

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 12:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

Page 4 The applicant addresses absolute priority 1 by proposing a program of 3 years of training and support for new teachers, changing the structure of the first year of teaching and engaging new teachers in real world math and science internships. The project also includes the novel inclusion of a mindfulness component to enable teachers to handle the challenges of high need schools.

Page 5 The applicant proposes a novel program that is designed to prepare teachers for work in high need schools. The project devotes considerable thought and personnel to the preparation program. It focuses the student teacher portion on reflection and collaboration through a Critical Friends Group (CFG), matching mentor and cooperating teachers, a site based project director who is the liaison between universities and Collaboration and Reflection to Enhance Atlanta Teacher Effectiveness in Math and Science (CREATE) schools and mindfulness training.

Page 7 The project includes components that will build a support system through a CFG as well as a technique to combat emotional exhaustion, burnout and give the teacher a sense of personal accomplishment through mindfulness training. The inclusion of these techniques in future teacher preparation programs would add to the practice. Additionally the CREATE program (page 8) contains a 7 week summer internship component that will increase teachers' content knowledge. Research has shown that content based research internships are linked to decreased teacher attrition and increased student achievement. The benefits of mentorship are recognized to be two fold – support the novice while strengthening skills of veteran teachers.

Page 9 The applicant indicates that results from this project will be shared locally, and at state and regional conferences. Results of this project will influence the way pre-service teachers are involved in field experiences, how they respond to mentorships, CFG's, and mindfulness training.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

page 10/-15 The applicant identifies and discusses the three main goals of the CREATE project on page 14. The identified goals are: to increase student achievement in math and science, decrease teacher attrition and increase teacher satisfaction and effectiveness. The logic model on page 15 identifies the actions, inputs and outcomes in short, medium and long term terms that will lead to the goal success. The program involves a summer professional development content component, mentoring each of the three years of the program, stipends, and participation in a CFG.

The proposed program involves a three year residency model program and students enter in the last year of their university teacher training program at GSU (page 10). For the first year residents are placed in classrooms with an experienced cooperating teacher where they teach small groups, observe, lead whole class sessions and complete their university requirements (page 11). The second year consists of a co-teacher arrangement where two residents are paired together to plan, teach and reflect together. The third year residents become lead teachers in their own classrooms. The program offers support throughout the three years and gradual assuming of responsibilities. An essential part of the support component is the monthly CFG that serves as a vehicle to share and discuss all aspects of teaching and learning. Page 12 The inclusion of a mindfulness program strengthens the teacher's ability to manage stress and will allow for focused work.

Page 12 The applicant describes the multiple types of mentorship that the program provides for in each successive year. This provides a scaffold support structure that will be a presence throughout the program and benefit residents, mentors and students.

Page 12 The applicant describes the financial support available to residents so they may focus on their studies. For many in the high need area that do not have financial means this will encourage them to join and stay in the program. This is also beneficial to the school districts that receive additional personnel. The applicant describes a paid internship that each resident will experience. This part of the program will give residents experience in working with scientists.

Page 16 The applicant has identified two potential risks to the program's success – teacher resistance to the CFG and the difficulty of coordinating schedules for mentor training and meetings. The applicant suggests that scheduling and

personnel will address these issues.

Weaknesses:

page 15 The applicant indicates in the chart on page 15 that there may be a set of "external factors" influencing the outcome of the project's success, however there is no further discussion of these issues and how they may be mitigated. The stated issues are ones that the applicant would have little control over however acknowledging that they may occur and preparing for these changes would strengthen the proposal.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

page 16/17 The applicant has indicated that the CREATE advisory team will meet monthly and manage the grant. This team is composed of personnel from the project as well as universities, partners and researchers.

Page 18 The applicant delineates the performance target, data collection method, and the monitoring that will assess if the project is progressing appropriately. The applicant also indicates that monthly meetings of the CREATE advisory team will be performed to analyze progress, monitor data and make improvements as needed. A formative survey (page 19) will be administered and shared with the team to address any issues that may arise.

Page 19/Appendix J The applicant has submitted letters of support and commitments from partners and collaborators. A chart outlining commitments of partners is also provided.

