

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2012 03:48 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

**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	24
<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>74</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CCP 6	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</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 75

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Validation Panel - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

## 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 has a clear logic model described on pages e26-e27, including short-term and long-term results and strengthened home and school environments. The actions described are well-aligned to the goals of improving both social-emotional and cognitive preparedness for school, specifically in the areas of increasing engagement, decreasing stressors for parents and children, and reducing family conflict and child neglect. The project demonstrates strong potential to be incorporated into the ongoing work of the applicant and partners. The LEA has implemented the work in 51 schools (p. e28). In addition, the LEA has prioritized parent and family engagement as a priority in the strategic plan to improve schools (e28). Specifically, the intervention is designed with three stages, with the third stage being led by parents from the community. On page e27, these sessions are led by FAST parent graduates and co-produced with school and community staff. Additionally, the model allows for adaptation to meet specific cultural and community needs, with a clear core constituting 40% of the implementation and adaptations representing 60% of the implementation as described on page e27.

In addition to providing a clear estimate of cost per student, the project outlines the process for both community and national scale up, with costs for this scale-up process provided. The project also provides strong support to ensure fidelity of implementation, including technical assistance, training, supervised implementation, negotiated cultural adaptations, program manuals, and integrity checklists, etc (p. 32).

**Weaknesses:**

The project notes that implementation allows for negotiated cultural adaptations on p. e32, but does not address how the program might be adapted to meet the diverse linguistic needs of a community. The project notes that none of the activities requires parent literacy or mastery of English on p. e26, but does not provide information on how diverse linguistic communities have been or might be fully integrated into the school community through this approach.

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

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

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

**(2) The 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:**

The project represents an exceptional approach to increasing early learning opportunities and strengthening parent and family engagement. The Elements of FAST are well-designed. The first hour of each session provide parents the opportunity to take a leadership role in planning and leading a session, with strong coaching provided. The second hour provides children with the opportunity to interact more informally with staff while parents receive parenting support sessions. The most innovative aspect of the program is the 15 minutes of 1-1 parent-child time, during which time the parent is coached to pay full attention to the child's free play choices, and to not criticize, interrupt, boss or teach (p. e27). The design of these sessions is both simple and well-aligned to the project goals.

The project is well-informed by current research and effective practices. The project has made strong use of best practices in program evaluation. The use of a logic model and the strong planning around fidelity of implementation reflect deep knowledge of effective practices for program management and continuous improvement. Multiple measures have been used to assess the effectiveness of the program, as described on pages e34-e38.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**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 project provides a detailed timeline on p. e29, including information on the intervention, evaluation and dissemination process. These tasks relate to both the sustainability and the scalability of the proposed project.

The management plan is clear, and includes both a steering committee to ensure coordination and smooth operation of the day-to-day operations as well as an advisory board.

Personnel demonstrate diverse areas of expertise aligned to the project goals and strategies, and sufficient experience with managing and scaling complex projects with multiple partners and stakeholders.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**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:

The proposal is designed to improve school readiness, with a strong focus on social-emotional as well as cognitive preparedness. In addition, the proposal supports transitions from kindergarten through third grade.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

#### 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:** 08/03/2012 03:48 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/30/2012 04:07 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

**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	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 #6 - Validation Panel - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

## 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- reviewed and scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A- reviewed and scored by another reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

**(2) The 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- reviewed and scored by another reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A- reviewed and scored by another reviewer.

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

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

**(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing 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- reviewed and scored by another reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A- reviewed and scored by another reviewer.

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will 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 applicant provides a detailed explanation of the evaluation methodology, including the numbers of participants, how they are recruited, from which schools, how random assignment is made, the independent variables and dependent measures, power/effect size analyses, and assumptions of the HLM procedures. These proposed evaluation activities appear to be appropriate and in line with the initiatives being conducted to provide the kind of high quality data the applicant seeks to obtain. The program evaluation, formative evaluation, and summative evaluation objectives are clearly defined, with measurable outcomes well described.

It is clear from the description how the data being collected will provide an indication of the objectives being met, both formatively and summatively. Measurable outcomes appear to be appropriate to assess program impact, monitor progress, and provide accountability information to stakeholders.

