

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/30/2015 06:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

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	16
Sub Total	100	16
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	16

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

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

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 cluster-level RCT (pg 29/30) is designed to meet WWC standards w/o reservation.

The evaluation questions are clearly delineated in the table on pages 30/31.

The proposal breaks out outcomes into short, medium, and long term outcomes.

EQ4 (page 31) plans to address differences by student demographic subgroups.

Minimum detectable effect size is clearly outlined and appropriate.

The proposal articulates the outcomes of the project and the assessments (i.e. the CWRA+ appear appropriate to address the impact questions).

There are multiple sources for collecting data on level of implementation (per page 31) and Appendix J page 10 clearly outlines fidelity of implementation indicators.

The Evaluator has worked on two i3 funded studies and has familiarity with WWC standards. Per Appendix J, the team currently works with the JSU team as evaluator for their current CORE i3 grant and resumes are strong.

Weaknesses:

Regarding student selection, it is unclear what is meant by a 'representative' random sample. This seems counterintuitive to the concept of randomization.

It is unclear what will the noncognitive/21st Century Skills measures will be.

The proposal does not address a plan to assess HS graduation as an impact/outcome variable despite being listed in the logic model.

The proposal would benefit from further description of how the applicant will account for likely inherently lower response rates (surveys about noncognitive skills) in the control schools. It would also benefit from further clarification regarding whether, when randomized to participation groups, schools agree to take part in data collection and/or the collection of extant student achievement data.

Measureable thresholds for acceptable implementation are outlined, but more information is need regarding how this data will be used in a quantitative way to expire it' potentially mediating impact on the impact questions around student outcomes

Not enough information was given regarding the budget to know if it is appropriate to the design.

Reader's Score: 16

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 06:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 02:21 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

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	17
Sub Total	100	17
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	17

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

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 logic model includes short, medium and long term outcomes. Key personnel include an evaluation manager, an impact study lead and an implementation study lead. Each of these individuals has the appropriate background and experience to complete their portion of the evaluation. The evaluation plan uses a randomized control trial design that meets WWC standards without reservations to evaluate the impact of project activities with participating states serving as blocks within which participating and control schools will be randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. The plan includes one implementation and three impact questions. The implementation question will be addressed using data from two surveys given to teachers, an administrator survey and a school-wide diagnostic index. The proposal includes details about the method of analysis and analytic approach (page 34), including details about the hierarchical linear model to be used to identify differences between diverse settings/populations. In particular, the evaluation plan includes a regression model for the posttest score that is appropriate for a quantitative dependent variable and both quantitative and qualitative independent variables. Data for the impact questions include a college and work readiness assessment and a learning and study skills inventory. Details about minimal detectable differences are provided. The external evaluator has been identified. The budget includes sufficient funds for conducting the project evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan does not include separate evaluations of each of the six separate components of the project (partnership building, technology, active learning methods, classroom support, college readiness and change management). It also does not include evaluation of the professional development programs for teachers.

Reader's Score: 17

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 02:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 02:40 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	15
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	30	28
Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	35	32
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	75
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	78

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

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 involves the development of strategies of the CORE model of high school reform for improving student outcomes through a two-year interactive school certification program. The involvement of the higher institutions is expected to lead to changes in improved high school graduation and college work and work readiness among 10th -12th grade students who are identified as high need in rural schools.

The plan defines the incorporation of a quality designed program model with strategies built around six CORE components through a network of partners and support services. The reform strategies are identified for school transformation and are expected to effectively improve student success and readiness for college and career. (pgs. 2-6)

(2) The plan includes multiple strategies for the potential replicability of the proposed project that will expand to every state through partnerships and collaborations. The research based strategies that can be replicated are built around the CORE model and are clearly defined with details focusing on partnership building to result in positive outcomes; technology for innovative approaches to teaching; active learning methods for interactive activities; classroom support for improved academic performance; college readiness for students who are not prepared; and change management to deal with the impact of change. The development of strategies for implementing these components are expected to produce effective outcomes as proposed in the plan in a variety of settings. (pgs. 3-8)

