

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 6/24/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction -- Teaching and Learning (S371C110023)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of State-level activities		
Quality of State-level activities		
1. State-level activities	37	33
Sub Total	37	33
Quality of the State subgrant competition		
Quality of the State subgrant competition		
1. State subgrant comp	28	28
Sub Total	28	28
Project management		
Project management		
1. Project management	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Adequacy of resources		
Adequacy of resources		
1. Adequacy of resources	20	20
Sub Total	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Priority		
Effective Use of Technology		
1. Competitive Priority	5	1
Sub Total	5	1
Absolute Priority 1		
Improving Learning Outcomes		
1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Absolute Priority 2		
Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making		
1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - SRCL - 5: 84.371C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction -- Teaching and Learning

Questions

Quality of State-level activities - Quality of State-level activities

1. In determining the quality of State-level activities, the Secretary considers: See Sub-Criteria

Reader's Score: 33

Sub Question

1. How the SEA will carry out the required State-level activities (described in the Additional Requirements section of the NIA) and how it will align those activities with its comprehensive State literacy plan.

Strengths:

The applicant provides strong evidence for how it will carry out state level activities and how these align with the state literacy plan. The grant will build the bridge from a position of system wide readiness to one that results in improved learning outcomes, data-based decisions and effective use of technology. (p. e1). The activities are aligned with a comprehensive state plan of reading. The plan incorporates a framework which includes research based literacy elements. Activities described in the proposal outline implementation phases with attention to the complex nature of systems development and change. (p. e3) Attention is given to capacity building and readiness for change.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

2. The SEA's goals for improving student literacy outcomes throughout the State for all students (e.g., limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities), including a description of the data (which may include data gathered through a needs assessment) that the SEA has considered or will consider and a clear and credible path that the SEA will take to achieve these goals with the support of its LEAs.

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a comprehensive plan for meeting the goals and articulating a clear path to achieve the goals with the LEAs. The proposal presents a clear vision that is shared by stakeholders and depends upon various data sets as indicators of success. Target goals will be established for the state literacy assessment and leading indicators will be used to assess progress. (p. e 13). A well mapped out implementation plan and timeline support the attainment of these goals.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 8

3. How the SEA will provide technical assistance and support to its SRCL subgrantees (and, at its discretion, to other LEAs or early childhood education providers) to enable them to implement a high-quality comprehensive literacy program and to improve student achievement in core academic subjects.

Strengths:

The applicant describes a sound, multitiered process for providing support to the LEA and Early Childhood providers. Leadership and management teams will provide support at the state, regional and local levels, with clear and specific roles and responsibilities being outlined. (p. e14) Professional development modules that align with the state's literacy plan will be provided. Integration of state level leaders into the process will ensure clear alignment and prioritization of project goals.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not address specific details for how the professional development training modules can be accessed. Provisions about the schedule or timetable of technical assistance aligned with the various phases of subgrantee work would ensure all elements are being addressed.

Reader's Score: 4

4. How the SEA will evaluate the State's progress in improving achievement in literacy for children and youth from birth through grade 12, including disadvantaged students, including: (1) whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluator (whose role in the project is limited solely to conducting the evaluation); (2) whether the evaluation will use methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the objectives of the proposed project; and (3) how the SEA will use evidence to inform and continuously improve the design and implementation of its activities.

Strengths:

The applicant describes a comprehensive process for evaluation of the project with clear goals and expectations. Three purposes or research questions will guide the evaluation. (p. e17)The evaluator will work with the state to design the evaluation approach and methodology for the project. The evaluator will be a research expert and have experience in evaluating large scale programs. Various data will be collected that is accessible and appropriate to project goals. (p. e18) State outcome measures will be used to provide data in literacy areas.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not adequately address how the SEA will use evidence to continuously improve the design and implementation of its activities. While data based on student outcome measures have been identified, limited information was provided regarding the process for using these results to change or improve the design of the project on an ongoing basis.

Reader's Score: 8

5. How the SEA will disseminate information on project outcomes, disaggregated by student subgroup, and in formats that are easily understood by, and accessible to, the public, and how the SEA will make that information useful to varied groups (such as families, educators, researchers, other experts, early childhood education providers, and State leaders).

Strengths:

The applicant has presented a sound, multi-pronged approach for disseminating project results to various stakeholder groups. The existence of a communication plan (p. e20) which aligns with the literacy initiatives will help determine the key information to be shared. The plan will be revisited quarterly and then annually with a variety of strategies for reaching out to groups. In addition, a web portal will be dedicated to the project (p. e20). Social networking sites and public awareness campaigns will be used to reach out to stakeholder groups.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant's proposal for dissemination needs refinement in some of the details. Limited information is given on how the SEA will reach various diverse groups with different backgrounds and understanding of the project, its goals and outcomes. More definition is needed to understand how a range of stakeholders will be reached so that communication can be easily understood and is accessible to all groups.

Reader's Score: 3

Quality of the State subgrant competition - Quality of the State subgrant competition

1. In determining the quality of the applicant's proposed SRCL subgrant competition, the Secretary considers: See Sub-Criteria

Reader's Score: 28

Sub Question

- 1. The extent to which the SEA will run a rigorous, high-quality competition for subgrants, including how it will review and judge:**
- a) The LEA's or early childhood education provider's capacity to successfully implement its proposal.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence of a rigorous process for subgrant competition by utilizing a two pronged approach (p. e21) and differentiating the subgrants based on the level of the applicant. The competitive process requires applicants to partner and collaborate with ECE groups. The applicant has provided clear and specific selection criteria for eligibility. Additional considerations are given to populations of poverty or disadvantaged students. The applicant presents a timeline for awarding subgrants. Additional factors that support successful implementation have been identified for use in determining awardees. (p. e24-25)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

- 2. (b) The extent to which each SRCL subgrant applicant has proposed a comprehensive high-quality literacy program that meets all of the requirements set out in paragraph (d) of the Additional Requirements section in the NIA and that:**
- (1) Addresses the needs of disadvantaged students and proposes to implement activities in schools and early learning programs with the highest levels of need and capacity for improvement.**
 - (2) Is informed by a needs assessment described in the application and is designed to support effective teaching and to improve student achievement of struggling readers.**
 - (3) Involves other agencies, nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations, and families in activities that promote the implementation of effective literacy instruction for disadvantaged students.**

Strengths:

The applicant has developed a comprehensive process for subgrant applicants to follow. The application and required data will ensure that project needs and populations to be served will be included. Table 12, Consideration Pool and Priority for Selection, (p. e22) outlines criteria related to students of greatest

Sub Question

need and disadvantaged student populations. Schools serving high poverty students, based on the state's definition of poverty, and capacity to serve these students, (p. e22) will be given priority. Additional requirements for the applicants include data based on the State's needs assessment which inform the scope and direction of the project, (p. e.25) and involvement of other agencies, nonprofits and communities and families in activities to promote implementation. The application, planning template and RFP instructions (Attachment 2) provide applicants with a consistent format to help them obtain necessary data. In addition, links to other agencies and questions surrounding partnership will elicit this information from applicants.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 8

3. (c) **The extent to which each SRCL subgrant applicant demonstrates that it will implement a coherent strategy to improve literacy instruction that aligns activities under the SRCL subgrant with literacy instruction supported with other Federal funds, including with funds the entity receives under Title I, Title II-A, and Title III of the ESEA and, as appropriate, the Head Start Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, and State and local funds.**

Strengths:

The applicant has demonstrated this area through inclusion in the application materials. Subgrant applicants will have to demonstrate a coherent strategy (p. e26) for improving literacy instruction that aligns with SRCL and with federal, state and local funds. The application material and scoring guidelines require these elements to be present and will provide the basis for scoring application reviews.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted.