The measures to be used as the source of data are clearly explained. Measures to be used for summative evaluation appear to be valid, appropriate, and realistic. The evaluation plan details when and how the data is to be collected, and the number of students/ participants involved. It is clear from the proposal how the data will be analyzed. There is also mention of the dissemination of reports on the results and outcomes.

The project will make use of an independent evaluator, with appropriate time and resources devoted to the project. The plan describes the qualifications of the evaluator.

**Weaknesses:**

More explanation should have been provided as to how the present funding is different from, and a progressive extension of, prior research.

The explanation of how the program evaluation and other formative evaluation outcomes and on-going lessons learned will be incorporated back into the project could have been clearer.

**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:** 07/30/2012 04:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/31/2012 01:25 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<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	19
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	19
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CCP 6	1	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CCP 7	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
1. CPP 8	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
1. CPP 9	1	
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

1. CPP 10

**Sub Total** 1

**Total** 105 19

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Validation Panel - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

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

**General:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

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:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

**(2) The 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 scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

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

**(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing 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 scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will 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 investigators described a methodology for validating the Families and Schools Together (FAST) program to reduce lack of family engagement, family stress, and child neglect in low-performing schools. A strength of the evaluation is the specificity with which the investigators articulate the research design and analysis. This consists of a well-designed, mixed-method experimental clustered-randomized control trial with a fairly large sample of schools. The investigators also proposed the use of appropriate methods for the analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data and provided adequate calculations of minimum detectable effect sizes for project outcomes. The investigators also proposed the documentation of high-quality implementation data to ensure that the FAST program will be implemented as intended and provided sufficient information to facilitate program testing in other settings. No concerns were observed regarding the suggested resources for carrying out the project evaluation.

**Weaknesses:**

While the research design and data analysis were presented clearly, the alignment of data to answer research questions and sampling procedures was not fully clear. Some assumptions had to be made regarding what measures and/or instruments were going to be used to measure project outcomes. A table with research questions and instruments would have been helpful.

Program outcome measures were also of concern. Investigators proposed the use of the PPVT-4 and the WSJ-III as measures of cognitive development. The PPVT-4 is a measure of the student's ability to understand spoken English and receptive vocabulary, which is unclear how this relates to project outcomes. Given that identifying adequate measures of cognitive development could be a challenge, there are potential reasons for such choices, but those reasons were not clearly articulated. However, investigators may want to look into this issue deeply.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**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 scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

N/A scored by another reviewer

**Reader's Score:**      0

**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:** 07/31/2012 01:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2012 04:09 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

**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	24
<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>74</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CCP 6	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 7</b>		
1. CCP 7	1	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 8</b>		
1. CPP 8	1	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 9</b>		
1. CPP 9	1	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

**Competitive Preference Priority 10**

1. CPP 10

	1	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	0
<b>Total</b>	105	75

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Validation Panel - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

## 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 proposal lists a clear set of goals listed on page 22. These goals align with the competitive preference priority 6 by targeting kindergarten students and their parents.
- + The project proposal provides a logic model for the project's assumption of how the intervention will lead to improved early learning. This represents how the strategies of the project are linked to the expected outcomes. This logic model is on page 27.
- + Scale up costs are provided for up to 500,000 students in the proposal on page 33, which provides estimates for the cost feasibility for this project potentially being able to impact more students as a large scale project.
- + The specific price per student is listed based on a 2012 estimate of a similar FAST implementation.
- + All of the partnering organizations are already engaged in similar work whether it be supporting FAST or studying FAST and therefore, this proposal aligns with the work and priorities of these organizations.

**Weaknesses:**

-The proposal does not contextualize the costs in an attempt to justifying or explain how reasonable these costs are compared to similar interventions.

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

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

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

**(2) The 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:**

+ The approach of FAST reflect the field s current knowledge from research shown through the citations provided to show the empirical base the work builds upon.

+ This approach also represents current research knowledge based on similar studies done on the FAST approach conducted by WCER colleagues.

+ The magnitude of impact that this intervention is anticipating to see is based on similar implementations that have been carried out using the FAST model. This is specifically related to changes in students' social skills and academic competence.

**Weaknesses:**

- No weaknesses were identified related to the significance criteria.