(3) With the attention of the proposed plan addressing these needs, the effective approaches will also take in account that the best way to address low graduation rates is well-prepared teachers. The plan will address this challenge, which is identified as a national needed solution, by increased professional development that supports implementing variation of project and placed-based learning, which is expected to improve outcomes, especially for rural students. (pgs. 10-11)

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 proposed project focuses on the unmet demand for needed reforms to increase high school graduation rates and college degrees for rural students. The CORE model approach will include educational strategies that include teacher preparation, technology support, a two-year school certification program and a full year internship placement for students. The comprehensive planned model is targeting 11,200 students in their study and will benefit 20,000 students over the grant period, which can enable the applicant to reach the level of scale that is proposed in the application.

(2) The project will be provided many resources from the universities to be used along with grant funding to address supporting schools with a wide variety of needs and preparing teachers and administrators for the workplace. The CORE model demonstrates unique characteristics that are considered relationship driven and identifies barriers to scaling the project. The plan outlines funding support to address barriers that focuses on leading and attending professional development opportunities; requiring input from the school systems during the planning stage; increased expectations of high need and rural students; providing linkages to college, and replacing textbooks with a digital environment. The grant funding is also being used for continuing existing grant supported positions that will extend the infrastructure supporting CORE activities and collaboration at the national office. The budgeted line items indicate an adequate use of grant funds along with resources from the communities and partners to address the above barriers presented by the applicant. (pgs. 12-14)

(3) The proposal provides substantial evidence that there are mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on the project. These include certification guidelines, workbooks and materials; validated research measures that can be replicated; presenting findings at conferences; developing varied guidebooks to be shared that relates to implementation of the CORE Academy, building CORE partnerships, change management and providing classroom support. The board dissemination of all aspects of the CORE program can support further development and replication. (pgs. 14-15)

Weaknesses:

(1) The plan lacks substantial descriptions of the strategies that relates to the full year internship program that is implemented by JSU. Additional information about this program can validate how the College of Education uses project strategies to enable the level of scale that is proposed in the application. (pg. 13)

(2 & 3) No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 28

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 goals are precise and are supported through six major objectives and corresponding action items that will lead to measurable learning outcomes. The project is aligned with a Logic Model that includes project activities, the participants who are involved, and defined short, medium and long range outcomes intended to be achieved by the proposal. The objectives are directed toward goals for academic achievement, expanding partnerships, expanding the use of technology in the CORE high schools, extensive professional development for teachers at the CORE Academy, preparing students for college and career, and supporting change management in CORE high schools. There are anticipated measurable outcomes defined in the plan, which will determine the effectiveness of the CORE model implementation in the randomly selected 80 schools participating in the study. (pgs. 16-25)

(2)The applicant's management plan is charted in the proposal with detailed features around seven key components, related activities which can ensure objectives are achieved on time and within budget, defined responsibilities and includes a flowchart of the major milestones across the four-year project. The Core Management Team, key personnel and partnerships with the project are expected to strengthen the efforts of the program, provide resources needed for operation, and will ensure objective outcomes that benefits the targeted population. (pg. 25 &Appendix J)

(3)The project is embedded in an already implemented CORE and the newly proposed plan was developed with no new funding. The applicant details plans for establishing dedicated relationships with state, regional and national partners, which will expand supports and improve educational outcomes for students nationwide. The plan also includes the JST team approach for sustainability long term and the capacity to replicate the model.

