

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/30/2015 05:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	12
Sub Total	100	12
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	0
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	103	12

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Validation Panel - 3: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Questions

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) 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.

(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

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 extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) 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.

(5) 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.

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

Strengths:

The table on page 34 clearly outlines measures of fidelity and sets thresholds for implementation.

The evaluation outlines a plan to look at mediating factors (demographics such as low income and ELL; page 30).

MDES are listed, appropriate and based on attainable sample size.

The statistical model appears appropriate to answer the research questions.

The evaluators have experience with evaluating i3 grants.

There is a solid plan in place for providing ongoing feedback (pg 32).

The resume provided for the PI is strong.

The budget size appears appropriate relative to the scope of the evaluation plan.

Weaknesses:

The project does not meet WWC standards without reservations but rather with reservations.

It is unclear what plans are in place to address schools who self-select to participate.

Page 28 says each school will be matched to 2-3 control schools but later on the proposal says three schools. Further it says the schools will be matched on 'core baseline outcomes' but such outcomes are not defined, and later mention of a control group selection only references geographic proximity as a matching variable.

Pg 28 lays out the impact study questions but the questions all seem to be phrased as comparison to the control group at a single time point as opposed to change over time, whereas the outcomes in the logic model are more focused on changes over time.

Pages 29/30 references assessing fidelity of implementation but no details are given re: how this will be done, the scale, etc nor how the fidelity data will be used from a quantitative perspective in the impact analyses as a mediators.

While the table on page 34 nicely outlines measures of fidelity and sets thresholds, I would like to see these factors woven into the impact model as well.

Page 30 references collecting implementation data via staff surveys of both the treatment and control schools. It is unclear is what questions the control schools will be asked that would address fidelity to a model they are not implementing (As proposal references collecting fidelity data from them).

The plan for examining cost effectiveness needs more clarification (page 33) to judge its suitability.

It is unclear what the projected outcomes are based on. The target of 90% graduating with some earned college credit (pg 12) needs a baseline. Also the logic model and page 12 references a 5% increase in certain metrics (i.e. course passing) but page 33 references a 5 percentage point increase - these metrics are different. The need to clarify this is especially relevant for metrics that are already low numbers at baseline (i.e. if the dropout rate is currently 10% and one plans to reduce it by 5 percentage points that's cutting it in half, whereas if one plans to reduce it by 5% that is only reducing it by half a percentage point).

The impact study questions as written on pages 33/34 don't make reference to the control group.

Reader's Score: 12

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

- (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.
- (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.
- (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach; and
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

- (a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/30/2015 05:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 07:01 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	0
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	0
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	14
Sub Total	100	14
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	0
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	0
Sub Total	3	0
Total	103	14

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Validation Panel - 3: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Questions

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) 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.

(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

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 extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) 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.

(5) 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.

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

Strengths:

The proposal includes a series of four research questions (page 28) that address the first and third goals of the project. The proposal includes both impact and implementation studies. The impact study employs a school-level quasi-experimental design that matches treatment and comparison schools and meets the WWC standards with reservations (page 28). The implementation study includes three specific questions regarding key components, extent of implementation and advantages/disadvantages of the early college high school design. The data from the impact study will be analyzed using hierarchical linear modeling and includes analysis for subgroups including low-income students and English language learners. The proposed level of scale is schools in urban and suburban settings; the project will provide information about the differential effectiveness for the targeted students in these settings at this scale. The proposal includes a power analysis to determine the sample size needed to measure effects of 0.15 standard deviations or less (page 31). Data for the implementation study will come from surveys administered to treatment and control schools (page 32). The proposal includes sufficient funds to conduct the evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan does not indicate details about how comparison schools will be selected for the quasi-experimental design. The plan does not meet WWC standards without reservations. The evaluation plan does not address goal 2 and its associated objectives. In particular, the proposed professional development programs for principals, teachers and staff and leadership coaching need to be evaluated. The proposal indicates that these programs will be assessed (page 15) but does not indicate how. In addition, the standards-based ECHS curriculum with wraparound student supports (page 21) should be evaluated. The professional development for college faculty should also be evaluated.

