

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 04:19 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	25	25
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	25
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CCP 6	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CCP 7	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
1. CPP 8	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
1. CPP 9	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

1. CPP 10

	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	1
<b>Total</b>	105	76

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

### 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 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 Validation grant.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

#### Strengths:

The Applicant's goals are ambitious, clear and specific with strategies and activities to accomplish the project's goals (e27-e38).

The applicant notes a history of working with school districts and indicates that partner districts have demonstrated their willingness to sustain the project's objectives after the grant ends (e38-e39). In addition, sustainability will be demonstrated through enriching the leadership pool, collaborative implementation of high quality professional development, transfer of leadership to districts and ensuring the program's place in NTC's ongoing work (e38-e39).

The applicant estimates the start-up costs of the proposed project to be \$1,061,870 (year one) and operating costs is \$15,110,491 (years 2-5). The estimated costs for the applicant to reach 100,000 students is \$164 per student, the cost to reach 250,000 students is \$65 per student, and the cost to serve 500,000 students is \$33 per student (p. e41). The costs seem reasonable relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 25

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- (3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

This application is an exceptional approach to addressing the improvement of achievement in low-performing schools by the utilization of highly trained full-released mentors chosen from within the LEA.

The applicant described how its project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. Research was referenced throughout the proposal. The services described in the application are based on the most current information and research available to this program, because it is based on previous experience and evaluations from their previous program that has been in place.

The applicant provides information about their claim to the effectiveness of the proposed project. The research/studies provided by the applicant shows that the applicant performs results-driven work.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 25

**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 complex projects.
- (3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate,

based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

**Strengths:**

The applicant outlined a clear and defined management plan and identified key personnel , responsibilities, their specific tasks, a timeline, and milestones for accomplishing the project s objectives (p. e45-46).

The applicant provides the names of the project s key personnel and specific tasks in managing the programs, resumes were submitted, and the key personnel selected reflect a highly qualified team to implement and manage the complex programs (p. e45-e50).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**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 include a well-designed experimental study or a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6**

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:**

**Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**

**Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8**

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:**

**Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9**

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:**

**Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10**

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 proposes to use several means of technology to improve student achievement and teacher effectiveness. For example, [REDACTED] (an online mentoring program), [REDACTED] tools, and [REDACTED]

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 1**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/04/2012 04:19 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 05:52 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	25	25
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	25
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CCP 6	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CCP 7	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
1. CPP 8	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
1. CPP 9	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

1. CPP 10

	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	1
<b>Total</b>	105	76

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

### 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 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 Validation grant.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

#### Strengths:

The project design offers a solid solution that comprehensively addresses priority #1, teacher effectiveness. The applicant clearly outlines goals and describes a systematic set of activities to meet those goals. Its unique approach focuses on a 2-year induction and mentoring model for beginning teachers in high needs schools in an effort to increase employee retention. A strength of the project design is the use of digital tools such as the [REDACTED] (p.1) to help mentors and mentees collaborate, which addresses CPP #10. Also impressive is the use of full release mentors in contrast to the traditional buddy system that is often a quick fix and ineffective approach (p.8). The potential results could not only help to retain more effective beginning teachers but would also provide rigorous training for principals and mentors. The applicant intentionally selects three LEAs of differing demographics (a dense urban district, a rural district, and a multi-ethnic metropolitan area), which should provide broad results for replication. Much attention is devoted to the sustainability of the grant and transferring responsibility in an intentional release method. The applicant clearly outlines a reasonable budget and justifies how the high initial costs will pay off in results at the end of the grant.

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**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 extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

This proposal is an exceptional approach to Absolute Priority #1. It provides strong evidence using data from 14 years of providing mentoring and induction services across the United States. The applicant cites current research supporting the effectiveness of full release mentors and how this ultimately increases student achievement. Comprehensive professional development for first and second year teachers is critical to the goal of increasing effective teachers in high needs schools, and this application successfully describes an innovative solution.

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score:** 25

**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 complex projects.

(3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

**Strengths:**

This application clearly outlines the responsibilities, timelines, and milestones of their 5-year mentoring project. It is evident from the qualifications of the project director and other key personnel that they have the experience necessary to make results happen and vast "on the ground" experience at managing complex projects.