(4) The proposed implementation of the project is expected to provide consistent delivery of expected outcomes to be used as a continuous feedback loop of information. The continuous feedback is intended to ensure interventions are received, inform program course directions, allow for decision making, and examines data from multiple courses in a useful and supportive way that promotes change and reform. (pg. 29)

Weaknesses:

(1 & 2) No weaknesses noted

(3)The project lacks a clear and coherent multi-financial and operating model. The management team is already in place and the core model relies on services and resources already available, however, the plan did not explain an accompanying financial operating plan for the expanded CORE model. (pgs. 25-26)

(4)The project did not clearly explain the continuous performance feedback loop to be used for determining continuous improvement and operation of the proposed project. (pg. 29)

Reader's Score: 32

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 applicant addresses practices that are identified as potential cost-effective and will focus on integrating technology in the classroom, teacher mentoring, networking, sharing lesson plans and learning objects, and leveraging school dollars through partnerships. The plan demonstrated several means for sustainability after the grant funding period that includes numerous resources provided through the project partnerships.

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 demonstrates throughout the proposal that the CORE model approach will include educational strategies that include teacher preparation, technology support, a two-year school certification program and a full year internship placement for students. The adoption of these proven effective practices are expected to impact education through multiple components that supports system-wide changes, allows for replicability, and ensures effective practices to ensure impressive student outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 02:40 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2015 09:39 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

Reader #4: *****

	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	33
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
Sub Total	100	78
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	81

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

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:

The project is a pragmatic solution with innovative components for high school redesign with rural populations. The project demonstrates experts in the field of school restructuring with a clear understanding that

- 1) The teacher is the center of student learning, high expectations and positive outcomes in academic achievement.
- 2) District leaders are the change agents within the school system by planning and implementation of innovative grant initiatives through its local schools to ensure that the project is sustainable.
- 3) The principal must have professional development of effective outcomes within their school, build teacher morale and demonstrate leadership strategies.
- 4) Finally, school partnerships among postsecondary institutions, business and industry is essential to revitalizing schools to understand research-based practices, current issues and strategies in education and education reform.

Based on these fundamental principles exhibited in the project, the solutions presented to transform pedagogy using place-based approaches, which is a derivative of constructivist and problem-based strategies using a cognitive science medium, i.e. technology devices to instruct students, accelerated learning is actualized within the school.

The project presents a design that focuses on teacher and administrator professional development as catalysts of change. The project includes existing schools who have implement the strategies with successful outcomes and can be replicated in other schools and their districts.

Weaknesses:

None reported.

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:

Teachers need extensive support particularly in high-need, disadvantaged and rural schools to implement a new strategy, pedagogy or process. The project will provide a two-year comprehensive participatory teacher program.

The project seeks to provide technology education strategies to treatment schools to construct place-based teaching and learning environments to accomplish higher order thinking in the classroom. Rigorous teacher professional development will offer solutions to transforming pedagogy. In addition, school principal will be active in the professional development process through the project administrator professional development.

Grant funds will be used for technology purchases and infrastructure at treatment schools. The project will provide funding for control schools by offering incentives. Schools who successfully implement the grant goals and objectives will earn a school certification credential managed by the project team and its partners, which includes the district superintendent as a member of the regional collaborative team.

Dissemination practices are highly effective as participating school districts, state board of education, postsecondary institutions, business and industry are part of the regional collaborative. The collaborative team plans to host workshop, conferences, develop website with resources for replicability in other school districts with rural populations. The project is replicable by providing school reform strategies for K-20 partnerships.

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 has a clear, coherent timeline and financial plan to carry out the goals and objectives in other school districts. The project design enables teachers and administrators to become proficient in advanced technology and become effective educators that meets the needs of students. Technology education approaches are relevant to students; relationships between teachers and students are formed when pedagogical strategies infused with technology are implemented in the classroom.

The project design and management team is adequate and effective by expanding postsecondary institutions in the region to join the CORE partnership and work with treatment schools to earn the CORE credential that represents a whole-school technology teaching and learning model. The project includes detailed milestones in which the management team will carry out the project tasks.

The project will ensure continuous improvement using results from data collected by teachers and administrators.

Weaknesses:

It is imperative that the grant project is the sole teacher professional development during school year. Additional professional development outside the scope of the grant will be overwhelming for local schools.

