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Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

   (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant provides adequate details to show the understanding of the problem by discussing that their data shows the need for the Summer Academy for Integrated Language Learning (SAILL) because of the need to effectively and equitably educate English Learners. The applicant also discussed that educating ELs is one of the biggest challenges facing public education today. Further strong research is provided to show an understanding of the problem by the applicant discussing that nationally, 4.6 million students are ELs, and NAEP scores reflect wide gaps between the academic achievement of ELs and non-ELs with only 63% of ELs graduate from high schools nationally. (pp. 1, 2) Adequate details are provided to show an understanding of the problem by the applicant writing that as the EL population grows, so does concern over their underachievement which poses a compelling national issue. To address this concern the applicant wrote that the SAILL model provides a rapid, relatively low-cost method of increasing HS EL language acquisition while increasing teacher efficacy to integrate ELD practices into rigorous academic content. (pp. 3)

The applicant also provided clear details to show the potential contribution of the proposed project to increase understanding of issues by discussing that SAILL uses promising EL instructional recommendations which are integrating oral and written English language instruction into content-area teaching, and supporting student learning interactions through peer-assisted learning strategies (PALS). (pp. 3, 4)

The applicant provides compelling details to show their project involves the development of promising new strategies by writing that SAILL’s rationale is built on evidence of effective language pedagogy that places importance on language and content integration. In addition, the applicant wrote that students and teachers are active participants in language learning processes that build on students’ prior knowledge and experiences. Language skills are most effectively learned in context through purposeful, language-rich, experiential study. (pp. 7)

Strong details are discussed by the applicant to show that their project involves the development of promising new strategies by discussing that the curriculum is project-based and student-centered, drawing on prior experiences of students by providing ample room for student discussion which allows students to teach and learn from one another. To further show strong details for the development of promising new strategies the applicant discussed that small groups will negotiate the meaning of the content and clarify understanding leading to language becoming a vehicle for deepening content comprehension. (pp. 8)
Weaknesses:
The applicant provided minimal details to show their actual program involves the evaluation and implementation of their 5 week summer program with no details to show how the summer program will impact the regular school year and academic performance of English Learners. (pp. 1 to 9)
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Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

   (2) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

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

Strengths:
The applicant provided very clear goals and objectives. For example, the applicant discussed their goal of improving district-wide academic outcomes for newcomer EL students and their objective of implementing SAILL to integrate language into content. (pp. 12)

There is adequate evidence provided to show the underlying conceptual framework of the project by the applicant writing that given the short five-week course of the summer program, Multilingual Pathways Department provides SAILL teachers with foundational curriculum so they all focus on instructional delivery instead of materials creation. To provide strong details about their conceptual framework, the applicant also wrote that the summer experience should provide SAILL teachers with a solid example of project-based curriculum, which will be implemented with ELs at their individual school sites. (pp. 12)

The applicant also provided strong details to show feedback and continuous improvement by discussing that they will use the Improvement Science process to ensure continuous improvement and establish a replicable model with strategies for the curricular and pedagogical supports needed for ELs to meet the language demands of different subject areas, and thus, improve access to academic content, including Computer Science. (pp. 15)

The applicant also provided strong details to show feedback and continuous improvement by discussing that their independent evaluator, will support continuous improvement by applying formative and summative evaluation approaches to systematically inform the project team's decisions and actions on program policies and practices. (pp. 16)

Weaknesses:
The applicant did not provide details to show the specific support they will provide for English Learners during the regular school year. (pp. 12 to 17)
Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

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

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

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

(3) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

Strengths:
The applicant provides adequate details to show their objectives of their project to be on time. For example, the applicant wrote their objective of developing modules to replicate SAILL with timelines discussing that by Summer 2023, 80% of SAILL teachers will participate in the Improvement Science process, measured by teacher data submissions and reports. (pp. e90 to e93)

Adequate evidence is provided by the applicant to show the qualifications, including relevant training and experience of key project personnel. For example, the applicant wrote that the co-Project Director has experience as the Executive Director of College & Career Readiness for the SFUSD Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and has overseen the district’s High School Credit Recovery program, AVID, dual enrollment and Pre-Educator Pipeline. Previously, as Supervisor of Multilingual Pathways, and also oversaw all secondary EL services. (pp. 17)

There are adequate details to show the qualifications of key personnel staff and their relevant training. For example, the applicant wrote that the coordinator for the summer program has overseen the Computer Science Program Administrator for SFUSD, and provided leadership of activities to improve CS education for K-12 students. In addition, the applicant also wrote that the coordinator will arrange for Bootstrap PD and then lead the CS professional development related to using Bootstrap in Algebra and Physics. (pp. 18)