Reader's Score: 2

4. **The extent to which the SEA will give priority to LEAs or providers of early childhood education that propose to serve high-poverty schools or a high-poverty population, based on a definition of poverty and process for applying the priority provided by the State.**

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates support of this indicator by prioritizing those with the strongest and greatest need and largest capacity to serve high poverty schools. The definition of poverty that is used by the state will be applied, (p. e26) with the actual definition being stated. LEA applicants will be required to identify a school or ECE setting and all must serve high poverty children. Specific criteria are provided for each age level-birth-5, K-5 and 6-12. (p. e27)

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 6

5. **The extent to which the SEA will give priority to LEAs or providers of early childhood education whose applications are supported by the strongest available evidence.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides good support for applications with the strongest evidence available. Applicants will be required to implement required elements in the state's Comprehensive Literacy Plan (p. e28). This evidence can be anchored in research or effectiveness data on a specific strategy, approach or

Sub Question

intervention. Elements such as universal design, Response to Intervention and coherent assessment systems will be given consideration in the process. Alignment of materials with state learning standards will also be a recognized element in the application and scoring process.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 4

- 6. The extent to which the SEA will develop or update a process, or use an existing process, to review and judge the evidence base and alignment with State standards for the curricula and materials that LEAs propose to use in implementing their subgrants, and how the SEA will make the process and results of any such review publicly available.**

Strengths:

The applicant has a sound and appropriate process for reviewing curricula and materials proposed by the LEAs in subgrant applications. A two pronged process will be available with the use of an existing online process to validate a program's effectiveness and a review of instructional material process. (p. e. 29) Both options ensure research based materials will be selected to meet project goals. Table 14 (p. e30) provides sound evidence of how this process will be used to align materials with standards. Use of online website with the state conducted materials review will make process public and accessible to all applicants throughout the state.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses notes.

Reader's Score: 5

Project management - Project management

- 1. The Secretary considers the following factors in determining the quality of the project management plan: See Sub-Criteria**

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

- 1. (i) 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant has presented a comprehensive management plan with clear roles and responsibilities for each individual or level of involvement in the project. (p. e31). Position dedicated to budget manager will oversee links to the budgetary aspects of the project. Organizational chart is helpful in seeing the relationship and connection with all who will be involved in the project. Table 16 (p. e35) provides information on key program milestones, activities and timelines with attention to alignment with other partners and funders.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 6

2. (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key personnel.

Strengths:

The applicant provided information on the training and experience of key personnel for the project in Attachment 4. Resumes are included in the project proposal along with a draft Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Project Director (p. e40). Many of the positions are yet to be filled, so the Request for Qualifications provides a sample of expected qualifications. The requirements and qualifications with the position are very detailed and specific, requiring that the personnel hired would have the experience and training for the scope and work connected with the project as well as experience with large scale change efforts.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) The extent to which the State will ensure a diversity of perspectives in the design and implementation of the proposed project, including those of: families, teachers, early childhood education professionals, officials from other State and local agencies, Head Start Advisory Councils, professional organizations, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, and libraries.

Strengths:

The applicant has suggested a variety of strong and reasonable methods to ensure diversity in perspectives. The State collaborated with multiple partners when developing the proposal, seeking out groups that are familiar with and represent local, state and federal educational organizations which support efforts to improve learning and/or literacy. The Project Director will meet with the Oversight Committee and regularly convene the Advisory Committee to review goals and outcomes. In addition, the Project Management Team will gather on the ground input (p. e41) and perspectives from subgrantees through the Regional Coordinators.

Weaknesses:

There are no noted weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 4

Adequacy of resources - Adequacy of resources

1. The Secretary considers the following factors in determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project: See Sub-Criteria

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

1. (i) The extent to which the costs described in the SEA's budget are reasonable in relation to the

Sub Question

number of objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project .

Strengths:

The proposal suggests strong evidence for ensuring costs described are reasonable. The applicant discusses selection of an "expert" Project Management Team and State Technical Assistance team, responsible to lead, monitor and hold participants accountable to meet objectives in a timely manner and within budget. (e. 42) Funding will be structured via tiers over the five years as a stair step approach to build strong and sustainable projects. Allocation will take place according to demographic, economic and geographic distribution.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (ii) The quality of the SEA's plan to ensure that SRCL subgrant funds are allocated as follows:

- * **At least 15 percent to serve children from birth through age five.**
- * **At least 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade five.**
- * **At least 40 percent to serve students in middle and high school, through grade 12, including an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools.**

Strengths:

The applicant describes a strong process outlining a series of steps to ensure allocation of funds according to the required percentages. (p. e42) The state has utilized a number of steps to ensure the subgrant funds will adhere to guidelines. This includes an application process will allow some variance for the 15/40/40 SEA requirement. Local LEA's will be informed of the requirements and technical assistance will be provided to support and assist in budget development. (p. e43). In addition, the Administrative funds for an Operations Manager will monitor the expenditure of funds to ensure objectives are met within budget and on time.

Weaknesses:

There are no noted weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 4

3. (iii) The extent to which the SEA will use the grant to leverage other State and Federal funds in order to maximize the impact of the grant and how it will support LEAs and early childhood education providers in integrating funds with other local, State, and Federal funds and in developing a plan for sustaining funding after the end of the subgrant.

Strengths:

The SEA presents strong evidence for how they will leverage other funds to maximize this grant. The application presents specific references to the amount of grant funds pledged for 2011-2012. The collaborative process used to develop the SEA proposal engaged leaders from various divisions in the process and ensured their voices would inform the project (p. e43). This early buy-in from key partners helped to inform and engage them in the process, while garnering support during implementation phases. State agencies have committed to provide technical assistance and models from exemplary school district will be shared with others. Sustainability plans will be required of LEAs to continue to assess the integration of funding from other agencies.

Weaknesses:

No noted weakness in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

Sub Question

4. (iv) **The extent to which the SEA will award SRCL subgrants of sufficient size to support projects that improve instruction for a significant number of students in the high-need schools or early learning programs serving children birth through five that the SRCL subgrantee would serve.**

Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly describes how the subgrant will support projects for a significant number of students. The proposed budget enables purchases of standards based materials in Year 1 with support lessening over the five year period. (p. e45). Two approaches were described for use. The first approach supports partners serving high poverty populations, while the second approach is for capacity building, which makes all partners eligible.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Competitive Priority - Effective Use of Technology

1. **To meet this priority, an applicant must (1) propose to use technology--which may include technology to support principles of universal design for learning (as defined in the NIA)--to address student learning challenges; and (2) provide, in its application, an evidence-based (as defined in the NIA) rationale that its proposed technology program, practice, or strategy will increase student engagement and achievement or increase teacher effectiveness.**

Background: The effective use of technology is a critical tool for improving learning outcomes and providing teachers with high-quality professional development. Use of concepts, ideas, programming techniques, and computer-assisted text displays that give access to the text for students who cannot access traditional print, including limited-English-proficient children and students with disabilities, is a basic tenet of universal design for learning (as defined in the NIA) and can help improve students' literacy and language development and identify and address student learning challenges.

Strengths:

The applicant includes the goal of creating a technology infrastructure to support improved teaching and learning in the Phase 2 stage of the project. (p. e3) Using technology is also referred to in p. e1 of the application materials as follows: Effectively utilizing technology to improve teaching and learning.

Weaknesses:

While the overarching goals for creating a technology infrastructure are strong and align with the work in the project, there is minimal information about how this will be accomplished. The applicant does not adequately address principles of universal design and the ways in which technology will serve various student populations. There are limited references to technology or how it will be used to manage, collect and analyze student data or directly impact student learning by providing students with accommodations or adaptations to the traditional learning modalities.

Reader's Score: 1

Absolute Priority 1 - Improving Learning Outcomes

1. **To meet this priority: An applicant must propose a project that is designed to improve school readiness and success through grade 12 in the area of language and literacy development for disadvantaged students.**

Background: Improving the language and literacy development of disadvantaged students is essential

to improving academic achievement for these students in all content areas. The 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results show disproportionately large numbers of disadvantaged students struggle with developing the necessary pre-literacy and literacy skills needed to read, comprehend, and use language effectively. This results in persistent gaps in academic achievement through the elementary and secondary school years and in high school graduation rates, and presents civic and economic difficulties for these students later in life. Meeting the language and literacy needs of disadvantaged students, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities, is a particular focus of the SRCL program.

Strengths:

The applicant has provided strong evidence for improving learning outcomes. The project goals and priorities align with the state's comprehensive plan for literacy and provide a clear and concise implementation plan. Attention is given to disadvantaged students and how these students can be identified and closely monitored for progress and improvement. Interventions and assessment in the implementation plan refer to and include activities at various levels-Tier 1, II and III based on student need.

MET

Weaknesses:

Proposal does not adequately address special populations or limited English students and the differentiated programming they may require. The applicant makes limited references to students with disabilities.

Reader's Score: 0

Absolute Priority 2 - Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making

1. **To meet this priority: An applicant must propose a project that is designed to collect, analyze, and use high-quality and timely data, especially on program participant outcomes, in accordance with privacy requirements (as defined in the NIA), to improve instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes in early learning settings and in elementary and secondary schools.**

Background: Accurate, timely, relevant, and appropriate data, and the effective use of that data for informed decision-making, are essential to the continuous improvement of children's literacy and language development. In developing comprehensive literacy plans and programs, it is important for States to consider strategies that provide educators, as well as families and other key stakeholders, with the data they need and the capacity and training to use those data to improve school readiness, respond to the learning and academic needs of students, improve educator effectiveness, inform professional development practices and approaches, and make informed decisions that increase student pre-literacy, literacy, and language development.