Reader's Score: **33**

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:

Transformative pedagogy in the classroom is comprised of a teacher with resources, collaboration with external stakeholders, teacher support, continuous learning via professional development, using technology for place-based instruction, and setting high expectations in the classroom. This cost-effective approach will exceed student outcomes through academic achievement, limited remediation, timely completion and graduation and guarantee career or college placement. One-time costs of technology purchases are a start-up to increase student academic performance and if successful, will become operational costs for the school districts after the grant period.

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 project has a model of effective practices such as assessment rubric, research-based strategies, research study results, implications, data management plans, IRB approval letters for broad adoption for any school district nationwide.

Weaknesses:

None reported.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/02/2015 09:39 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 02:23 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

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	0
Enabling Broad Adoption of Effective Practices		
1. CPP 2	2	2
Sub Total	3	2
Total	103	75

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: Jacksonville State University (U411B150025)

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 viable approach that will help validate professional development for active learning methodologies, technology integration, change management and other teacher and administrator supports that will help increase graduation rates and college and work readiness among 10th-12th grade students in high need and rural schools. The project model (the Collaborative Regional Education (CORE) is a strong way to introduce a two-year school certification model to rural high schools via integration of technology and active learning methods in classrooms. Also, providing teachers with professional development and classroom support better prepares students for college and career through increased 21st century and non-cognitive skills. The model will also include partnership building, technology, active learning methods, classroom support, college readiness and change management supported by regional universities across the country. In addition, the project will provide school technology, teacher mentorship, online professional learning communities, a math and English bridge program, and change management support for administrators. (pgs. 1-4) Research is referenced in support of active learning models such as project-based learning, technology integration, classroom support, and partnership building in Appendix and on pages 1-6.

2.

The applicant demonstrates the model is replicable in other settings. Through partnership with six regional universities developed through another i3 grant, the applicant has deployed the model and serves school systems in five additional states: Arkansas, Georgia, North Carolina, Missouri and Texas. The applicant is in the process of adding Louisiana Tech University as a project site and plans to recruit two additional regional universities in different states through the proposed initiative. The three-day conference, CORE Academy, is a key professional development feature of the model. CORE Academy will be replicated in three additional locations. The applicant will document all components of the regional university's responsibilities for convening workshops and all other components of the model as demonstrated in Appendix J. The model has potential to be expanded to every state through partnership in collaboration with the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). The success of the project model is demonstrated through reports by LEAs that have replicated the model. For example, one high school reported that after implementing technology and project-based learning in their classrooms, graduation rates increased from 63% in 2009 to 88% in 2013, while college acceptance rates increased from 33% to 79% in the same timeframe.

3.

The project will meet national needs for by helping prepare teachers to better support students in obtaining the skills needed to enter the workforce as career ready.

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. The proposed project responds to the continued demand for a plan to help students gain the skills needed to be successful. The proposed project will prepare students for careers dictated by skills needed in the 21st century for success (i.e., Life and Career Skills; Learning and Innovation Skills- 4Cs; Core Subjects-3Rs; and Information, Media, and Technology Skills). As reported, 25% of rural students do not graduate from high school and only 17% of adults in rural areas have a college degree. Comprehensive approaches such as that specified in the proposed model geared that promote change are the only way to have real change (pgs. 11-13)
2.
The applicant presents a clear description of factors that make the proposed program. Factors described include the lack of faculty and PK-12 teachers both leading and attending professional development opportunities; lack of input from the school systems during the planning phase to ensure the intervention is consistent with the school's needs; and a limited focus on increasing the expectations of high need and rural students by providing linkages to college and solutions to the digital divide. (pg. 14) Project funds will allow for a more coordinated professional development approach, strong collaboration with the overall school system that allows for more focus on what is needed by the school and the students.
3.
The applicant describes intent to develop products for disseminating project information. For example, the applicant has begun developing materials/guidebooks, systems and validated research measures that can be replicated more broadly by project universities. The applicant will serve as the national center that will support replication of the model. Guidebooks will be developed for implementing a CORE Academy, building CORE partnerships, change management and providing classroom support. The effort will be accomplished with the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. The applicant has begun present findings at i3 project director meetings,

the American Evaluation Association, American Educational Research Association, and other national conferences. (pgs. 15-16)

