

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2012 04:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	100	74
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CCP 6	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CCP 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. CPP 8	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. CPP 9	1	
Sub Total	1	

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

Sub Total 1

Total 105 76

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

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 very clearly identifies the need for an effective early intervention program including the fact that currently there is no effective kindergarten mathematics curricula listed on the What Works Clearinghouse site. Throughout the proposal, the applicant addresses how it will achieve its principal goal to implement an effective and innovative early mathematics intervention program for economically disadvantaged pre-K and K students (p. e27). In order to accelerate early mathematics learning, the applicant has provided a very detailed chart indicating how it will align standards (pp. J10-11). The applicant has provided an outline for the developmentally appropriate types of activities it will include within its program (e.g., use of concrete materials, teacher-guided scaffolded- instruction, multiple opportunities for engagement and discussion, addressing development range of students, in-school and home activities, and individual progress monitoring) (pp. e29-30).

The applicant provides a very detailed cost analysis in both the program narrative (pp. e35-36) as well as in the budget narrative. The costs are detailed to show which are fixed and which are variable. For instance, the applicant provides a per pupil cost of \$396 for the project which includes the evaluator's fees and then provides a per pupil cost, \$264, sans the fees. The cost of \$4,000 per classroom, which includes teacher professional development, including classroom visits every other week for one year, and materials, is very

reasonable. The applicant provides the costs for the requisite scale-up numbers, as well.

Weaknesses:

NONE

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 proposed project provides a truly exceptional approach to the field of early childhood mathematics. Although there are several validated early literacy interventions, there are no options available in the field of early mathematics. The applicant provides a plethora of information in regards to both seminal research from the early childhood field (p. e37) to current research in the three fields of early childhood, early mathematics learning, and SES. In addition the applicant cites research which indicates that early mathematics achievement is a better predictor for later academic achievement than literacy achievement.

The applicant includes the use of academic vocabulary within its program. The importance of using language in a mathematics program, for both SES and LEP students, has been known for more than 20 years. While several early childhood core mathematics programs attempted to integrate this information (e.g., Mimosa, Rigby, and Houghton Mifflin Math) into their projects, none of the programs ever received validation and, for the most part, they are no longer published. In addition, these programs did not provide an intervention piece. This project has the potential to provide early childhood educators with a tool that has been long needed in the field.

Based on the applicant's prior research, this project has the potential to measurably improve student achievement and close achievement gaps at the very beginning of a child's educational career and make a difference at an age when it matters the most.

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 key personnel proposed for this project bring a plethora of experience managing large projects. Each of these proposed staff members have research specific to the fields of early learning, mathematics, and understanding the effects of student-family income levels, all areas key to both the implementation and/or research affiliated with this project.

The applicant very clearly articulates its management plan and includes defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones (pp.e235-247) for accomplishing the project tasks. The original project includes urban/suburban as well as rural schools from both Northern and Southern California. Partnering with the California STEM Learning network will help to grow the project throughout the state. The applicant has clearly outlined a sustainability plan for project participants. A key exceptional approach for ensuring sustainability includes the development of an early mathematics training network. This approach has worked well for the educational literacy community and is much needed in the numeracy field. WestEd is well situated to include the Regional Education Laboratory, REL-West, to administer the project. All of the Regional Education Laboratory sections have a success record of bringing projects to scale.

Weaknesses:

The early mathematics trainers/coaches positions are an integral component to the proposed professional development. There does not appear to be a job description that outlines the roles and major responsibilities or required experience for these positions.

Reader's Score: 24

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:

This section was scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

This section was 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 applicant provides a very thorough explanation addressing the ways it will address all three criteria outlined in the i3 Program Competitive Preference 6. By aligning standards from PK-K-1, the proposed project will provide teachers with valuable data which will help to inform teachers' instruction so they may differentiate their teaching to ensure that all students are prepared for success.

Weaknesses:

The applicant clearly addresses the transition from age three (Head Start programs) to PK/K, as well as K to Grade 1. It is less clear how the applicant will provide a transition to grades 2 and 3.