Strengths:

The applicant refers to and uses data as a theme throughout the application and at each phase of the process. From the preimplementation phase (p. e3), where data management is described, and throughout each of the phases, data assessment, collection, analysis and interpretation are key components. Data connected with leading indicators will also be used in the application process.

MET

Weaknesses:

The applicant describes one of the main outcomes of the proposed project to be "Enabling more data-based decision making by aligning data collection and using data to identify instructional practices that achieve literacy results," indicating this to be a strong objective. While data is required of the subgrantees within their applications and must be woven throughout their project of how data will inform and improve instructional outcomes, there are no specific details about the kind of support that will be provided to help them reach this goal. There is limited information regarding how families and other key stakeholders will be provided with the

data they need or with the capacity and training to use data to improve school readiness.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 6/24/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 6/24/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction -- Teaching and Learning (S371C110023)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of State-level activities		
Quality of State-level activities		
1. State-level activities	37	29.5
Sub Total	37	29.5
Quality of the State subgrant competition		
Quality of the State subgrant competition		
1. State subgrant comp	28	24
Sub Total	28	24
Project management		
Project management		
1. Project management	15	10
Sub Total	15	10
Adequacy of resources		
Adequacy of resources		
1. Adequacy of resources	20	16
Sub Total	20	16
Priority Questions		
Competitive Priority		
Effective Use of Technology		
1. Competitive Priority	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Absolute Priority 1		
Improving Learning Outcomes		
1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Absolute Priority 2		
Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making		
1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	79.5

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - SRCL - 5: 84.371C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction -- Teaching and Learning

Questions

Quality of State-level activities - Quality of State-level activities

1. In determining the quality of State-level activities, the Secretary considers: See Sub-Criteria

Reader's Score: 29.5

Sub Question

1. How the SEA will carry out the required State-level activities (described in the Additional Requirements section of the NIA) and how it will align those activities with its comprehensive State literacy plan.

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion i - The applicant presented a very detailed, comprehensive and cohesive plan for how the project will support subgrantees in aligning their literacy efforts with the state literacy plan (p. 1-11). The applicant has already convened a state-wide literacy team to expand the state framework to include ECE programs (p. 2) before developing this proposal. The applicant proposes a 5 phase process for building a state wide system (p. 4-5) which should ensure the successful development of a cohesive framework for literacy services birth to grade 12. The applicant also proposes two kinds of grant opportunities (literacy system subgrants for intensive supports, capacity building subgrants for professional development, p. 4-5) which should ensure a comprehensive and all-inclusive state wide system for supporting effective literacy practices.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

2. The SEA's goals for improving student literacy outcomes throughout the State for all students (e.g., limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities), including a description of the data (which may include data gathered through a needs assessment) that the SEA has considered or will consider and a clear and credible path that the SEA will take to achieve these goals with the support of its LEAs.

Sub Question

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion ii. The applicant provided a comprehensive and detailed plan for the data that will be collected or used to determine if the goals of the project are being met (p. 11-13). The state has set an ambitious goal that 95% of the children in their state are prepared to enter Kindergarten and that 95% of high school students will graduate with robust literacy skills by 2016 (p. 11). In addition, the applicant has provided baseline data for students in grade 3 through high school graduates. The same data will be collected each year to determine the progress and set annual goals for the project (p. 12).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriterion ii. The state currently has no baseline data collected for Early Childhood Education programs (p. 12-13). It is not clear from the information provided what measure the state/project will use to determine if children enrolled in ECE programs will enter Kindergarten with "school-ready language development" (p. 11). It was also not clear what measures were used in Table 8 (p. 12-13) for the baseline data. It is unclear without more detailed information how the 95% goal would be met by students who are ELL or who have special needs. Knowing the measure to be used for all children and the interventions for children who are English Language Learners and special needs would be helpful in determining whether the 95% goal is realistic for any of the students.

Reader's Score: 6

3. How the SEA will provide technical assistance and support to its SRCL subgrantees (and, at its discretion, to other LEAs or early childhood education providers) to enable them to implement a high-quality comprehensive literacy program and to improve student achievement in core academic subjects.

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion iii. The applicant provided comprehensive and detailed information about how it will provide technical assistance to LEA/ECE programs in their development of effective literacy plans/approaches (subgrantee application, planning template and the draft of request for proposal instructions found in Attachment 2, p. e0-e29). Once the subgrantees are identified through the application competition process, the applicant proposes a cohesive approach for continued technical assistance as evidenced by a dedicated management team that will provide assistance (p. 14-15) and a series of professional development activities that include on-site support and individualized coaching (p. 15). The applicant also provided the content of these professional development modules which includes information about aligning literacy approaches with state standards, effective assessment methods, evidence-based literacy instruction and intervention, creating systems for comprehensive literacy approaches and specific information about effective instructional strategies for students with disabilities and those who are English Language Learners (p. 15). This appears to be an effective system for delivering assistance to the subgrantees.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriterion iii. While the applicant provided specific information about the content of the technical assistance to subgrantees more information about the amount of time devoted to these professional development/technical assistance activities (workshops, coaching) would have made it clearer if the amount of assistance will be effective. Additionally, how these technical assistance supports (program identifies need or applicant identifies who receives assistance including the amount of support) would have strengthened this section.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 4

4. How the SEA will evaluate the State's progress in improving achievement in literacy for children and youth from birth through grade 12, including disadvantaged students, including: (1) whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluator (whose role in the project is limited solely to conducting the evaluation); (2) whether the evaluation will use methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the objectives of the proposed project; and (3) how the SEA will use evidence to inform and continuously improve the design and implementation of its activities.

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion iv. The applicant has provided comprehensive and detailed information about the qualifications that will be required/desired for any independent evaluator who is contracted for this project (p.18), the purpose of the evaluation (p. 16-18) and the kinds of measures to be collected (p. 18-19). These criteria appear to be appropriate for an effective evaluation plan. There are specific project questions related to measuring the effects of the literacy efforts for project children who have disabilities or who have limited English proficiency (p. 18) which should increase the likelihood that these children are effectively served.

Subcriterion iv

The applicant has identified standard child outcome assessments to be used by all subgrantees (p. 18-19). These assessments are targeted for the selected age groups and will provide continuity of evaluation for all subgrantees. This may help identify effective strategies/interventions by subgrantee.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriterion iv. The applicant did not provide information about measurement beyond student outcomes (p. 18-19). Questions related to implementation were included in the purpose of the evaluation (p.16-17) but no information about how implementation would be measured was included in this section. While student outcomes are important to understanding the effectiveness of selected literacy approaches, it would also be extremely important to include measurement of implementation to determine the extent that these approaches were reliably delivered as well as teacher/program characteristics. Additionally, the applicant did not include any information about social validity measures (rating scales, interviews) to better understand teacher and family perspectives about the selected approaches.

Subcriterion iv. There was limited information included in this section about how the SEA will use evidence to inform and continuously improve the design and implementation of its activities. There was a statement on p. 16 about reviewing and assessing progress and a 90-day improvement plan but more detailed and specific information about the actual process for using data to continuously improve the projects would have strengthened this section. The applicant stated on page 15 that the project management team will utilize feedback from the subgrantees and the independent evaluator to monitor and revise plans but it is not clear how the subgrantees will be involved in this process or how the information will be communicated to them.

Reader's Score: 6.5

5. How the SEA will disseminate information on project outcomes, disaggregated by student subgroup, and in formats that are easily understood by, and accessible to, the public, and how the

Sub Question

SEA will make that information useful to varied groups (such as families, educators, researchers, other experts, early childhood education providers, and State leaders).

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion v. The applicant provided a detailed dissemination plan for communicating information about the subgrant application and selection process (Table 4, p. 9) and for its review of instructional literacy materials (Table 5, p. 10). The applicant proposes to use an existing state data system to disaggregate or aggregate data for dissemination purposes. The application also included an innovative approach for internal communication and collaboration among subgrantee partners through a social networking site (p. 21). The project proposes to disseminate the goals, guidelines and criteria for subgrantee participation through a dedicated public web-portal and results of the grantees efforts through public awareness campaigns (p. 21). These approaches should result in effective information sharing among the subgrantees and in general to professionally related groups.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriterion v. The applicant did not provide specific information about how it will disseminate project results that are understandable to families and the general public other than to state through "public awareness campaigns" (p. 21). It would have strengthened this section if the applicant had acknowledged that families specifically and the public in general require a different kind and level of disseminated information and the kinds of information that will be targeted for these audiences.