Reader's Score: 14

Priority Questions**Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity****1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)**

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

- (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.**
- (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.**
- (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.**

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;**
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;**
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;**
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach; and**

(5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

(a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 07:01 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 02:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	30
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	29
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	74
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	1
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	77

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Validation Panel - 3: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Questions

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

(1) The significance of the project is defined because of needing to improve the future of the targeted population of low-income, first-generation and minority student, and the project implementation of an evident-based Early College High School. The significance of the proposed project also includes the creation of the Early College that have targeted outcomes to improve academic achievement, reduce achievement gaps, ensure college and career readiness, enhance teacher effectiveness and transform the learning environment. The project has identified gaps and weaknesses with definitive statistics and numbers that validates that the new school redesign, offers solutions with new and highly promising approaches and strategies. The new approaches are expected to improve student outcomes through a highly structured program and guided pathways and lead to a postsecondary certificate, a degree, or a credential with market value that aligns with regional high-need industries. (pgs. 3-6)

(2) The project developed a framework for replicating and expanding the model in a variety of settings with a diverse array of students. The implementation in a variety of settings include factors relating to long-standing relationships; a strong track record of increasing student achievement outcomes; increasing the number of students succeeding in college-prep courses; and increased number of students on track for high school and college graduation. These research-based strategies are designed to replicate this reform learning environment in diverse settings and will address the critical transition into college and dual enrollment opportunities to high school students at scale. (pgs. 6-7)

(3)The plan clearly describes the challenges of addressing the national need for high graduates to be prepared for college level academic work or for jobs in high-demand growth industries. The targeted students have disproportionately higher percentage number relating to barriers and career readiness gaps that hinders their success. The plan explains a scalable approach in distinctive ways that combines high academic standards with student's supports and a school climate that will enable students to obtain college credit while still in high school. (pgs. 7, 8)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

(1)The applicant includes data to validate a need for creating elements for establishing support efforts to prepare low-income students for postsecondary academic pursuits with cost-efficient and scalable approaches. The proposal intends to reshape the high school curriculum to improve student achievement, teacher effectiveness through the use of technology, promoting STEM for a rigorous and engaging coursework, and staff development for preparing teachers. Data shows that academic achievement in the targeted schools reveals that ethnicity and poverty corresponds to high and low achievement levels. With effective implementation of the plan, it is expected to improve achievement for the high-need population in the region and offer accessibility to college level coursework through the high school redesign. (pgs. 9-10)

(2)The plan explains barrier approaches in distinctive ways, through initiatives aligned with strong partnerships; academic programs with state standards; extensive professional development and coaching; formative and aligned assessments into classroom practices; an online web-based learning system and online; instructional strategies and student support services. The proposed project will address the barriers that have prevented effective services to address discipline issues that have prevented student access to dual enrollment programs, career awareness and college exploration and access in a cost effective manner. (pgs. 10-11)

(3)The use of dissemination mechanisms are part of this blended learning environment, which includes deployment manuals; various digital tools; multiple media networks; attending state-wide and national educational conferences; CSCC website; and partnership networks. The anticipated results to disseminate information on the project are intended to inform the field about best practices and lessons learned in order to support replication in other settings. (pgs. 10-11)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) 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.

(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

Strengths:

(1)The project has goals and objectives to reduce risk factors that will minimize dropout rates and to increase the number of the targeted student to be college ready and college bound. The plan clearly articulates the program goals with identified research-based programs with an array of strategies to be used as intervention tools to help students that are at-risk. The project also incorporates goal deliverables for improved teaching approaches; effective communication with college and community/business partnerships; additional supports needed by students to ensure success; faculty collaborations through the blended learning environment; aligned curriculums to state standards; and intervention strategies that are specific and measurable for improved academic achievements. (pgs. 12-17)

(2)The strong support components of the project are expected to assure program success through effective management, which includes alignment and dissemination efforts of key project personnel. The plan outlines the responsibilities and activities of each partner of the project along with the key personnel and their roles in the project. The applicant anticipates and it is probable that by using their management structure, the monitoring of the work plan, effective partner communications and continuous processes, the proposed project will achieve the milestones in the timelines that are outlined in the plan. (pgs. 20-26)

(3)The plan reflects a multi-year financial and operating model that will successfully bring the project to at least 10,000 students over the five year grant period. Included in the plan is a sustainable structure and practices (intensive planning; implementations; new structures; ensured sustainability), that are defined for each year of the grant period and reflects milestones to be accomplished at all school in the region. (pgs. 26, 27)