Page 20/Appendix F The applicant presents [REDACTED] as the project director. Her credentials and experience in previous large scale grants equip her with the skills to lead the proposed grant.

Weaknesses:

pages 16/17 Although the applicant presents a chart outlining milestones, personnel responsible for its implementation and some dates, the timeframe for the project is vague and requires more detail as to length of activities,

start and completion dates. The project would also benefit from the inclusion of fuller explanations of the activities that will drive the program. For example, they could have noted how long mindfulness training will take, and where will it be held, and who will administer it

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 12:11 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 12:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant will address Absolute Priority 1 (Improving the Effectiveness of Teachers or Principals) and the Subpart B: Increasing equitable access to effective teachers for low-income and high-need students) by developing the project CREATE (Collaboration and Reflection to Enhance Atlanta Teacher Effectiveness). CREATE will merge a teacher residency model with increased opportunities for teacher collaboration and reflection.

The project is based on creating a 3-year residency program for new teachers designed to increase student achievement in math and science. All CREATE schools are part of the Atlanta Public Schools (APS), a high-needs school district that serves 84% students of color and 75% students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. That way, they are making sure they are impacting academically high need student. The applicant also wants to decrease teacher attrition and also increase teacher satisfaction and effectiveness. As a result, they want to develop highly effective math and science teachers for high needs students.

(2) The Project CREATE is presenting a novel idea in creating a 3 year model 3-year model designed to retain highly qualified teachers in urban schools that begins in a teacher's final year of teacher certification coursework, continues through his/her second year of teaching, and includes program components designed to overcome shortcomings typical of teacher induction (page 4). The applicant explained in a comprehensive way the extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally. Usually is one semester of student teaching, some proposals are suggesting one year of student teaching, so this idea, of really

mentoring these new teachers, it will be considered novel. Additionally, the applicant is including few novel ideas to add to the 3 year residency model. One is the ideas is the Critical Friends Group, a special type of teacher learning community (page 7 and Appendix D) and the other one is Mindfulness Training, defined as the intentional cultivation of moment by moment non-judgmental focused attention and awareness (page 7 and Appendix D).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant described in a clear way the 3 goal from CREATE: (1) increase student achievement and engagement in math and science; (2) decrease teacher attrition from high-needs schools; and (3) increase teacher satisfaction and effectiveness.

In page 10, the applicant included Figure 1 showing the program structure. That figure showed three inputs or objectives (increasing responsibilities and independence, to build a community foundation and collaboration, and to provide additional support mechanisms). The next two columns describe what will happen each academic year. After Figure 1 the proposal included 4 pages explaining in detail what was on the figure.

The logic model is included in page 15. The logic model, included inputs, outputs, short, med, and long term outcomes. Also it is included the assumptions and external factors that could alter the project.

The project articulated a plan to achieve the initial idea of the 3 year residency to improve science and math in high-needs students.

(2) The applicant identified 2 possible potential risks (page 16) and the way they will mitigate those risks.

Weaknesses:

(1) The project goals are not aligned in a clear way with the activities.

Even though it is clear that the timeline refers to an academic year, it is not clear, for example, how gradually those responsibilities will increase.

(2) The external factors in the logic model (page 15) could be considered potential risks and they should have a way to mitigate those.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

(1) Table 1, page 16, the applicant described the milestones for the project and the people responsible for doing those. The table also included when those milestones will happened.

Because it is an academic year, it is easy to follow when the milestones will happen. In terms of the objectives, it is my understanding that those are the one in page 10, figure 1 increasing responsibilities and independence, to build a community foundation and collaboration, and to provide additional support mechanisms). And everything is aligned with the logic model that directs the project.

Table 2 included the annual performance target, the data collection method, and the periodic progress monitoring the target. The way they will assess progress is summarized there (final summative evaluation, quarterly teacher satisfaction survey, teacher attrition data every July, daily teacher attendance data collected in July but done quarterly, average mean score for the 3-8 math and science students-fall and winter).