Reader's Score: 3

Quality of the State subgrant competition - Quality of the State subgrant competition

1. In determining the quality of the applicant's proposed SRCL subgrant competition, the Secretary considers: See Sub-Criteria

Reader's Score: 24

Sub Question

- 1. The extent to which the SEA will run a rigorous, high-quality competition for subgrants, including how it will review and judge:**
 - a) The LEA's or early childhood education provider's capacity to successfully implement its proposal.**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion i(a) The applicant has provided detailed and specific information about how it will administer a rigorous, high-quality competition for subgrant applications. The applicant will not only provide funds to assist LEAs and ECE partners but will also fund additional LEA and ECE programs in the form of capacity-building subgrants (p. 21). They will support subgrantees in their application efforts by providing several grant writing workshops (p. 24) which should make it more likely that deserving and qualified programs that do not have previous experience securing grant funds will be able to compete for these funds with programs that have long standing grant application experience. A detailed plan and process for including these programs is included in the subgrantee application, planning template and the draft of request for proposal instructions found in Attachment 2 (p. e0-e29). Given the

Sub Question

comprehensive and detailed information included in these materials it is very likely that the applicant will successfully support and identify appropriate programs to participate in this project.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

2. **(b) The extent to which each SRCL subgrant applicant has proposed a comprehensive high-quality literacy program that meets all of the requirements set out in paragraph (d) of the Additional Requirements section in the NIA and that:**
- (1) Addresses the needs of disadvantaged students and proposes to implement activities in schools and early learning programs with the highest levels of need and capacity for improvement.**
 - (2) Is informed by a needs assessment described in the application and is designed to support effective teaching and to improve student achievement of struggling readers.**
 - (3) Involves other agencies, nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations, and families in activities that promote the implementation of effective literacy instruction for disadvantaged students.**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion i(b) The applicant has provided clear guidelines about addressing the needs of disadvantaged students and including those programs with the highest level of need and capacity for improvement. A detailed plan and process for including these programs is included in the subgrantee application, planning template and the draft of request for proposal instructions found in Attachment 2 (p. e0-e29). Additionally, technical assistance in the form of grant writing will be offered to potential subgrantees so they can clearly develop their plan for a strong literacy program.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriterion i(b) The applicant provided very little specific information about the needs assessment that will be used to inform effective teaching other than asking the subgrantee how they will use the needs assessment to identify effective instructional strategies (Question #5, p. e4 in Attachment 2) and that a needs assessment will be conducted in October/November 2011 (p. 24; p. e19 in Attachment 2). The applicant will provide support for this needs assessment in one of their grant writing workshops (p. e20, Attachment 2) but specific information about the content or process of this needs assessment would have strengthened this section.

Subcriterion i (b) The applicant has made it a requirement that subgrantees must involve key partners and stakeholders in its literacy efforts as evidenced by Question 9a in the subgrantee application materials (p. e6, Attachment 2) but has provided no other support or information about this involvement. More information about how selected programs might be supported in this effort, other than just making it a requirement, would have strengthened this section.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 4

3. (c) The extent to which each SRCL subgrant applicant demonstrates that it will implement a coherent strategy to improve literacy instruction that aligns activities under the SRCL subgrant with literacy instruction supported with other Federal funds, including with funds the entity receives under Title I, Title II-A, and Title III of the ESEA and, as appropriate, the Head Start Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, and State and local funds.

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion i(c) The applicant has provided a strong approach for supporting potential subgrantees in identifying additional funds for their literacy efforts. The application requirements for the subgrantees to leverage additional funding are clearly and comprehensively defined in the application template and guide that will be provided to all potential LEA/ECE applicants (p. 26; Attachment 2). Additionally, the applicant will provide potential subgrantees with technical assistance in the form of grant writing conferences and webinars to identify ways to leverage other funding (p. 26).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 2

4. The extent to which the SEA will give priority to LEAs or providers of early childhood education that propose to serve high-poverty schools or a high-poverty population, based on a definition of poverty and process for applying the priority provided by the State.

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion ii The applicant articulated a clear plan for giving priority to LEAs/EC providers who serve high-poverty populations that included a definition of poverty that was individualized by age-group/setting. The applicant based their definition of poverty on the state definition of where to implement state-funded full-day Kindergarten programs (p. 26). The specific criteria for birth to age 5, the elementary level (K-5) and secondary level (6-12) were clearly defined and individualized for each of these settings (p. 27). Additionally, the applicant is requiring that the network (B-5, K-12) for providing educational services to the same high poverty population be identified before applying for grant funds (p. 27). This will ensure continuity of instructional services to project children.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 6

5. The extent to which the SEA will give priority to LEAs or providers of early childhood education whose applications are supported by the strongest available evidence.

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion iii - The applicant has provided clear guidelines for giving priority to selecting LEAs or EC

Sub Question

programs that provide the strongest evidence of efficacy. Program evidence can include a research base for the strategy/intervention or from data collected and analyzed for that approach (p. 28). The applicant also provided a comprehensive list of possible approaches to be considered that included universal design for learning, response to intervention, coherent and connected assessment systems, and social-emotional support programs (p. 28). This provides the subgrantees with a great deal of flexibility in identifying instructional approaches that meet the criteria of the competition while also meeting the local needs of the program.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 4

- 6. The extent to which the SEA will develop or update a process, or use an existing process, to review and judge the evidence base and alignment with State standards for the curricula and materials that LEAs propose to use in implementing their subgrants, and how the SEA will make the process and results of any such review publicly available.**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion iv - The applicant has articulated a strong process for evaluating the evidence base of the subgrantees selected curricula and instructional materials and for ensuring that these are aligned with the state standards. The applicant will use an existing review process for the subgrantee competition specified in this application with procedures added to accommodate the early childhood portion of the competition (p. 29). One of the strongest components of this process is supporting the potential subgrantees to engage in the curricula selection process by providing access to online resources that summarize evidence based materials (What Works Clearinghouse, Best Evidence website) (p. 29). The applicant also has a coherent approach for identifying promising Birth to 5 programs for inclusion in the competition; programs must either use instructional materials/approaches included on the What Works Clearinghouse or Best Evidence websites or they can provide a research evidence base for their selected instructional practice (p. 29-30). Lastly, a state conducted review will ensure that all programs in the state have an equal chance for inclusion in the project (p. 30).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 5

Project management - Project management

- 1. The Secretary considers the following factors in determining the quality of the project management plan: See Sub-Criteria**

Reader's Score: 10

Sub Question

1. (i) **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.**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriteria i- The applicant provided a sufficiently detailed management plan and timeline for the subgrantee grant development portion of the project (p. 35-38). This part of the plan is well articulated and includes enough details to determine its effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriterion i While the applicant provided a sufficiently detailed management plan and timeline for the grant development portion of the project, the project management plan related to the remainder of the grant activities (implementation of the literacy efforts during years 2-5) did not include specific or fine-grained information about these activities. For example, on page 39 the applicant states that the project will "develop statewide communication plan" as an activity that would occur for the last four years of the grant without providing any substeps. Without having finer grain information, there is really no way to determine if the applicant could successfully complete this activity of developing their communication plan. Also, the applicant listed the five phases of the project in one column and the column listing activities did not correspond to the specified phases (p. 39). This made it confusing to determine what activities were related to which phases.

Reader's Score: 3

2. (ii) **The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key personnel.**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion ii The applicant provided detailed job descriptions for all grant positions (p. 31-33) and the roles and responsibilities of all grant personnel were well articulated. The applicant included a recruitment announcement for the project director position which was very detailed and specific about the roles and the qualifications needed to be considered for this position.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriterion ii - It was very confusing to have 12 additional resumes in the appendix that according to the applicant (p. 40) are personnel who "may be included in the project." This is a very convoluted approach to providing information and made it difficult to concentrate on the salient information related to this subcriterion. The applicant would have been better served including recruitment announcements of the additional open positions. Also the management organization seems very "top heavy" so it would have been helpful to include a rationale for including this many management personnel as well as how all of the efforts of these personnel would be coordinated so as not to duplicate efforts.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 4

3. (iii) **The extent to which the State will ensure a diversity of perspectives in the design and implementation of the proposed project, including those of: families, teachers, early childhood education professionals, officials from other State and local agencies, Head Start Advisory Councils, professional organizations, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, and libraries.**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriteria iii- The applicant has already taken steps to ensure a diversity of perspectives by collaborating with a number of local, regional and state programs when developing this application (p. 40) including the Department of Early Learning, Washing Reading Corps, Reach Out and Read Washington, the regional Educational Service Districts, the state curriculum advisory and review committee, career and technical education representatives, secondary and school improvement representatives and representatives of the state's Infant and Toddler regional "hubs."