(4)The applicant outlines a continuous cycle plan that ensures feedback and improvement through five-stage institutional assessment approaches. The intent of the project is to close the loop and continuously incorporate components into other programs and activities available to the students, which includes teacher training, the early college program, and partnerships. The benefits from this project will be revealed through feedback and the expected improvements will be long lasting for the academic success of the students. (pg. 27)

Weaknesses:

(1) It is unclear how the project will recruit students to benefit from the Early College Program within the high school setting. The potential contribution of the project is determined by the infrastructure to offer the ECHS to large number of students; however, it cannot be to all students within the seven different school districts in the same timeframe. (pgs. 13)

(2)The plan could further define how teachers are chosen for the Early College Program and the teacher professional development which is intended to ensure student-teacher interactions, delivery of aligned instructional materials, and identifying and understanding barriers that can impede student academic success.

(3) It is not certain that the applicant has a multi-financial operating model to leverage funds on a national or regional level during the project grant period.

(4) No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 29

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 extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) 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.

(5) 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.

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

Strengths:

Not applicable

Weaknesses:

Not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

(a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.

(b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

(c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide

(1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;

(2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;

(3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project,

particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;

(4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach; and

(5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

The plan specifically details plans focusing on the specific barrier of preventing first-generation, low-income students from pursuing a post-secondary education. The proposal will provide resources dedicated to advising, tutoring, and coaching students as they transition into college and make choices resulting in increased persistence.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

(a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

Strengths:

The project reflects a plan that will successfully reach at least 10,000 students over the five year grant period. Included in the plan are and practices that includes intensive planning, implementations, new structures and ensured sustainability which can accomplish the replicability and adaptability at all schools in the region.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/01/2015 02:34 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2015 09:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	13
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	30
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	30
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	73
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	1
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Validation Panel - 3: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Questions

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

College-credit courses offered in high school may not earn the credential to receive college credit upon entering a postsecondary institution. Oftentimes, students who are enrolled in advanced placement or college-credit courses may the pass assessments needed to qualify for college credit, but do not receive college credit due to varying factors such as scoring guidelines or disparities in college criteria. Common Core standards set a strategy of high expectations for college preparedness, which is in development stages for many schools and their districts. The project offers a solution to bridge the transition of secondary school standards and college preparedness by aligning current K-12 academic standards with college readiness. The project will develop an ECHS model that enhances teacher professional development of understanding the college expectations and its environment. Teachers will be hired as adjunct faculty while working in the high school. The college will work with district and school administration in developing a design model of a cost-effective early college high school model that will led to increased postsecondary enrollment. In addition, the college will offer district administration and counselor professional development to build understanding of college and career readiness.

The ECHS model is replicable, as the project was implemented in other school districts in various states. Replicability of the project would fit in diverse high school populations, particularly among high-need populations who need a culture of higher expectations, college preparedness and postsecondary opportunities.

Weaknesses:

The project would be enhanced by statistical data to support the number of the postsecondary graduates compared to the high percentage of high school graduates to show growth of postsecondary graduates from the early college high school model. This information is not included in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

A key component of ensuring that implementation of an early college high school model will be executed at schools is through the district administration. The project plans to educate district officials of the ECHS model to ensure disaggregation at the local school model and to build sustainable outcomes.

The protocol among many school districts, local administration and teachers is the top-down organizational management where mandates to plan and implement instructional methods, professional development and standard-based instruction starts at the superintendent's directive. The project's team will serve as an external group or partner with district officials to ensure effective implementation of the ECHS model.

According to p. 16 of the application, the partnering organizations in this project have experience with setting up the ECHS model in several regions as states such as MA, OH, NC, TX and CO.

Based on the project's experience with school districts in outlining states, case-studies and design models of ECHS implementation will be provided from treatment schools to show instructional improvement and cost-effectiveness of an early-college model to support college costs. This strategy may be effective to meet demand in college affordability. Many students and parents may not consider college options when there is high tuition or the only option is student loan financing. Saving college costs while in high school may improve student outcomes to consider postsecondary enrollment.

Weaknesses:

None reported.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) 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.