Strong details are provided by the applicant to show the potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends. For example, the applicant discussed that the project has provided a variety of funding sources to operate SAILL for five years with continuous adaptations to strengthen the program. To show their ability for sustainability the applicant provides adequate details to show that with strong results, funding has been established for a basic summer program for ELs via a range of stakeholders, so that SAILL will be able to continue post grant. (pp. 18)

Weaknesses:
The applicant provides minimal details to show who will be responsible for which milestones of the grant to ensure timelines are met. (pp. 19 to 25)
Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Within Absolute Priority 3, we give competitive preference to applications that address the following priority:

   Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in the notice). These projects must address the following priority area:

   Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science (as defined in the notice) coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in the notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in the notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

   Note: Projects addressing this priority must be administered in a manner consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

Strengths:

The applicant provided adequate details to show their expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework by proposing that SFUSD’s five-week SAILL program integrates English into rigorous content using collaborative learning with heterogeneous groups of Newcomer ELs. The applicant also provided adequate details to show that their project will include students improving their English skills while learning Computer Science through Bootstrap embedded into Algebra or Physics. (pp. e15)

Adequate details are provided to show the involvement of underrepresented students by the applicant discussing that they will track EL enrollment in pre-CS or CS courses in SFUSD or CCSF after SAILL participation. (pp. e15)

Weaknesses:

None noted.
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Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

   (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

Research demonstrates that English Learners need high-level academic curriculum combined with linguistic scaffolding that supports rigorous learning (page 3). By building on the already existing Summer Academy for Integrated Language Learning (SAILL) Program, this project “will advance knowledge of practice about EL strategies to increase students’ access to and success in rigorous academic content in HS.” (page 1)

This project provides significant teacher development (70 – 84 hours, page 5) both before and during the summer academy. In this fashion, teachers are learning daily and putting their learnings into practice. The focus is on instructional delivery. Teachers are encouraged to experiment. Teachers return to their home schools the following school year and incorporate these new strategies into their daily teaching.

Another unique aspect of this proposal is its emphasis on heterogeneous grouping and collaborative learning for the English Learner students. (page 4) Heterogeneous grouping will force students speaking different native languages to communicate using English as they collaborate to solve problems.

This project hopes to demonstrate that integrating English learning into math/physics with computer science is an effective strategy. (page 7)

Weaknesses:

This proposal provided minimal detail as to follow up with students after the summer program ends. Without significant follow up this reviewer questions whether the program will achieve the stated goals of increases in student graduation rates, access to college preparatory courses and pre-Computer Science or Computer Science courses in college.

Reader’s Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed
Strengths:
The goals of this project, to improve academic outcomes for newcomer EL students and to create a professional learning space for teachers to integrate language and content through curricular and instructional support, are clearly identified. Several objectives have been developed for each goal along with quantitative performance measures. (pages 12 – 13) All measures are measurable and should ensure that the project achieves its stated goals.

A logic model is provided in Appendix G (page e69) and clearly defines resources, outputs, outcomes, assumptions and contextual factors. Outcomes are separated into short-term, intermediary and long-term.

SAILL has been using the Improvement Science process as it has built the program from a small pilot to an institutionalized summer program for ELs. Formal Improvement Science meetings are planned prior to, during and after each summer program. The daily professional development meetings for teachers during the summer academy also provide for continuous improvement. Additionally, demonstration visits will provide feedback and opportunities for improvement. (pages 15 -16)

Weaknesses:
This project will charge attendees for demonstration visits (page e33). Costs of these visits should be covered as part of the grant budget because they facilitate dissemination and replication.

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

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

   (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

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

   (3) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

Strengths:
A comprehensive management plan is presented in Appendix I (pages e75 – e77). This plan lists activities, timelines and responsible personnel tied to the goals, objectives and performance measures of the project. The proposal includes a detailed budget (pages e79 – e87) that includes stipends for teachers as well as equipment, travel and salaries.

Key project personnel are well qualified with relevant training and experience in appropriate areas.
Dissemination is one of the goals of this project. Wide dissemination is provided for both in the budget and in the management plan. Letters of support specifying matching funds are provided both from the San Francisco Unified School District and the Community College of San Francisco. Additionally, the project proposal includes plans for demonstration visits by outside administrators to promote replication of the project. Curricular materials along with professional development training details will be made available to other school districts.

Weaknesses:
The management plan presented includes a plus one for several categories in the section for personnel responsible. It is unclear to this reviewer who or what the plus one represents.

Reader’s Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Within Absolute Priority 3, we give competitive preference to applications that address the following priority:

   Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in the notice). These projects must address the following priority area:

   Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science (as defined in the notice) coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in the notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in the notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

   Note: Projects addressing this priority must be administered in a manner consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

Strengths:
This proposal embeds computer science in algebra and physics courses while providing English Learners a collaborative and engaging environment in which to succeed academically. This is facilitated by professional development for teachers that occurs both before and during the program. The use of heterogeneous grouping and collaborative learning scaffolded by teacher training makes this project unique.