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriteria iii The applicant did not provide a persuasive plan about how to include families and teachers but stated that they will seek input from subgrantees about how to include families (p. 41).

Reader's Score: 3

Adequacy of resources - Adequacy of resources

1. **The Secretary considers the following factors in determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project: See Sub-Criteria**

Reader's Score: 16

Sub Question

1. (i) **The extent to which the costs described in the SEA's budget are reasonable in relation to the number of objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project .**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriteria i - In general the proposed budget is reasonable in relation to the objectives of this grant. The applicant provided proposed expenses and rationales for each line item for each of the five years of the grant (Budget, p. e0-e31) and there was no item that seemed grossly out of line with amounts one would anticipate for a grant of this size.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriteria i- There were several line items that could have been more explicitly described including the external evaluator and expert consultant costs (the number of days/hours contracted, products to be delivered, services provided, p. e9-e10) and meeting expenses (rental costs, kinds and costs of

Sub Question

materials, p. e12). The costs of computers and workstations (\$5000, p e7) seem a little expensive for this kind of item.

Reader's Score: 7

2. (ii) **The quality of the SEA's plan to ensure that SRCL subgrant funds are allocated as follows:**
- * **At least 15 percent to serve children from birth through age five.**
 - * **At least 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade five.**
 - * **At least 40 percent to serve students in middle and high school, through grade 12, including an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools.**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriterion ii - The applicant has provided a clear plan for ensuring that subgrant funds are distributed as requested (15% birth through age 5, 40% K-grade 5, 40% grades 6-12 (p. 42-43). The subgrantees will also receive Technical Assistance support on monitoring their budgets (p.43). The applicant will allocate funds for an Operation Manager to ensure subgrantees stay within budget (p. 43).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriterion ii It would have been helpful if the applicant had provided more information about the plan to create an application process that includes specific budgets for B-5, K-5, 6-8 that allow variance from the 15/40/40 SEA requirement. It could potentially be a great support for the SEA to provide structure to the subgrantees in the form of templates for potential distribution of funds, but it was not clear from the information provided why the applicant would develop budget templates for variations from the 15/40/40 structure. This seems like a contradiction with the statement on page 43 that states distribution of funding that enables the state to meet its 15/40/40 required funding distribution will be followed.Ã

Reader's Score: 3.5

3. (iii) **The extent to which the SEA will use the grant to leverage other State and Federal funds in order to maximize the impact of the grant and how it will support LEAs and early childhood education providers in integrating funds with other local, State, and Federal funds and in developing a plan for sustaining funding after the end of the subgrant.**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriteria iii - It appears that the applicant has a cohesive plan for leveraging other funding and supporting the subgrantees in leveraging their own additional funding. The applicant met with partners in the development of this application. There is already 2.5 million in federal, state and other funds committed to the project (p. 43) which should provide a solid base to these efforts. The applicant will provide TA to the subgrantees regarding strategies for leveraging additional funds and for developing sustainability plans (p. 44). The applicant also discussed a current district in their state that can be used as a model for the subgrantees for ways to successfully leverage additional funding (p. 44).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

4. (iv) **The extent to which the SEA will award SRCL subgrants of sufficient size to support projects that improve instruction for a significant number of students in the high-need schools or early learning programs serving children birth through five that the SRCL subgrantee would serve.**

Strengths:

Strengths

Subcriteria iv - The applicant has a process to distribute funds that includes loading more funds the first year of the grant to enable schools to purchase curricula (p. 45). TA will also be provided to subgrantees as a support to help them build a budget that will provide enough funds to effectively serve project children (p. 45).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

Subcriteria iv The applicant is going to provide a large range of funds to subgrantees during the first year (\$250,000 to \$2,000,000) but provided no information about how the specific amount will be determined (number of students, need of students, intensity of educational intervention, number of students with disabilities, number of students who are English language learners) (p. 45). The applicant may want to consider offering some budgetary guidelines to schools and programs based on amount per student in model or effective programs as a starting point.

Reader's Score: 2.5

Priority Questions

Competitive Priority - Effective Use of Technology

1. **To meet this priority, an applicant must (1) propose to use technology--which may include technology to support principles of universal design for learning (as defined in the NIA)--to address student learning challenges; and (2) provide, in its application, an evidence-based (as defined in the NIA) rationale that its proposed technology program, practice, or strategy will increase student engagement and achievement or increase teacher effectiveness.**

Background: The effective use of technology is a critical tool for improving learning outcomes and providing teachers with high-quality professional development. Use of concepts, ideas, programming techniques, and computer-assisted text displays that give access to the text for students who cannot access traditional print, including limited-English-proficient children and students with disabilities, is a basic tenet of universal design for learning (as defined in the NIA) and can help improve students' literacy and language development and identify and address student learning challenges.

Strengths:

Strengths

No strengths noted in this section.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant provided little information about their plan for effectively using technology in this proposed project other than a general statement on page 1 saying that their outcomes would include effective use of technology and on page 16 that the purpose of their evaluation is to measure effective use of technology. The applicant also is requiring that the subgrantee include information in their application process about how the subproject will use technology (p. 22). It is not sufficient in addressing this absolute priority to include the RFP wording under outcomes or goals with no other specifics about how this project will purposively integrate the effective use of technology in their project. Additionally, it is ironic that the applicant included a support letter from Bill and Melinda Gates in the appendix but so little information in the narrative about how technology will be to used to support student learning.

Reader's Score: 0

Absolute Priority 1 - Improving Learning Outcomes

- 1. To meet this priority: An applicant must propose a project that is designed to improve school readiness and success through grade 12 in the area of language and literacy development for disadvantaged students.**

Background: Improving the language and literacy development of disadvantaged students is essential to improving academic achievement for these students in all content areas. The 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results show disproportionately large numbers of disadvantaged students struggle with developing the necessary pre-literacy and literacy skills needed to read, comprehend, and use language effectively. This results in persistent gaps in academic achievement through the elementary and secondary school years and in high school graduation rates, and presents civic and economic difficulties for these students later in life. Meeting the language and literacy needs of disadvantaged students, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities, is a particular focus of the SRCL program.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant will build their proposed literacy approach on the foundation of previous initiatives including the SAILS (Standards, Assessment, Instruction and Intervention, Leadership and System-wide Commitment) Framework in 2005 (p. 2). The applicant provided a clear plan for including the most disadvantaged children in the state. The applicant is also requiring subgrantees to use programs/approaches that have a research base as evidenced by inclusion in the What Works Clearinghouse or Best Evidence (p. 30-31) which should result in improved learning outcomes.

PRIORITY MET

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted in this section.

Reader's Score: 0

Absolute Priority 2 - Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making

- 1. To meet this priority: An applicant must propose a project that is designed to collect, analyze, and use high-quality and timely data, especially on program participant outcomes, in accordance with privacy**

requirements (as defined in the NIA), to improve instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes in early learning settings and in elementary and secondary schools.

Background: Accurate, timely, relevant, and appropriate data, and the effective use of that data for informed decision-making, are essential to the continuous improvement of children's literacy and language development. In developing comprehensive literacy plans and programs, it is important for States to consider strategies that provide educators, as well as families and other key stakeholders, with the data they need and the capacity and training to use those data to improve school readiness, respond to the learning and academic needs of students, improve educator effectiveness, inform professional development practices and approaches, and make informed decisions that increase student pre-literacy, literacy, and language development.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant included a detailed plan for the data that will be collected to determine if the goals of the project are being met by the project management team (p. 11-13, 15).

PRIORITY MET.