(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

Strengths:

The project design is a holistic approach to transforming a classroom culture of high expectations through effective teacher professional development. The proposal project's design of training support for district instructional leaders and counselors is innovative as most districts follow a top-down management design to ensure school procedures are executed at the local school level. The objectives will be achieved by training all educational stakeholders to adopt the ECHS model.

The management plan is adequate, practical and reasonable to conduct the first year of planning, followed by implementation during years 2-3. Independent operation will occur in year 4 followed by community partnership, dissemination and established instructional strategies. Refinement and reflection will be a continuous process, but emphasize in year 5 (p.26). The management plan will comprise of a former superintendent to form an advisory board, to oversee and implement the project goals and objectives.

The project is clearly delineated with a five stage continuous improvement model. Institutional frameworks are commonplace throughout school districts, which are delegated through local schools to implement. A revised model would be protocol for among all educational stakeholders. The project's management plan would offer the expertise needed to carry out the goals and objectives within the framework. Oftentimes, frameworks are disseminated without a strategy to implementation. The project's design and management team offers cohesiveness to ensure clearly defined milestone and fosters continuous improvement (p. 27).

Weaknesses:

Statistical data is needed to support the project design model. It is unclear if the ECHS model is a comprehensive plan where all students participate in the ECHS model or the number of teachers participating in the teacher professional development.

Reader's Score: 30

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 extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project s effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) 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.

(5) 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.

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

- (a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.
- (b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.
- (c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach; and
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

The project outlines the cost-effectiveness of dual enrollment at the high school and community college as compared to high school matriculation with a clearly and coherence budget which outlines cost savings (p.2).

Weaknesses:

None reported.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

(a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.

(b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.

(c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.

(d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

Strengths:

The proposal meets the competitive priority, based on the broad applicability of practices at numerous schools that highlights the critical component - student school experiences are transformed from the high expectations modeled by the teacher.

The substantial growth outcomes with the Reynoldsburg school district in implementing ECHS demonstrate before practices, current initiatives with ECHS model in several states, and after practices, which identifies continued practices and refined cost-effective approaches to implement the model in this project (p. e-63).

Weaknesses:

None reported.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/02/2015 09:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 10:20 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	30
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	28
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	73
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity		
1. CPP 1	1	1
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	76

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - i3 Validation Panel - 3: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Columbus State Community College (U411B150002)

Questions

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 involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses a challenge for which there is a national need for solutions that are better than the solutions currently available.

Strengths:

1.

The applicant presents a unique design that builds upon and expands upon upon the evidence-based Early College High School model. The project is unique in that it is anchored by a community college that already established strong relationships with multiple districts. This feature allows for centralized coordination for regional implementation, joint professional development across LEA partners, expansion of LEA staff serving as adjunct community college faculty for dual enrollment coursework, shared costs for curriculum development. It also features the use of on-line technology across the region to provide alternative dual enrollment course delivery modes. (pgs. 2-7) A strong feature of the project is that it builds upon an existing regional foundation of partnerships between secondary, post-secondary, and industry which provides a viable pathway toward a certificate, a degree, or a credential with market value and which are aligned with regional high-need industries.

2.

The applicant demonstrates the model is replicable in other settings. The proposed project has already been replicated over the last decade in urban districts, small and large districts with diverse student populations, including economically disadvantaged and minority youth. The model is adequate for entities trying to implement high standards and assessments, and need proven models to increase the number of high-need students who succeed in college-preparatory courses and are on-track for high school and college graduation. Replication can be facilitated by factors that are particular to the various regions, including government policy, state and regional initiatives, and education reform efforts. (pgs. 6-7)

3.

The proposed project has potential to address a national need for services. The proposed project addresses a fact that is national in nature that many high school graduates are not prepared for college-level academic work or for jobs and careers in high-demand growth industries. Documented low readiness levels correspond with the mediocre levels of postsecondary completion across the country. The project will also help address the persistent completion gap between low-income and wealthier students. The project combines high academic and college and career readiness standards with student supports and a school climate that support students to obtain college credit while still in high school. As a result, early colleges increase the number of high-need students who succeed in college-preparatory courses and are on-track for graduation. (pgs. 7-8)

Weaknesses:

1.
No weaknesses noted.
2.
No weaknesses noted.
3.
No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. In determining the applicant's capacity to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates there is unmet demand for the process, product, strategy or practice that will enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The extent to which the applicant will use grant funds to address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application.

