1. While there is a focus on heterogeneous grouping for students, it is not clear how teachers will be supported in differentiating instruction to meet the individual learning needs of students while ensuring rigorous instruction for all. (pp. e25)
2. An estimated or proposed teacher to student ratio would aid in determining cost alignment and the level of support for ELL students.

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:

1. The proposal represents an exceptional approach supported by research-based strategies.
2. The proposal has the potential to increase graduation rates and standardized test scores for ELL students. (pp.e37)
3. Instructional and design strategies are supported with research.

Weaknesses:

1. The impact of the number of teachers needed to implement this program is not discussed. (i.e. the optimal student to teacher ratio for highest levels of effectiveness and the costs related to hiring additional teachers)

Reader's Score: 33

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. The executive director is clearly identified possessing sufficient experience and expertise to oversee project implementation. (pp. e37)
2. Key personnel are clearly identified with supporting resumes in the addendum indicating sufficient capacity of the management team to complete the proposed activities. (addendum)
3. The applicant provides a clear and sequential timeline covering activities, outcomes and responsible groups. (pp. e38-e39)
Weaknesses:
1. The applicant does not indicate milestones to ensure check points for progression and success throughout implementation.
2. Training modules are not in place in SY 2014-15, SY 2015-16 and SY 2016-17; thereby diminishing effectiveness and fidelity of Instructional Coach work in those years.
3. The management plan does not consider the training of new employees to sustain momentum and impact for program implementation.
4. Principals are not included in the management plan to ensure that they are properly trained for observing the process and ensuring fidelity.

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:
1. 

Weaknesses:
1. 

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.
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:
1. The applicant proposes a clear plan with the potential to extend opportunities and create direct pathways that support students in accessing post secondary education.

Weaknesses:
1. 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:
1. The applicant clearly provides support for LEP students to improve English language acquisition with a high school design that embraces English Language Learners.
No weaknesses noted.

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:

Weaknesses:

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:
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