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

The applicant provided little explicit information about how this project would enable data based decision making other than a general statement on page 1 saying that their outcomes would include more data based decision making and on page 16 that the purpose of their evaluation is to measure effective use of decision making. The applicant also is requiring that the subgrantee include information about how the subproject will enable more data based decision making in their application process (p. 22). There was also limited information about how the SEA will use evidence to inform and continuously improve the design and implementation of its activities.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 6/24/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 6/24/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction -- Teaching and Learning (S371C110023)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Quality of State-level activities		
Quality of State-level activities		
1. State-level activities	37	32
Sub Total	37	32
Quality of the State subgrant competition		
Quality of the State subgrant competition		
1. State subgrant comp	28	28
Sub Total	28	28
Project management		
Project management		
1. Project management	15	15
Sub Total	15	15
Adequacy of resources		
Adequacy of resources		
1. Adequacy of resources	20	20
Sub Total	20	20
Priority Questions		
Competitive Priority		
Effective Use of Technology		
1. Competitive Priority	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Absolute Priority 1		
Improving Learning Outcomes		
1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Absolute Priority 2		
Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making		
1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Total	105	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - SRCL - 5: 84.371C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction -- Teaching and Learning

Questions

Quality of State-level activities - Quality of State-level activities

1. In determining the quality of State-level activities, the Secretary considers: See Sub-Criteria

Reader's Score: 32

Sub Question

1. How the SEA will carry out the required State-level activities (described in the Additional Requirements section of the NIA) and how it will align those activities with its comprehensive State literacy plan.

Strengths:

[Note: I have numbered all pages in the Washington (S371C110023) application consecutively. Those numbers occur after the e-number, as in e1, p. 1]

STRENGTHS

A.(i)

The proposed literacy project represents the outgrowth of continuous and comprehensive literacy planning involving numerous stakeholders and is focused on increasing capacity for sustainability.

Building upon the results of an earlier K-12 reading system, SAILS (Standards/Assessment/Instruction & Intervention/Leadership/System-wide Commitment) (e2, p. 29), the applicant describes specific federal, state and private funds and a total amount of money (\$2.5 million) that will be leveraged to support effective literacy instruction (e8-9, p. 27-28). Along with obtaining statewide stakeholder input (e8, p. 27), these results provide evidence of strong support for previous and currently proposed literacy initiatives.

That the SEA's proposal progresses through five implementation phases, based on implementation science research by Fixsen et al (2005), demonstrates a commitment to developing effective planning and implementation processes (e3, p. 22).

Two separate sets of sub-grants, one targeting B-12 literacy systems and the other focusing on LEA/ECE (Early Childhood Education) capacity building (e0,16), afford an impressive and innovative way to completely fulfill the requirements of this competition.

In addition to the sub-grant applicant evaluations, the SEA has also included an Instructional Materials Review process that will target curricular materials selected by applicants (e9-10, p. 28-29).

In phase 2 (e3, p. 22), the second bullet mentions "Deliver effective Tier I core literacy to all students" In the third bullet, "Select intervention approaches..." suggests that the applicant is taking a realistic look at the intended effects of their literacy initiatives and is not waiting until phase 3, 4, or 5 to determine if they have any struggling students.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

A.(i)

The first item in Table I: State-Level Activities Prepare Literacy Leadership Teams to Implement the Comprehensive Literacy Plan/CLP (e3, p. 22) states, "Establish strategies and structures to implement components of effective B-12 pre-literacy and literacy instruction," It is unclear whether the strategies and structures will be developed from needs assessments, anecdotal perspectives, or research theory. Since this project is data-driven, it would seem justified to say that the strategies and structures need to be developed from some type of empirical evidence or theory rather than leaving input open to possible anecdotal perspectives. It isn't until the initial implementation in Phase 2 that data is mentioned. Prior to that, there is no evidence-base requirement for setting up the project. (e3, p. 22).

Reader's Score: 9

- 2. The SEA's goals for improving student literacy outcomes throughout the State for all students (e.g., limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities), including a description of the data (which may include data gathered through a needs assessment) that the SEA has considered or will consider and a clear and credible path that the SEA will take to achieve these goals with the support of its LEAs.**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

A.(ii)

Delivering Tier 1 core literacy instruction to all students, including disadvantaged students, in Phase 2 of the Initial Implementation of the "Strategic LEA/ECE (early Childhood Education) Actions (e3, p. 22) demonstrates that certain groups of students will not be marginalized and that all students will receive the same initial opportunity to learn. However, if intervention is necessary, such approaches will be available. As a consequence that some students may need intervention, the infrastructure for support of improved teaching and learning will be in place.

At the end of each implementation phase, requires sub-grantees to share results and adjust their programs as necessary, based on the data (e3-4, p. 22-23). That this is completed four times within a five phase program, and the fact that the last two phases, "Innovation and Sustainability," represents a strong commitment to program improvement and capacity building.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES

A.(ii)

There is no evidence of goals or data regarding K-2 students (23% of the target group) in Table 8 Goals for 2016 and Corresponding Baseline Date (2010) for Student Achievement on State Literacy Assessments (e12, p. 31).

Without the inclusion of some type of rationale, the entry and exit goals of 95% for student achievement and literacy assessment (e12-13, p. 31-32), appear a little ambitious, if not inappropriate, especially for new or recent English Language Learners (ELLs) and other student arrivals

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. How the SEA will provide technical assistance and support to its SRCL subgrantees (and, at its discretion, to other LEAs or early childhood education providers) to enable them to implement a**

Sub Question

high-quality comprehensive literacy program and to improve student achievement in core academic subjects.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

A(iii)

A project management team consisting of the Project Director, Core Team, Regional Liaisons, Professional Development (PD)/Technical Assistance (TA) Coordinator, Coaches and Literacy Specialists will provide technical assistance and support (e14, p. 33). This reflects an appropriate way for providing technical assistance and support at state, regional and local levels. The inclusion of a Professional Development/Technical Assistance Coordinator emphasizes the significance of instructional strategies.

On-site support, individual coaching, and professional development modules will encompass standards, assessments, evidence-based instruction and intervention, leadership and system-wide commitment, ELLs, students with disabilities, and early learning standards and literacy (e15, p. 34). By initially identifying these 7 different areas, the SEA demonstrates a commitment to focus on the Additional Requirements specified in the Program Requirements of the RFP (e23, p.96).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

- 4. How the SEA will evaluate the State's progress in improving achievement in literacy for children and youth from birth through grade 12, including disadvantaged students, including: (1) whether the evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluator (whose role in the project is limited solely to conducting the evaluation); (2) whether the evaluation will use methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the objectives of the proposed project; and (3) how the SEA will use evidence to inform and continuously improve the design and implementation of its activities.**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

A.(iv)

The SEA contracts with an external evaluator whose role is solely to conduct the evaluation (e16, p. 35). Using an external evaluator reduces the possibility of bias and increases evaluation validity.

The Evaluation plan measures improvement in literacy outcomes for students, the extent of implementation in locally developed sub-grant proposals, improvement in educator capacity to implement evidence-based instruction and effectively use data in instructional decision making, and the use of technology to improve learning and teaching (e16, p. 35). Comprehensive components cover the evaluation of students, evaluation of instructors, and evaluation of program. A wide range of evaluations as proposed by the applicant affords a greater amount of data from which to make timely revisions and adjust resources.

The project will utilize a variety of data to measure student achievement outcomes as well as non-academic indicators (e18, p. 37). This allows for a better interpretation of possible causes of assessment discrepancies.

The SEA will gather statewide stakeholder input and maintain an eye toward "usability" and continuous improvement in order to update and improve the state's Comprehensive Literacy Plan, of which this proposal will help facilitate (e8, p. 27).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

A.(iv)

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

- 5. How the SEA will disseminate information on project outcomes, disaggregated by student subgroup, and in formats that are easily understood by, and accessible to, the public, and how the SEA will make that information useful to varied groups (such as families, educators, researchers, other experts, early childhood education providers, and State leaders).**

Strengths:

STRENGTH

A.(v)

A dedicated web portal is a viable communication effort by which information may be disseminated about the sub-grant process (e20-21, p. 39-40). It can be accessible to all stakeholders.

The LEA will publish Weekly Bulletins/Memoranda. This will be useful to people who may not have access to the state's web portal (e9, p. 28).

Emails, regularly scheduled meetings, and disseminations to early learning providers and infant toddler "hub" leaders will also be utilized (e9, p. 28). These represent multiple dissemination strategies that can be attuned to varied groups.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

A.(v)

Ambiguity exists between the State's Longitudinal Data System (SLEDS), the Comprehensive Educational Data and Research System (CEDARS), and data "by any means" (e20, p. 39). Specifically, data collected "by any means" may not render any conclusive evidence. This can be problematic because it is not specified as to where the data comes from, who submitted the data, or what specific data will be included in the communication. It is not clear whether all stakeholders will be receiving the same data or not (e20, p. 39).