This project has potential replicability and, if successful, will integrate English language development into rigorous computer science, math and science courses, resulting in increased academic performance for these students.

Weaknesses:
This reviewer found no weaknesses in this area.
## Questions

### Selection Criteria

**Significance**

1. Significance | 25 | 23

**Quality of Project Design**

1. Project Design | 35 | 32

**Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan**

1. Resources/Management Plan | 20 | 18

**Sub Total** | 80 | 73

### Priority Questions

**Competitive Preference Priority**
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Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   (1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

   (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

1) The applicant proposes to modify a currently existing summer academy program in the school district for newcomer English language learners to include Computer Science content as well as enhanced Math and Science content that incorporates Computer Science strategies. The applicant does a good job of providing evidence of a need for the program and that the proposed project addresses those identified needs outlined on pages e19-20. Furthermore, the applicant says that some of their schools currently have no Computer Science curriculum available, so this is an important improvement. The program will also use the program to help students improve their literacy skills contextually, integrating language and content, as well as having them learn the Computer Science content as explained on page e26. The strategy of combining linguistic scaffolding efforts with the improved Computer Science content is essential to the success of the targeted student population. Another important facet of the program is that the students work in groups providing opportunities for collaborative learning which is also discussed on page e26.

2) The applicant has proposed a program called Summer Academy for Integrated Language Learning in the San Francisco Unified School District, which is an enhancement of a currently existing program for newcomer English language learners. The specific enhancement is to incorporate Computer Science content into the currently existing program for students, while also working with teachers to provide professional development to integrate Computer Science content into their STEM discipline curriculum. Specifically, much of the Computer Science content will focus on Bootstrap which is an existing strategy for teaching Computer science content and skills to students, especially for teachers with no formal Computer Science training. Bootstrap will also be incorporated into Algebra and Physics curriculum by participating teachers as described on page e23. This decision to provide Computer Science for the newcomer English language learners is an effort that should significantly improve an innovative strategy to providing Computer Science skills development to the targeted student population. Furthermore, it will be interesting to see whether Computer Science outcomes are improved for all students in the school district because of the enhanced professional development received by the participating teachers.

Weaknesses:

1) The only identified weaknesses in this proposed strategy to provide enhanced Computer Science skills training as part of a Summer academy for newcomer English language learners is the absence of significant continuing individual support specifically for the participating students after the Summer academy has ended. Although the applicant mentions that the students will have access to counseling and dual enrollment community colleges courses available to all English language learners in the system as described on page e25, no specific mentoring program have been set up for this cohort of students. It seems a shame to invest the time and effort on these students in the area of Computer Science and then not specifically mentor them and provide additional targeted curriculum that will take advantage and build upon their newly
developed interest.

2) There are no identifiable weaknesses in the SAILL Summer academy proposal as it effectively builds on strategies that have been successful with in developing literacy skills in newcomer language learners. Furthermore, the decision to encourage integration of Computer Science content and skills development into Algebra and Physics discipline content is quite innovative and will provide research data which will be of interest to schools around the country.

Reader’s Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

   (2) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

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

Strengths:

1) The applicant has clearly outlined the goals, objectives and expected outcomes of their project beginning on page e28 and summarized in two tables in section B1.2 on pages e30 and e31, for student- and teacher-related objectives. It is important that they have distinguished the difference between the student- and teacher-related objectives for the Summer academy program because the teacher training has the opportunity to have a much larger impact on students in the district, when they return to the classroom during the regular school year. Bootstrap training for non-Computer Science teachers in Algebra and Physics teachers will help in the integration of Computer Science in the curriculum. The cohort support for the teachers is well-designed and should have a high likelihood of success.

2) The conceptual framework underlying the proposed project is clear and understandable and based on published research and past experience of the school district with Summer academies for newcomer English language learners. The processes on collaborative learning and integration of Computer Science into other STEM disciplines such as Algebra and Physics are important strategies that support the goals of the EIR program. The planned program builds on past success with a Summer academy program that positively impacted literacy skills in a similar student population, so this conceptual framework seems likely to succeed.

3) The proposal by the applicant to use the process of improvement science and disciplined inquiry to systematically study, learn and apply changes to the program, as described beginning on page e33 is appropriate. A timeline for the formative evaluation and feedback process is included on page e34 along with responsibilities. Both project administrators and the external evaluation team will participate in the process. Monthly meetings are planned to ensure program objectives and outcomes followed planned guidelines and meet expectations. Quantitative targets seem reasonable.