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:

The applicant provides information which indicates that this project will address both the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. (p. e27). The proposed program has an emphasis built on the work of Beck and McKeown, 2002, who have shown the importance of building academic language through academic vocabulary. The applicant also provides strong evidence that their program will include differentiated learning, an effective RtI strategy, to ensure that the needs of all students are met.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant fully addresses how it will provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, and programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes and close achievement gaps, it does not indicate how it will increase college- and career-readiness which is a criterion addressed in this Competitive Preference Priority.

Reader's Score: 1

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 04:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 04:27 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	100	74
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CCP 6	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CCP 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. CPP 8	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. CPP 9	1	
Sub Total	1	

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

Sub Total 1

Total 105 76

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

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 response to this criterion is fully developed with no weaknesses. The proposed project's principal goal is to implement an effective and innovative early mathematics intervention for economically disadvantaged pre-K and K students (p. 4) and will impact approximately 37,872 students (p. 12). The project's second goal is to track overall school achievement by children who have received our effective early mathematics intervention (p. 7). The strategy is explicit and detailed, first introduced on pp. 6-7 and then described as components of the intervention on pp. 10-11. These actions are aligned to the STEM priorities of this competition, focusing on early learning in mathematics for economically disadvantaged students.

The applicant describes theory and implementation as the primary factors upon which success and failure depends (p.12). Based on the applicant's well-articulated theory, the theory's empirical underpinning, and the track record and expertise in implementing projects of this type, there is no doubt that the goals and strategies of the proposed project will result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. WestEd

The estimated costs of the project are exceptionally reasonable when balanced against the project's objectives, design, and the potential significance of a) closing the SES-related gap in early mathematical

knowledge and b) validating on a statewide level of scale the effectiveness of the model as part of a two-year math intervention. It is estimated that the cost per student is \$264 per student, which excludes the budget for the evaluator (p. 11) and that an accurate start-up figure for a district to adopt this intervention is \$133-200 per student (p. 13). Estimated costs to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students is included, with the expectation that costs would be lower factoring in economies of scale (p. 13).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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:

The proposed project is an exceptional approach to the STEM priority. The Pre-kindergarten and Kindergarten components are described fully and the model of causation presented further supports the exceptional nature of the approach (p. 9). The evidence provided in support of this work is up-to-date and is demonstrative of the depth and breadth of the applicant's knowledge of research and effective practice. The research and empirical base is expertly outlined and fully supports the goals and strategies of this project (pp. 14-15 and throughout the entire narrative).

The applicant provides an exceptionally strong rationale for the significance and magnitude of the effects of the proposed early math intervention, beginning on page 14, which is supported by the extensive research-based evidence provided. A focus on early mathematics is clearly needed and will substantially and measurably improve student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates and increase high school graduation rates.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were 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 project's management plan is extensive, detailed, and well-conceived. It includes clearly defined responsibilities of key personnel, as well as timeline and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, which are noted in Appendix J. The narrative describing the management plan and Table 8 (p. J32) are tightly aligned, cogent, and detailed. The plan also includes tasks in School Year 5 and 6 for example, that are related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

The qualifications of the key personnel are exhaustive and represent a team that is exceptionally qualified to carry out a project of this complexity, magnitude and scale. Key personnel qualifications are described on pages 27-28, accompanied by CVs in Appendix D. The co-directors possess an impressive and relevant set of qualifications and previous experience, particularly in collaborating in complex early educational research and intervention projects.

The applicant's capacity to bring the proposed project to scale is clear. With over 40 years of experience working with school districts and schools nationally, WestEd has established itself firmly with its successful track record of increasing student achievement and closing achievement gaps, as well as managing large, complex educational projects. There is no doubt, based on the presented evidence, that the proposed applicant has the capacity and the management capabilities to lead a successful project.

Weaknesses:

The only minor weakness concerns the 8 local trainers who will be recruited and hired (p. 21). Their training and responsibilities are both clearly described. What is missing; however, is a more complete description of the qualifications and expertise required for local trainers to carry out those responsibilities.