Reader's Score: 3

Quality of the State subgrant competition - Quality of the State subgrant competition

- 1. In determining the quality of the applicant's proposed SRCL subgrant competition, the Secretary considers: See Sub-Criteria**

Reader's Score: 28

Sub Question

1. **The extent to which the SEA will run a rigorous, high-quality competition for subgrants, including how it will review and judge:**
 - a) **The LEA's or early childhood education provider's capacity to successfully implement its proposal.**

Strengths:

STRENGTH

B.(i)(a)

The "Application Planning Template and Instructions" provides comprehensive and clear information for decisions regarding sub-grant evaluations (e1-5, p. 67-71). It sufficiently supplies information needed to judge LEA and ECE proposals. The two grant writing conferences and informational webinars are assets for assisting sub-grantee applicants (e24, p. 43). This demonstrates the SEA's commitment to encourage a high quality application

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

2. **(b) The extent to which each SRCL subgrant applicant has proposed a comprehensive high-quality literacy program that meets all of the requirements set out in paragraph (d) of the Additional Requirements section in the NIA and that:**
 - (1) Addresses the needs of disadvantaged students and proposes to implement activities in schools and early learning programs with the highest levels of need and capacity for improvement.**
 - (2) Is informed by a needs assessment described in the application and is designed to support effective teaching and to improve student achievement of struggling readers.**
 - (3) Involves other agencies, nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations, and families in activities that promote the implementation of effective literacy instruction for disadvantaged students.**

Strengths:

STRENGTH

B.(i)(b)

The SEA requires all sub-grantees to provide a 5-year timeline (e3, p. 69) delineating the 5 phases of implementation they will take to provide a high quality B-12 comprehensive literacy program that is aligned with state standards. In order to impact achievement, a consistent plan and direction will keep the focus on project objectives.

Questions 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, found in "Section B: Descriptive Information" of the "LEP Application" require sub-grantees to give detailed explanations as to what and how required implementations will be made regarding the needs of disadvantaged students, conducting a needs assessment, and involving other stakeholders in the implementation of effective literacy instruction (e3-4, p. 69-70). A high quality program that targets disadvantaged students, provides a knowledge of what their needs are, and offers collaborative opportunities to address those needs are illustrated with this requirement.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 8

- 3. (c) The extent to which each SRCL subgrant applicant demonstrates that it will implement a coherent strategy to improve literacy instruction that aligns activities under the SRCL subgrant with literacy instruction supported with other Federal funds, including with funds the entity receives under Title I, Title II-A, and Title III of the ESEA and, as appropriate, the Head Start Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, and State and local funds.**

Strengths:

STRENGTH

B.(i)(c)

Questions 6 and 7 found in "Section B: Descriptive Information" of the "LEA Application" asks LEAs how they will align with other federally funded agencies. The inclusion of this requirement helps reassure that federal funds are being spent judiciously.

Questions 6, 7, and 9a in "Section B: Descriptive Information" of the "LEA Application" provide links with pertinent stakeholders (e.g., private organizations, CBOs, public agencies, federal programs, parents) that help ensure overall support (e4, 6; p. 70, 72).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 2

- 4. The extent to which the SEA will give priority to LEAs or providers of early childhood education that propose to serve high-poverty schools or a high-poverty population, based on a definition of poverty and process for applying the priority provided by the State.**

Strengths:

STRENGTH

B.(ii)

The applicant requires that all the LEA elementary and secondary schools must be Title I receiving or eligible and Birth to age 5 providers must qualify for one of the programs that relate to high poverty populations. All feeder pattern sites must serve high poverty population (e26-27, p. 45-46).

The capacity sub-grants are designed so that all 295 districts, regardless of the percentage of disadvantaged students, can participate in the state literacy proposal. In this respect, disadvantaged children who do not qualify for free or reduced lunch are not further disadvantaged on the basis of family income.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 6

- 5. The extent to which the SEA will give priority to LEAs or providers of early childhood education whose applications are supported by the strongest available evidence.**

Strengths:

STRENGTH

B.(iii)

Section B of the "LEP Application requires that the activities and timeline described for each school/ECE partner should implement evidence-based strategies or practices that aligned with the state's literacy plan, the "universal design for learning," the Response to Intervention System, and coherent and connected assessment systems. (e4, p. 70) The SEA encourages the sub-grant applicants to anchor their evidence in research or empirical data collected , to align their instructional materials with state learning standards through the Instructional Materials Review, and to conduct a needs assessment to ascertain the level of each component of effective literacy instruction as outline in the state' literacy plan (e28, p.47). Without a needs assessment, it is difficult to know what to do, and hence, to build a successful program. All instructional materials should align with state learning standards. Evidence is not powerful unless it is based on empirical data or research.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 4

- 6. The extent to which the SEA will develop or update a process, or use an existing process, to review and judge the evidence base and alignment with State standards for the curricula and materials that LEAs propose to use in implementing their subgrants, and how the SEA will make the process and results of any such review publicly available.**

Strengths:

STRENGTH

B.(iv)

One of the strongest aspects of the state proposal is the utilization of existing online and state-developed review instruments that allow sub-grantees to make informed decisions regarding for curricula and material alignment with state standards. The state currently has a system of reviewing instructional materials in different content areas. This project would provide for the selection of an instructional materials review committee and notification given to publishers to prepare and submit materials for review. The applicant points out that a state-conducted review would be valuable for many small and rural/remote districts and allow for significant savings in staff time and financial resources.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Project management - Project management

- 1. The Secretary considers the following factors in determining the quality of the project management plan: See Sub-Criteria**

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

- 1. (i) 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.**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

C.(i)

Roles and responsibilities for 9 team positions are provided. These positions are adequate and justified in light of the number of students (100,000) and educators (5000) that will be involved throughout the project (e31-34, p. 50-53).

The applicant provides a detailed management plan that identifies milestones, person(s) responsible, dates, and a differentiation between state-level activities and Birth-12 state literacy activities. Two additional features of the management plan are the five implementation planning phases and three cohort site phase-ins over the duration of the grant (e35-39, p. 54-58). The plan can be easily modified to reflect other opportunities for funding and any necessities for change. The organizational chart on e34, p. 53 provides a helpful hierarchal relationship of responsibilities.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 6

- 2. (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key personnel.**

Strengths:

STRENGTH

C.(ii)

Project team resumes and qualification announcements for staff positions provided in Part 6 of this application are impressive. Most of these resumes and qualifications involve personnel with doctorate degrees and extensive experience in education and literacy. The proposed Job Recruitment

Sub Question

Announcement draft alone for the Project Director affirms the SEA's pre- and initial-implementation thoroughness. The qualifications for all staff positions provide Full Time Equivalent (FTE) requirements (e41-43, p. 61-63) .

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the State will ensure a diversity of perspectives in the design and implementation of the proposed project, including those of: families, teachers, early childhood education professionals, officials from other State and local agencies, Head Start Advisory Councils, professional organizations, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations, and libraries.**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

C.(iii)

One of the most impressive aspects of this project is the depth and breadth of collaborative efforts with multiple partners. These efforts , including references made to the Bremerton School District, provide a model of what capacity building and project sustainability should reflect (e40, p. 59). "Attachment 1: The Faces of Washington State: Our Robust Foundation" elevates the TRF criterion level of this review.

It is commendable that the management plan includes the composition and responsibilities of the project's oversight, advisory, and core team committees (e33, p. 52). This expanded involvement of stakeholder groups affirms the importance that the SEA has placed on the accomplishment of literacy goals.

The inclusion of the expertise and perspectives of the Independent Evaluator as part of "stakeholder input" adds credibility to including diverse perspectives (e41, p. 60).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 4

Adequacy of resources - Adequacy of resources

- 1. The Secretary considers the following factors in determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project: See Sub-Criteria**

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

Sub Question

1. (i) **The extent to which the costs described in the SEA's budget are reasonable in relation to the number of objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project .**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

D.(i)

Based on the potential significance of the proposed project (100,000 students; 5000 educators; the eligibility for all LEAs to be involved; the requirement for extended B-12 feeder pattern configurations; capacity-building assurances; and the extent of proposed literacy initiatives at local, regional, and state levels), the costs appear reasonable.