**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 proposal provides extensive evidence of the capacity of the personnel involved in this project as evidenced by the included cvs. The project manager and additional personnel have extensive experience managing large-scale projects as well as implementing and studying similar projects.
- + The proposal provides adequate descriptions of the capacity of WCER to manage this work. Specifically, the experience of the organization and the technical and human capital of the organization as well as partnering organizations suggest that this team will be substantially prepared and capable to carry out this work.
- + On pages 39-41 of the project proposal, the roles of the personnel are articulated as well as an estimate of their time commitment.
- + The management plan does include a timeline or milestones to ensure the timely progress of the proposal s plan and ability for the project s goals to be achieved within the time frame.
- + The project's lead organization, WCER, has worked or is working with local and national organizations suggesting that the organization possesses the capacity to scale up this project further.

**Weaknesses:**

- No weaknesses were identified with respect to the management plan and personnel.

**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 reviewed and scored by another reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A reviewed and scored by another reviewer.

**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:**

+ The project seeks to improve young children's school readiness by targeting their early socialization and learning.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 1

#### 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: 0

#### 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: 0**

#### **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: 0**

#### **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: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/02/2012 04:09 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2012 10:14 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

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

	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	24
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel</b>		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	23
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 6</b>		
1. CCP 6	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</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 73

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Validation Panel - 6: 84.411B

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

Applicant: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (U411B120009)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

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

##### General:

More attention given to cultural adaptation (pg e32) of program to limited English language proficient students and their families would have further strengthened this application.

#### 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:

" Goals and strategies are directly aligned with priorities; applicant is using a targeted approach to reduce critical non-academic barriers to school turnaround by using strategies that engage parents, school and community partners and empower parents to interact positively with their children.

The Project Design is comprehensive and utilizes expert partnerships to ensure present and future success/sustainability of the program.

" Targeting 60 schools not currently involved in the current FAST program is continuing to build capacity so that more families will have a chance at increased academic achievement leading to low performing school turnaround.

" Cost of \$54,000 to serve 60 families is reasonable with focus on fidelity and community scaling planned. The cost was calculated @ \$1400 per child and after deducting start up costs of training, implementation and evaluation the estimated cost is \$900 per child. The scale up costs were adequately addressed.

" Extensive research and planning is evident with already proven results in Philadelphia school system.

**Weaknesses:**

How cultural diverse/limited English proficient students/families would be addressed was not specified.  
(Cultural Adaptation pg 32)

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

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

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

**(2) The 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:**

" FAST program is exceptional, theoretically grounded and based on practical experience. The FAST program has been established in the district for years which has built capacity and sustainability toward credibility and strong relationships.

" 4 Fast research studies prove positive effects on Parent, Child and Teacher relationships (pg e36, e37).

" The proposed project is the only program of its kind that systematically operates within schools and this is significant as it is a challenge to incorporate nonacademic programs into educational systems.

" Comprehensive programming addresses Engaging parents, supporting Social Skills Development, Academic Competence and reduction of Children s aggression, further showing the extent to which the project will substantially improve all important aspects impacting the whole child, environment, climate and family. (pg e39)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**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:**

" There is extensive, proven leadership experience with research, implementation of successful activities, programs (pg. 39) and management of similar grants. " The Team (PI, Advisory Board, Steering Committee, highly qualified partners) has a proven record of improved student achievement throughout the US.

" The management plan clearly identifies scaling competence working with partners locally and nationally.

Scale up includes developing certified trainers which builds local capacity, uses Train the Trainer model and establishes a collaborative team for community level scale up. National scale up created a replication and dissemination Quality Assurance Package that has been refined over the past 20 years.  
pg e32

**Weaknesses:**

Clear timeline and milestones were missing from application.

**Reader's Score: 23**

**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:

" The application addresses early socialization and school readiness skills from Kindergarten through 2nd grade (pgs e22 & e23). One of the major strengths of the proposal is its proven record of relationships with Philadelphia school district & its teachers, early learning programs and its present alignment and partnerships. (FAST Logic Model pg e27)

" Program has partnered with AIR, Office of Research/Evaluation and Office of Early Childhood to ensure improved milestones, standards and alignment (pg e43) of the clearly defined outcome measurements.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

## 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:** 08/02/2012 10:14 AM