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 25**

**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 include a well-designed experimental study or a well-designed quasi-experimental study.**

**(2) 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.**

**(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.**

**(4) 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 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6**

**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 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7**

- 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 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8**

- 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 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9**

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 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10**

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:**

This application from the New Teacher Center plans to use the digital tools of e-Mentoring for Student Success and the [REDACTED] both of which will support beginning teachers and positively impact student achievement. The e-Mentoring will assist with geographic challenges that prohibit the use of a face-to-face mentoring model with a special focus on special education and grades 6-12 math and science. The online Formative Assessment System tools explained in the narrative will allow mentors and mentees to keep mentoring and observational data organized and secure online.

**Weaknesses:**

Reader's Score: 1

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/04/2012 05:52 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 08:09 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	25	0
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	0
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	23
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CCP 6	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CCP 7	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
1. CPP 8	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
1. CPP 9	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

1. CPP 10

**Sub Total** 1

**Total** 105 23

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

### 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 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 Validation grant.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

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 extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**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 complex projects.

(3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

**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 include a well-designed experimental study or a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

**(2) 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.**

**(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.**

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides four goals, each with one or more outcomes, three of which are well-addressed by the research questions identified in the evaluation plan. The evaluation plan includes impact, exploratory and implementation questions to address three of the four goals. Although the improved teacher retention goal is not specifically included in any of these questions, retention data is included among the teacher outcome measures. Two separate designs will be implemented to account for differences in site characteristics. A randomized control trial (RCT) will be used in two sites to compare NCT induction to status quo induction practices. To account for the broad set of induction strategies already in place at the third site the difference between served and un-served new teachers will be evaluated. How the RCTs will be conducted is well explained in the proposal as is the sampling for difference-in-differences study to be conducted at the third site. The evaluation plan provides appropriate two- and three-level hierarchical models for analyzing NTC effects on teacher outcomes and student outcomes and includes minimum detectable effect sizes. The plan also includes appropriate methods for analyzing implementation data and provides a sufficient list of topics to explain induction differences between treatment and control schools. The external evaluator, SRI, will be conducting site visits and classroom observations. The plan provides sufficient details regarding student outcome measures, teacher outcome measures and implementation measures to facilitate replication in other settings. Project Deliverables and Milestones provided in Appendix J provide sufficient evidence of periodic assessment toward achievement project outcomes. The plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the planned project evaluation.

**Weaknesses:**

While the proposal includes sufficient details for how LEA partner ownership of the induction program will be established, the evaluation plan does not include a specific assessment of how well project activities have built capacity of the LEAs to take ownership. Two of the three outcomes indicated on page e29 are not addressed by the evaluation plan. Since the targeted grades are K-8 the evaluation plan cannot determine if the student populations are better prepared for post-secondary education and rewarding careers. Although the evaluation plan addresses teacher effectiveness and retention it does not address mentors' enhanced ability to accelerate the learning of adults.

**Reader's Score: 23**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6**

**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 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7**

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 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8**

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 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9**

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 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10**

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:** 08/04/2012 08:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 07:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	25	0
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	0
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	24
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CCP 6	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CCP 7	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
1. CPP 8	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
1. CPP 9	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

1. CPP 10

**Sub Total** 1

**Total** 105 24

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

### 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 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 Validation grant.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Significance

#### 1. The Secretary considers the significance of the project. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel**

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

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

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

(3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed experimental study or a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

**(2) 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.**

**(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.**

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

**Strengths:**

--The narrative (pg 27) includes clear, concise, and measureable evaluation questions addressing not only the impact of the program, but project implementation and exploratory questions that go beyond the immediate purpose of the proposed project.

--The evaluation contractor (SRI) has extensive experience with complex and multi-faceted research projects, and thus should be able to perform the required evaluation activities and analyses on time and within budget.

--The measures used to assess implementation and teacher outcomes include participant surveys as well as direct observations/site visits. This multiple measure approach is preferable to a single type of measure as it enables triangulation and confirmation of the program effects.

--The application includes a strong experimental design for NTC program implementation for two project partners (Broward and GWAEA). Schools will be randomly assigned to treatment (NTC) or control (status quo induction) groups, and all new teachers in both groups will participate in two years of surveys and teacher outcome analyses. This will provide an exceptional amount of data for analysis and provide strong external validity for the project.

-- A strong difference-in-differences model will be used for Chicago Schools, that should likewise provide high quality data for analysis of the impact of NTC compared to veteran and novice teachers who did not receive the NTC structured induction process.

--The narrative provided clear and sufficient descriptions of how student achievement will be measured and analyzed, using the particular state's NCLB assessment. Teacher outcomes will be assessed using a validated observation instrument.

--The implementation measures described in the narrative are varied, and should provide sufficient data to thoroughly understand the quality of the teacher induction process within the treatment or control schools. Teacher survey instruments used in the evaluation have been validated through use by NTC.