Weaknesses:

1) There are no identified weaknesses or deficiencies in the identified project goals and objectives. Project goals, objectives and activities are clearly defined, and the applicant has categorized goals and objectives to identify which are student- or teacher-related.

2) The lack of cohort support for newcomer English language learners who have participated in the Summer academies, as described on pages e28-29, appears to be limited to support given to all students who are English language learners in the school district. This lack of specific support to the Summer academy cohort of students is concerning, as this population would seem to be at most risk of academic issues and most in need of mentoring and coaching. Furthermore,
if a student has demonstrated an interest or talent in Computer Science, that budding interest should be nurtured. The plan to charge outside districts for teacher training and/or demonstrations as described on page 33 seems to be in opposition to the goals of widely disseminating the strategy to impact the greatest number of students. It seems the costs of that training should be completely supported by the EIR grant. Otherwise, the conceptual framework of the program is strong as evidenced by past success with their other Summer academies.

3) The proposal by the applicant to use the process of disciplined inquiry to systematically study, learn and apply changes to the program, as described beginning on page e35 is appropriate. Therefore, the applicant has proposed sufficient procedures to ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project is appropriate and timely.

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources/Quality of Management Plan

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

   (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

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

   (3) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

Strengths:

1) A very detailed management plan with goals, objectives, activities, performance measures, a timeline and identified responsibilities is included beginning on page e75. The activities are well defined and appropriate to the mission and goals of the project. Quantitative targets are provided as performance measures for many of the listed activities. The budget and budget justification beginning on page e79 are also well-defined and reasonable given the scope of the project. Adequate funding is provided for participating teachers. The school district and the responsible program administrators have a documented history of delivering this program in the district for the target group of newcomer English language learners.

2) The qualifications of the management team as identified beginning on page e35 and in the attached CVs in Appendix B beginning on page e45 are appropriate in terms of educational training and previous work experience. The program director Dr. Fong has a record of achievement including leading several programs for English language learners and externally funded research programs. Ms. Gottesfeld has also had significant responsibilities in directing multilingual pathways in the district. Other key personnel have similar required skills and experience in education for English learners, STEM discipline experience, and Computer Science educational experience. Most importantly, Mr. Twarek has extensive experience with the Bootstrap Computer Science curriculum. The educational training and experience of the REA evaluation team (Drs. Moylan, Vega, and Gurn) are all outstanding.

3) The San Francisco Unified School District is committed to the delivery of Summer academies to support the academic success of newcomer English language learners. Part of this commitment is stimulated by the district's graduation requirements alignment to University of California college preparatory required coursework as discussed on page e19. Their commitment to keeping all students on track for graduation, has led to Summer academies for students who are off track, often the students with language challenges. The district’s Summer academies pre-existed this proposal and are likely to continue after the funding from this project ends. Furthermore, the professional development training received by participating teachers will enhance their use of Computer Science in their STEM disciplines after the program ends. The applicant also describes their plans to share the outcomes from their research efforts on the impacts of the program with other school districts regionally and nationally.
Weaknesses:

1) There are no weaknesses identified in the project management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. The plan defines administrative responsibilities, project timelines, and targets are provided for all project activities.

2) There are no weaknesses in the qualifications of the key personnel in terms of their qualifications, experience and relevant training.

3) The applicant’s suggestion that funding for the Summer academy proposal potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends includes the suggestion of charging outside districts for professional development and demonstration visits, as discussed on page e37, is problematic. Although this is a possible source of revenue to continue Summer academy professional development programming, it would seem to negatively impact dissemination efforts, decreasing opportunities to have other teachers embrace the strategies in their school districts. It was also confusing that the letter of support from the San Francisco Unified School District from Dr. Rocha, attached on page e73, does not directly support the merits of this proposal, commit to continuation of support, or even mention the program’s name directly. In fact, it could be that an incorrect support letter was attached.

Reader’s Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. Within Absolute Priority 3, we give competitive preference to applications that address the following priority:

   Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in the notice). These projects must address the following priority area:

   Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science (as defined in the notice) coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in the notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in the notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

   Note: Projects addressing this priority must be administered in a manner consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

Strengths:

The applicant has specifically proposed an early phase EIR program to increase the number of underrepresented students who are newcomer English Language learners who will take high school AP Computer Science courses and Science and Math classes which incorporate Computer Science content in the San Francisco Unified School District. Furthermore, the professional development received by participating teachers will benefit all English language learners in their schools, providing them with improved access to Computer Science content. The program as proposed should be able to achieve those goals, indicating they meet the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

There is no identified weakness in this proposal as it relates to establishing a program which provides access to Computer Science for students from underrepresented backgrounds from low income households.