(2) Page 19, Table 3 detailed in a very clear way the key partners participating in this project and their commitment with CREATE.

(3) The CREATE Advisory team will meet monthly to make the program adjustments an improvement as needed.

(4) The program has [REDACTED] as Project Director. In reviewing the CV, it is clear that he managed other projects of similar size and scope and has a lot of experience as a teacher, researcher, and project director.

Weaknesses:

(3) Even though the CREATE advisory team will meet monthly to analyze the periodic progress monitoring data it is not clear how they will use that data because they will not gather data monthly, just annually or in some cases quarterly. That section needs more explanation that shows how the applicant will ensures feedback and continuous improvement of the project.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/18/2014 12:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2014 10:23 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a teacher residency program with increased opportunities for teacher collaboration and reflection. Early career teachers will participate in a three year residency program that includes a critical friends group, mindfulness training, and a gradual increase in teaching responsibilities (p.5-6). This project is a novel approach to new teacher induction. The CREATE project builds on three promising areas of research on teacher induction (p.6). The project will serve as an exemplar for new practices in teacher induction. Results will be shared at state and national conferences (p. 9-10).

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

The project design is outlined by year in a chart on p. 10. A logic model is included on p.15. The program is clearly explained in the project design narrative. The applicant explains potential risks and strategies to mitigating those risks in the logic model and on p. 16.

Weaknesses:

The external factors listed in the logic model should be included as risks and the steps to mitigate them should be discussed.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

The applicant presents a management plan with timelines for completion of each milestone. The annual performance targets and methods for collecting data and monitoring are included on p. 18. Feedback and monitoring for continuous improvement will be conducted during monthly team meetings (p. 18). Partners are listed along with an overview of their commitments on p. 19. The project director has experience with managing large grants (p. 20). Performance targets with data collection methods and periodic progress monitoring is included (p.18).

Weaknesses:

The table for timelines and milestones on p.16 should be more specific as to dates and how long these activities will take.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2014 10:23 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 06:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	15
Total	100	15

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

- Overall, the evaluation plan for this application was very well written. The key questions were presented in the form of implementation and impact questions, and appear to be adequate to cover all aspects of the evaluation (pp. 22-23).
- The methodology that will be used to answer each of the questions is presented in a very organized and descriptive manner. The implementation study will use qualitative data along with survey data to evaluate the fidelity of implementation and the quality of the program (p. 22). The impact study will utilize a quasi-experimental design, using a statistical analysis for matching groups for the study (p. 25). Each of the designs appear to be adequate to answer the research questions. (pp. 24 -27).
- Just as with the methodology, the analysis plan for each phase of the study is presented in detail. The applicant has provided the process for establishing sample size and MDE size using appropriate statistical tools to accomplish that end (pp. 25-27).
- The key components and outcomes for the project are presented, along with a measureable threshold for acceptable implementation, meeting one of the major selection criteria. This is presented in the logic model provided to illustrate this (p. 15) and in a description of the outcome measures in Appendix J (pp. e132-135).
- The evaluators, as indicated in their vitae in Appendix F, appear to possess the experience and expertise to successfully conduct an evaluation of this size and scope. In addition, based on the budgeted amount provided for the evaluation, it appears that there will be adequate resources to conduct the study.

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/17/2014 06:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 02:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	15
Total	100	15

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Neighborhood Charter School (U411C140133)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Neighborhood Charter Schools of Atlanta seek \$3,622,804 to train 46 mathematics and science teachers through project CREATE. The project uses a three year residency model with year one residents with a cooperating teacher, year two residents teaching in pairs, and year 3 residents in their own classroom.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project

articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The clarity and importance of the key questions measuring both implementation and impact goals are addressed by the project evaluation. (Pages 20-27 and Appendix J)

Multiple and appropriate research methods for answering each question are provided.

The evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact.

The evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project.

A measureable threshold for acceptable implementation is provided. (Appendix J)

An ongoing, informative feedback loop is in place.

The proposed project plan includes sufficient resources of time, money, and personnel to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Description of outcome measurements is very detailed. (Appendix J)

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses evident.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 02:14 PM