Reader's Score: 24

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:

Scored by another reviewer.

Weaknesses:

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 applicant's proposal for an early math intervention targets the intervention at the PreK and Kindergarten level and is expected through successful implementation to impact early learning for high-needs students throughout elementary school. School readiness, alignment of developmental academic milestones that are aligned with appropriate outcome measures and improvement of alignment, collaboration and transitions between early learning programs are all addressed (p. 3).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

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:

The applicant addresses this competitive preference priority sufficiently. The proposed project provides specifically for the implementation of diverse teaching strategies, to include upward and downward extensions to provide differentiation for students with diverse and unique learning needs (p. 4). The intervention targets English Language Learners.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 1

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 04:27 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 04:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

Reader #3: *****

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

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

Sub Total 1

Total 105 25

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

This project has promise in evaluating the effectiveness of the intervention on participant math skills. The evaluation plan is thoroughly described including examples of protocols, analyses, methods for data collection, reporting and dissemination of findings. Human subjects review as well as offering professional development to control group teachers post-project are included in this proposal.

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

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 presents a well articulated and developed experimental design with randomization by classroom within schools. The causal model identifies the variables/factors to be examined in determining improvement in math scores for pre-K to 1st graders. The evaluators have considered and addressed the threats to both internal and external validity and have built in methods to address these issues. Analyses using HLM are clear and appropriate for the type of research questions proposed. The implementation fidelity observation checklist includes comprehensive rubrics to determine program fidelity and will provide insight into implementation issues for mid-course corrections. The timeline and data collection plan appear to be realistic and reasonable. Power analyses were conducted pre-project to determine necessary sample sizes and recruitment needed to detect effectiveness of outcomes. The budget proposed for the evaluation appears to be realistic and is directly aligned with the performance monitoring and evaluation research tasks outlined in the proposal. Offering the professional development to the control group reflects strong ethics on the part of the research team. The proposal includes some reknown educational researchers that are highly qualified to conduct the evaluation, disseminate the results and offer documentation for replication of the project if it is successful in increasing learning outcomes and reducing the learning gap for the participants.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

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 04:44 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2012 09:35 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	22
Significance		
1. Significance	25	24
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	21
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	100	67
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CCP 6	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CCP 7	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. CPP 8	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. CPP 9	1	0
Sub Total	1	0

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Total	105	69

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

WestEd has prepared a proposal focusing on Absolute Priority #2 for STEM education and Competitive Priorities 6 and 8. The project seeks to determine whether schools can prepare high-need children for world-class math standards by the end of kindergarten and close the SES mathematics achievement gap. An experimental design will be utilized to randomly assign 144 schools in California to groups. 37,872 pre-K and kindergarten students will be impacted.

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:

Absolute Priority #2 STEM education is addressed for pre-kindergarten and kindergarten mathematics achievement.

Professional development for LEA math specialists/trainers and pre-K and kindergarten teachers is present with ongoing support.

Two goals exist that are clearly delineated: first to provide early mathematics intervention and second, to track student achievement. pgs. e25,e27

Partnerships and prior experience exist to make project success and sustainability likely. Appendix D and E Per student costs of \$395 and \$4,000 per classroom are reasonable. pg. e35

There is an estimation of the costs to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students. pg. e36

Weaknesses:

Specific goals and strategies are not clearly defined in the narrative, but are present. The applicant needed a clear and concise way of presenting goals and supporting strategies.

It is uncertain what is entailed in the teacher professional development other than a mathematics workshop and onsite facilitation/observations in mathematics. pg. e215

Mediation and moderation variables found in the logic model are sketchy. Descriptions and a plan of use are unavailable. Providing them would have greatly benefitted understanding of the model. pg. e215 pg. 17

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

(2) The 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 proposed two-year (Pre-K/kindergarten) math intervention process appears to be predicated on sound products with good effect sizes. pg. e37

The approach appears exceptional because of the emphasis on directly teaching pre-K-kindergarten mathematics. The applicants have a strong history of product development and research aligned with mathematics achievement. Appendix D and E

A strong consortium of partners (WestEd, University of Oregon, LEAs that are both urban and rural) exists and have been successful in past endeavors. pg. e40 and Appendix G

The importance and magnitude of this project is great for increasing the level of mathematics achievement and teaching in early years.