The SEA provides additional justification for resources expenditures based on a) the innovative incorporation of three site cohorts implementations, representing demographic, economic, and geographical distributions across state, and b) conducting statewide reviews of core instructional materials for literacy instruction and intervention activities (e42, p. 61). The utilization of these cohorts allows program improvements to be reflected in subsequent sub-grantee implementations as well as provide more focused attention on one cohort at a time.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

2. (ii) **The quality of the SEA's plan to ensure that SRCL subgrant funds are allocated as follows:**

* **At least 15 percent to serve children from birth through age five.**

* **At least 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade five.**

* **At least 40 percent to serve students in middle and high school, through grade 12, including an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools.**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

D.(ii)

Rather than the SEA being solely responsible for the 15/40/40 distribution, the applicant has effectively distributed the responsibility for this requirement on the application process for the sub-grantees. LEAs and ECE providers must partner with each other in feeder site configurations to insure the 15% funding allocation for B-age 5 sites, 40% for elementary, and 40% for secondary at an equal disbursement between middle and high school projects (e43, p. 62). This represents the state's willingness to allow sub-grantees full access to understanding, and thus meeting all SRCL requirements.

The allocation of administrative funds for an Operations Manager to monitor expenditures and ensure that project objectives are met within budget and on time is commendable (e43, p. 62)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 4

Sub Question

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the SEA will use the grant to leverage other State and Federal funds in order to maximize the impact of the grant and how it will support LEAs and early childhood education providers in integrating funds with other local, State, and Federal funds and in developing a plan for sustaining funding after the end of the subgrant.**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

D.(iii)

Strategies to leverage other resources to maximize the impact of a grant is one of the most important and thorough facets of this application (e43, p.62). The applicant documents how their "buy in" process across early learning and K-12 educational entities has been essential for development of their proposal and especially for ensuring full implementation and sustainability after the funding ends.

Technical assistance in helping sub-grantees secure funding in their initial application process will be facilitated by Regional Liaisons whose level of expertise spans the B-12 continuum and by the Early Learning Joint Resolution Partnership (e44, p. 63).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

- 4. (iv) The extent to which the SEA will award SRCL subgrants of sufficient size to support projects that improve instruction for a significant number of students in the high-need schools or early learning programs serving children birth through five that the SRCL subgrantee would serve.**

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

D.(iv)

The SEA has developed an innovative two-pronged approach in awarding sub-grants. The first approach allows LEA/ECE partners serving high-poverty schools and populations to receive priority for B-12 Literacy System sub-grants. As other funding capacities to support the projects are developed over the duration of the grant, initial funding levels from the first year are proportionally reduced (e45, p. 64).

In the second approach, Capacity-Building sub-grants, all LEAs and ECE providers are eligible to apply. This allows for the dissemination of B-12 Literacy Learning Standards to educators in all learning settings, and not just those serving high-poverty populations (e45, p. 64). It is important to note that the DOE's SRCL program requires the development of literacy programs for "disadvantaged students," some of whom may not be in high-poverty categories.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Competitive Priority - Effective Use of Technology

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must (1) propose to use technology--which may include technology to support principles of universal design for learning (as defined in the NIA)--to address student learning challenges; and (2) provide, in its application, an evidence-based (as defined in the NIA) rationale that its proposed technology program, practice, or strategy will increase student engagement and achievement or increase teacher effectiveness.

Background: The effective use of technology is a critical tool for improving learning outcomes and providing teachers with high-quality professional development. Use of concepts, ideas, programming techniques, and computer-assisted text displays that give access to the text for students who cannot access traditional print, including limited-English-proficient children and students with disabilities, is a basic tenet of universal design for learning (as defined in the NIA) and can help improve students' literacy and language development and identify and address student learning challenges.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

Competitive Priority: Effective Use of Technology

Full disclosure is available on federal, state, and local websites regarding the following: initial posting, ongoing updates, decisions and results of all levels of the grant covering the application process of the sub-grantees at the SEA level and throughout the instruction and progress of the literacy programs at the LEA level.

In the Budget Narrative (e1), the applicant states professional capacity building and outreach efforts will extend from the state to LEAs and ECE partners to incorporate technology to effectively improve learning and teaching. Thus, the utilization of technology will be one of the variables that individual sub-grantees will be able to address.

In Table 8 of the Budget Narrative: Other Costs (e12), it states that 6-10 statewide sessions of professional development will focus on several items, including the effective utilization of technology with the intent of increasing learning outcomes in literacy for all students.

Each of the project management team members is expected to use technology to carry out their responsibilities (e.g., communicating with team and across the field with all participants, producing documents to support leading, and facilitating the literacy program). The printer will be used to support the printing of materials for statewide professional development. The equipment that the team members will be using include computer and work station, shared printer, shared LCD projectors, and shared document cameras (e7-8 in Budget Narrative).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

Competitive Priority: Effective Use of Technology

UDL principles and other specific applications for directly targeting disadvantaged students via technology are not specifically addressed.

Reader's Score: 4

Absolute Priority 1 - Improving Learning Outcomes

1. To meet this priority: An applicant must propose a project that is designed to improve school readiness and success through grade 12 in the area of language and literacy development for disadvantaged students.

Background: Improving the language and literacy development of disadvantaged students is essential

to improving academic achievement for these students in all content areas. The 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results show disproportionately large numbers of disadvantaged students struggle with developing the necessary pre-literacy and literacy skills needed to read, comprehend, and use language effectively. This results in persistent gaps in academic achievement through the elementary and secondary school years and in high school graduation rates, and presents civic and economic difficulties for these students later in life. Meeting the language and literacy needs of disadvantaged students, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities, is a particular focus of the SRCL program.

Strengths:

STRENGTH

MET Absolute Priority 1: Improving Learning Outcomes

The SEA literacy plan aligns directly with Priority 1 to improve school readiness at pre K levels, and to ensure continual success in K-12 levels in the following ways (e2, p. 21):

1. By aligning instruction and materials with state standards and with the Instructional Materials Alignment (e28-29, p. 47-48)
2. By using a progress monitoring system
3. By making instructional decisions based on empirical evidence and research
4. By including all students
5. By sustaining collaborative commitment at all levels

LEAs and their ECE partners will purposely implement the five phases of the SEA's literacy plan to ensure pre-Ks are school-ready and K-12s experience continued success.

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 0

Absolute Priority 2 - Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making

1. **To meet this priority: An applicant must propose a project that is designed to collect, analyze, and use high-quality and timely data, especially on program participant outcomes, in accordance with privacy requirements (as defined in the NIA), to improve instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes in early learning settings and in elementary and secondary schools.**

Background: Accurate, timely, relevant, and appropriate data, and the effective use of that data for informed decision-making, are essential to the continuous improvement of children's literacy and language development. In developing comprehensive literacy plans and programs, it is important for States to consider strategies that provide educators, as well as families and other key stakeholders, with the data they need and the capacity and training to use those data to improve school readiness, respond to the learning and academic needs of students, improve educator effectiveness, inform professional development practices and approaches, and make informed decisions that increase student pre-literacy, literacy, and language development.

Strengths:

STRENGTHS

MET Absolute Priority 2: Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making

The applicant states that a variety of data will be collected and disseminated. In addition to student achievement outcomes utilizing 4 different assessment instruments (e20, p. 39), the applicant will also measure and analyze non-learning outcomes (e.g., student attendance, educator participation, family participation in Head Start) (e18, p. 37). The matching of these outcomes can lend support to ascertaining

causation and not just correlational effects of program variables.

The applicant will also disseminate disaggregated project outcomes by subgroups, using the two existing state data systems, the State's Longitudinal Data System (SLEDS) and the Comprehensive Educational Data and Research System (CEDARS), (e20, p. 39). The inclusion of data within current operating systems adds to the project's impact and sustainability.

The overarching Research Question and three related questions guiding the applicant's evaluation plan (e17-18, p. 36-37) provide evidence of the SEA's respect for the significance of making evidence- and research-based decisions.

Assessment data will be an integral part of all five phases of the SEA's comprehensive literacy plan. It will include quantitative and qualitative measures as well as fidelity of implemental of instructional and intervention strategies (e3-4, p. 22-23 and Fig 1: State-Level Framework, e6, p. 25)

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESS

Absolute Priority 2: Enabling More Data-Based Decision-Making

No preliminary references are made to indicate specific assessment and data-gathering provisions for ELLs and for students and educators/stakeholders with disabilities (e.g., appropriate language proficiency and accessibility instrumentation). With the increased utilization of technology (e.g., the web portal, mentioned on e29, p. 39), these UDL provisions may become more influential and present greater barriers for disadvantaged individuals. It's easier to make accommodations and modifications face-to-face because it's right in front of you. With web technology, the other person is not in front of you. Thus, you have to assume they are waiting for these accommodations and should automatically expect them to be in place without having to ask. This becomes an important variable of any Needs Assessment of all students and stakeholders.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 6/24/11 12:00 AM