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

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 applicant outlines measurable goals and objectives for the project. The overarching goals for the project are to improve graduation rates and college and work readiness skills among high school students in high need and rural schools. These goals will be supported through six major objectives and corresponding action items that will lead to an ambitious set of process and learning outcomes. Objectives are to expand partnerships; expand use of technology; expand use of active learning methods; increase classroom support; prepare students for college and career; and support change management. A comprehensive logic model is provided describing the relationship among the components and outcomes, theoretically and operationally. The Logic Model concisely visualizes a well-specified conceptual framework, identifying key active ingredients that are considered to be critical to achieving outcomes.

2.
The applicant presents a management plan that is sufficient to guide staff in implementing the project. A project timeline organized by the project objectives is provided in Appendix J. The plan includes activities, due dates and responsible parties for the five years of the funded project. A flowchart of the major milestones across the four-year project is feasible the help staff ensure accomplishment of project goals. A clearly defined organizational structure is outlined for the project that delineates clear lines of authority. The proposed management team is already in place and functioning in the roles

proposed. Positions include the Project Director, Project Manager, and ICF, International evaluation team. Another i3 grant supports many of the team members specified in the organizational structure for the project including the database manager, conference coordinator, director of learning technology and the educational technology assistants (ETAs). The applicant will use project funds to hire a director of research, systems manager, IT specialist and membership coordinator to support the proposed project. Qualifications and responsibilities of key personnel is appropriate to the positions. The staffing structure will allow all phases of the project to be implemented with fidelity and allow a strong support structure for students. (pgs. 25-29)

3.

The applicant outlines a strategy to address financial and operating model for the project that helps efforts to operate the project at a national or regional level during the project period. The proposed management plan includes teams of staff and partners to support service delivery, coordination and communication. The senior administrators of the Center for Collaborative Regional Education initially provided direction and funding for the project and are committed to its continuation. The IRC Project Manager will oversee the logistics of workshops and conferences. Coordinating departments at the applicant organization will work together, across silos, to implement conferences, coordinate with PK-12 partners and provide professional development. The lateral team approach and continued validation from partners that the project model is needed enhances the long term sustainability and capacity for other regional universities to replicate the model. (pg. 25)

4.

The applicant presents strategies that are appropriate for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the project, allowing the applicant to make adjustments as needed to meet participant needs. Data from multiple sources, including CORE Academy and workshop evaluations will be shared just-in-time with project staff, and explored during team meetings to inform program course correction and decision making. (pg. 29) The CORE management team, including the evaluators, will continue to meet at least monthly to review the project plan, formative data, and results from the fidelity of implementation study. During data collection windows, these meetings will take place weekly. Updates to the management plan will be made annually and within three months of the grant award. (pg. 23)

Weaknesses:

1.

No weaknesses noted.

2.

The applicant does not elaborate on how staff supported in another i3 grant will be supported when that project comes to an end.

3.

Limited information is provided in support of the financial plan that involves sustaining the project. No information is provided on efforts to leverage funds to support the project.

4.

No weaknesses noted.

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:

“This criterion was thoroughly discussed and my score reflects my professional assessment of this section.”

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not meet Preference Priority 1. The applicant does not provide a budget or information that identifies specific information regarding the cost per student for the practice and a clear calculation of the cost per student. The applicant also does not delineate one-time costs versus on-going costs.

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:

The applicant meets Competitive Preference Priority 2. The project will impact education broadly through multiple components that support and sustain system-wide change. By validating the model, with the regional university providing the supports that empower schools to leverage partnerships, gain targeted professional development, and network teachers around best practices. The project will likely demonstrate an ability to identify, share and sustain effective practices quickly and with increased student outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/01/2015 02:23 PM