--The project plan includes sufficient resources (personnel and budget) to effectively carry out the budget. The Project's yearly budgets appropriately include different amounts each year for SRI, to reflect the specific evaluation activities that year.

**Weaknesses:**

--The use of technology is a key project implementation element. However, it is not clear in the evaluation narrative how the [REDACTED] and online [REDACTED] applications will be evaluated for impact.

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6**

**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 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7**

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 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8**

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 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9**

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 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10**

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:** 08/04/2012 07:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/05/2012 07:59 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	25	23
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	25
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CCP 6	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CCP 7	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
1. CPP 8	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
1. CPP 9	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

1. CPP 10

	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	1
<b>Total</b>	105	74

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Teacher Center (U411B120035)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional):

##### General:

The New Teacher Center(NTC) has long supported new teachers and this project seeks to validate its approach in three diverse settings: Broward County in Florida, the Chicago public schools and a consortium of 32 districts in Iowa. The approach to be implemented includes a heavy emphasis on strong mentorship of new teachers, including extensive training of mentors and totally freeing them up from classroom duties. NTC will also be expanding its two-year induction program and serve 2,475 first- and second-year teachers, reaching 164,000 students in mostly high-poverty schools. In addition, NTC will be employing its own innovative [REDACTED] program through [REDACTED] developed to house and enhance a wide-range of technology uses.

Reader's Score: 0

### 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 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 Validation grant.
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.
- (4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

##### Strengths:

The New Teacher Center s (NTC) proposal presents a high-quality, very comprehensive project design to ensure that goals set for increasing instructional effectiveness and student achievement by implementing a teacher induction program and increasing teacher retention are met. The plan includes a strong emphasis on technical assistance for teacher mentors by conducting Mentor Academies and Mentor Forums and by providing support for principals, acknowledging their importance in reaching the goals. The digital technology that NTC has developed is closely aligned with both mentoring and assessment objectives and stated outcomes and will assist the applicant in meeting them.

The project will be an integral part of the ongoing 14 years of work of NTC, which annually serves 24,000 teachers and 7,500 mentors in over 30 states.

The costs, estimated to be \$100 per student to reach 164,000, are reasonable, especially considering the estimated \$17,872 cost per teacher leaving a classroom. The scale-up costs are \$164, \$65 and \$33 respectively.

**Weaknesses:**

Some districts may find it financially impossible to replicate fully releasing mentors from classroom duties.

**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 extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

NTC's approach to improving teacher effectiveness is exceptional in that the induction and mentoring program it has designed is a two-year, research-based program with mentors fully released from classroom duties so that they can provide individually tailored support and guidance to new teachers, especially new teachers focused on better reaching ELLs and other students from traditionally underperforming and underserved populations. This program is the only one of its kind in the U.S. Also, the online tool that NTC has developed allows mentors and teachers to collect student work and analyze growth so as to refine and differentiate instruction to meet every student's needs, particularly the needs of those students who are frequently overlooked.

Several up-to-date studies are cited as evidence, one showing that a strong mentoring program resulted in an increase in teachers' intent to stay in teaching from 49% to 70% at the elementary level and 38% to 82% at the high-school level. An increase in experienced, effective teachers directly relates to increased student achievement, especially for high-needs students who traditionally, have had a higher percentage of new teachers.

**Weaknesses:**

None

Reader's Score: 25

#### 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 complex projects.

(3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

##### Strengths:

The management plan is very sophisticated, reflecting the applicant's strong 14-year track record, robust growth and gold standard induction program as labeled by the Chronicle of Higher Education. A Grant Oversight Council will be set up to manage the grant and will include the project director, senior program manager, site leads for each of the participating LEAs and representatives from SRI, the external evaluator.

Key personnel are all identified, experienced and completely capable of managing a complex project. Their responsibilities are clearly defined, as are the timelines and milestones. Given that NTC has revenues of \$20 million this year, 113 full-time employees and offices in 5 diverse states, it will have no problem scaling up the project.

##### Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 25

#### 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 include a well-designed experimental study or a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:** 0

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6**

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 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7**

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 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8**

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 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9**

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 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant has developed its own site to house its mentoring program and assessment tools. This site will enable program leaders and staff to organize and review data collected and keep it secure and to provide mentoring to teachers who are geographically distant. The online mentoring also provides specialized pedagogies and content for special ed teachers and math and science teachers in grades 6-12.

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score:** 1

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/05/2012 07:59 PM