(3) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths:

1.
The applicant demonstrates there is a demand for the strategy to be employed by the project. Data presented supports the need for an integrated high school and college program of study. The proposed project design supports legislation authorizing and appropriating funding for College Credit Plus, a dual credit initiative to provide students in grades 7-12 the opportunity to earn transcribed college credits in the targeted region for the project. (pgs. 8-9) College Credit Plus is described as a vehicle for expanding accelerated learning opportunities, but it can only achieve its potential for promoting a variety of rigorous post-secondary academic pursuits and options to high school students if they are college-ready. The lack of academic preparedness prevents students from accessing college level coursework available to them through College Credit Plus. The proposed project will likely provide the support needed for student become appropriately prepared. The early college model is documented as providing a rigorous academic program, including a cohesive instructional framework aligned to college-ready standards and engaging instruction, project- and inquiry-based learning, and wraparound student supports. These type strategies are research based and proven to help prepare under-performing students.

2.
The applicant presents a clear description of barriers that have prevented past efforts reaching the level of scale for the project design. For example, districts and high schools struggle struggled with implementing approaches to align with their academic program, and state standards, as well the standards for college course completion. The use of project funds to develop coordinated and extensive professional development and coaching is a strong way to support using formative assessments aligned with college-ready standards, and translating college-ready standards and aligned assessments into classroom practices that meet the needs of students. Other identified barriers the applicant will use project funds to address include student support services, which will provide a specific focus on discipline issues,

inefficiencies and the lack of resources. Support services will be addressed through professional development offerings for high school counselors and developing effective student support services addressing career awareness and college exploration and access. (pgs. 10-11)

3.

The applicant will employ strategies that are appropriate to disseminate project information. For example, the project will produce a deployment manual and various digital tools and resources to enable and facilitate adoption of the model, along with best practices, project activities, publications, and research findings will be disseminated to targeted audiences locally, statewide, and nationally. Specifically, dissemination will occur through information booths and presentations at a state-wide educational technology conference; events held by an alliance of dual enrollment partnerships, and regional partnerships between secondary and post-secondary education and industry. Methods are common practices for leadership teams and staff to educate those outside the region about the design of the model and provide opportunities for interested parties to see it in action. (pgs. 11-12)

Weaknesses:

1.

No weaknesses noted.

2.

No weaknesses noted.

3.

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

(2) 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.

(3) The clarity and coherence of the applicant's multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan to operate the project at a national or regional level (as defined in this notice) during the project period.

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

Strengths:

1.

The applicant outlines clear goals and objectives for the project, and measurable outcomes. Sufficient strategies will be implemented to achieve project objectives. For example, partners will provide technical assistance to district partners and schools on implementation of design elements such as secondary-Postsecondary bridging through which academic

standards align to college-readiness and focus on other aspects of college knowledge, which embed college academic expectations, norms, and counseling into high school. Other elements include a Common Instructional Framework that prepares students for college-level work through implementation of six evidence-based strategies: collaborative group work, writing to learn, literacy groups, questioning, classroom talk, and scaffolding ; and Wraparound Student Support Services, including career coaching and academic advising. All elements are research-based and appropriate to help students that are not academically prepared succeed. The deliverables described for each project goal are sufficient and align with the elements to achieve project objectives. (pgs. 12-17) A Logic Model clearly summarizes key components and activities, associated deliverables, design elements, and projected student outcomes and depict a concise visualization of the project's framework.

2.

The applicant presents a management plan for the project that is feasible to guide staff in implementing the project. A clearly defined organizational chart indicates key personnel and their role in the project. For example, a project director has been identified to guide the project that has experience in dual enrolment programs. A central coordinating body comprised of representatives from all project partners will serve as the board of directors for the project, and will have responsibility for project implementation and accountability. Responsibilities and activities for each project partners is clearly defined. Other key staff assigned to work on the project is described, including project roles and responsibilities which are deem adequate. Additionally, major project milestones, persons involved/responsible, indicators of accomplishments and timeframes of occurrence are adequately specified. The plan demonstrates there is partner communication, continuous improvement and work plans. (pgs. 20-24)

3.

The work plan outlined to support management of the project is feasible to use as an operating model for the project and bring the project to scale and institutionalize effective and sustainable structures and practices by the conclusion of the grant period. The plan demonstrates how the applicant, partners, and schools are involved and tasked with implementing the project. (pgs. 26-27)

4.