The interventions should meet the two outcomes of increased achievement and growth for mathematics preK through first grade.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not account for measuring impact on dropout rates, graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates. However, I am not sure that a proposal at the early learning level could account for such things in a five year period.

Reader's Score: 24

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:

A well-developed management plan exists with well-defined responsibilities and milestones. Appendix J
The WestEd project directors have experience with two previous federally funded grants of this magnitude.
The University of Oregon project directors have experiences with multi-state projects at large scale.
WestEd will use their Early Math Trainers Institute to train the specialists. pg. e48
Capacity to bring the project to scale at a state level is enhanced by multiple partners, including the California STEM Network who will work with LEAs and partners to foster sustainability. pg. e48
The partners appear to have a strong history of collaboration.

Weaknesses:

It is uncertain what the job description and specific hiring criteria of the eight local mathematics trainers are.
Local facilitators are mentioned to support professional development and achievement, but it is uncertain who these facilitators are and what their credentials are. Appendix J
The credentials of the four regional trainers on staff are uncertain as names were not attached nor were resumes included in the proposal. Appendix J pg. J34 e235-e247
The timeline of training and other milestones is only generally indicated. Appendix J

Reader's Score: 21

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:

The goals of the project specify that innovative practices will be designed and implemented to heighten educational outcomes in mathematics for preK, kindergarten, and subsequently, first grade students. Professional development was indicated to bring these goals about. pg. e26 A shared data system exists to track mathematics growth.

Weaknesses:

There are no apparent weaknesses.

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:

The applicant did not address this Competitive Priority.

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:

Thirty percent of the students are low SES and many are second language learners. Both English and Spanish versions of materials and instruction will be utilized.

Teachers will learn and present key mathematics vocabulary in English and Spanish. pg. e27

The applicant plans to differentiate instruction and individualize learning to meet the needs of high risk early learners.

Weaknesses:

It is uncertain of how the applicant will increase college and career readiness or high school graduation rates directly. It is believed that in a five year study these goals are beyond the realm of the project.

Reader's Score: 1

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:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority.

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:

The applicant did not address this competitive priority.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/06/2012 09:35 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 04:49 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

Reader #5: *****

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

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

Sub Total 1

Total 105 25

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Validation Panel - 2: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: WestEd (U411B120053)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

N/A

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

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 evaluation includes a well-designed randomized experiment. Hypotheses and research questions are well-defined and generated from a theory of change (page 16). The sample size of 144 schools and approximately 1,728 children (pages 18-19) will ensure sufficient statistical power to detect meaningful differences.

A Model of Causation delineating the theory of change is presented (Appendix J12).

Measures are clearly described (pages 28-30) and samples of observational rubrics and implementation fidelity sheets are included in appendix J. Appendix J also includes a detailed implementation plan for the study with clearly defined activities and responsibilities.

The program implementation will be clearly documented and the design includes a formative evaluation with progress monitoring (page 23). Data will be collected from teachers and parents, as well as local trainers.

On page 30 the proposal describes the plan to collect data to provide information about key elements and approach to facilitate replication. This will include the curriculum plan, fidelity of implementation, curriculum dosage levels delivered, and use of progress monitoring.

Training and implementation activities are clearly described (page 20-22) and the evaluation was designed to capture data on each of them.

The resources are sufficient to effectively carry out this project evaluation. The evaluation team is described on page 35 as stellar and this reviewer agrees with that assessment. The team (Technical Working Group) brings extensive expertise that includes qualitative methods, statistics and psychometrics, content (e.g., poverty and education). The PI s, Dr. Heid and Dr. Cook, are highly qualified with experience conducting large national studies and longitudinal clinical trials.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses detected.

Reader's Score: 25

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 04:49 PM