The applicant presents an adequate method for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the project. The project integrates the applicant organization's overall institutional assessment plan, which will provides a framework for continuous improvement. This will allow project staff to identify intending learning outcomes and benchmarks; measure selected program and general education outcomes; review and discuss data, and identify changes in teaching strategies and curriculum. The cycle is sufficient because it will be continuous. (p. 27)

Weaknesses:

1.

No weaknesses noted.

2.

The quarterly timeframes specified for accomplishing major project activities are broad in nature in relation to work to be done on the project, and lack a clearly defined time when activities will begin and end.

3.

The applicant does not describe a specific multi-year financial model, or a plan to operate the project at a national or regional level during the project period. No indication is provided on how funds will be obtained or leveraged to support the project or specified elements, or how the project may be operated nationally or regionally.

4.

The applicant does not provide information that indicates that the five stage continuous improvement cycle will be used to

make program changes. As described it is adequate to make changes to teaching strategies and curriculum based upon data collected.

Reader's Score: 28

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 extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project s effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will study the project at the proposed level of scale, including, where appropriate, generating information about potential differential effectiveness of the project in diverse settings and for diverse student population groups.

(4) 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.

(5) 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.

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1 Improving Cost-Effectiveness and Productivity (zero or 1 point)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that address one of the following areas:

(a) Substantially improving student outcomes without commensurately increasing per-student costs.

(b) Maintaining student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

(c) Substantially improving student outcomes while substantially decreasing per-student costs.

Other requirements related to Competitive Preference Priority 1:

An application addressing this priority must provide

- (1) A clear and coherent budget that identifies expected student outcomes before and after the practice, the cost per student for the practice, and a clear calculation of the cost per student served;
- (2) A compelling discussion of the expected cost-effectiveness of the practice compared with alternative practices;
- (3) A clear delineation of one-time costs versus ongoing costs and a plan for sustaining the project, particularly ongoing costs, after the expiration of i3 funding;
- (4) Identification of specific activities designed to increase substantially the cost-effectiveness of the practice, such as re-designing costly components of the practice (while maintaining efficacy) or testing multiple versions of the practice in order to identify the most cost effective approach; and
- (5) A project evaluation that addresses the cost-effectiveness of the proposed practice.

Strengths:

The applicant addresses Competitive Preference Priority 1. A clear description of how the project will improve student outcomes without increasing per-student costs is demonstrated. Project staff will monitor and demonstrate how the cost of training and certifying a corps of high school and college faculty to deliver courses for dual credit to college ready students will be lower than the cost of delivering a traditional sequence of courses separately in high school and college. This is a strong effort that will solidify technical assistance, capacity building, and professional development and make for an effective plan to help sustain the project. Further, collaboration with Project partners to help identify and assess the effectiveness of key design elements will be critical to successful regional scaling and sustainability.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2 Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices (zero or 2 points)

Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that enable broad adoption of effective practices. An application proposing to address this priority must, as part of its application:

- (a) Identify the practice or practices that the application proposes to prepare for broad adoption, including formalizing the practice (i.e., establish and define key elements of the practice), codifying (i.e., develop a guide or tools to support the dissemination of information on key elements of the practice), and explaining why there is a need for formalization and codification.
- (b) Evaluate different forms of the practice to identify the critical components of the practice that are crucial to its success and sustainability, including the adaptability of critical components to different teaching and learning environments and to diverse learners.
- (c) Provide a coherent and comprehensive plan for developing materials, training, toolkits, or other supports that other entities would need in order to implement the practice effectively and with fidelity.
- (d) Commit to assessing the replicability and adaptability of the practice by supporting the implementation of the practice in a variety of locations during the project period using the materials,

training, toolkits, or other supports that were developed for the i3-supported practice.

Strengths:

The applicant makes an adequate case of how the project is designed to enable broad adoption of effective practices. Collaboration with project partners will help identify and assess the effectiveness of key design elements is a key effort in formalizing the program design. The information collected will inform future expansion of the project design, and codify tools to disseminate key program elements. For example, from the evaluation a manual or technical guide will be deployed to enable replication of the model and scaling strategy in other sites.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/01/2015 10:20 AM