

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2015 05:33 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (U367D150013)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	32
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	13
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	0
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	3
Total	107	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 1: 84.367D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (U367D150013)

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:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to develop a research-based instructional leadership program with clinically rich components, a preparation design needed in the field; the fact that the proposed program is spread out across three states and 11 districts should give insight into the impact on local, state, and potentially national levels. The leveraging of resources from a university-based teacher education program and a national non-profit through a virtual/remote model has significant potential future preparation of school leaders.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's proposed scope, with only 40 total participants over three years, is not likely to offer representative sample of the potential for scaling up the program design at/on a national level. The applicant does not address how it will attend to or affect student learning.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

Strengths:

The applicant has clear and measurable goals for its proposed program design. It is building off an existing, if fledgling, model, and has a long-term plan for scaling its work, including using the initial year to refine its programming; the applicant will expand to other areas in each subsequent year. The program design features a year-long clinical experience coupled with intensive coaching, both necessary elements for quality apprenticeships; coaching support is also provided to school-based mentors. Program elements are logical and coherent, including how applicants will be recruited, how they will progress through the program components, and what their roles/contributions will be upon completion of the treatment. There is a clear plan to utilize technology to support coaching and study of practice. The applicant demonstrates that high needs students will be served by the proposed design.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe how its coursework is being or will be refined to best support new principals and the program design. The applicant does not demonstrate a significant need for instructional leadership in the districts in which it has partnered.

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.**
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
- (3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.**

Strengths:

The applicant has a significant number of personnel already determined for the proposed project, even down to the field-based coaches; all are considerably experienced or qualified for the assignment. Given that many of the resources have already been developed and/or piloted, much of the system and programming is ready to go; even still, the applicant is giving itself significant time to scale the work to ensure it can recruit and train high-quality personnel, both as participants and as coaches for when the work expands. The project timeline is detailed and organized by project goals.

Weaknesses:

The management plan does not assign specific personnel to its key activities, which, given the fact that nearly all of the personnel are assigned already, seems to contradict its existing plans.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.**
- (3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.**

Strengths:

The requirement that participants commit to at least three years of employment in leadership roles in their prospective schools/districts assures that the impact of the proposed project will be felt beyond the initial funding period. The proposed study strengthens the applicant's partnerships with school districts and professional preparation programs, building potential training and professional development pipelines across districts and states. The remote training/coaching model, if proven effective and scalable, could serve as a potential national model for principal training or professional development. The applicant has extensive plans for sharing its findings.

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides only a general description of its plans to share knowledge of its products and services; there are no plans to scale the system and/or provide technical assistance to others who might benefit from their program

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers:**

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.**

Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:

- (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iddocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and**
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/.**

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

Strengths:

The evaluation is guided by a significant number of research questions that address the process and performance of key program elements. The applicant is collecting a significant amount of data, has organized the data around its research questions, and will apply multiple analytic methods to the review of data; quantitative analysis will account for the lack of

randomization of site and participant selection.

Weaknesses:

The proposed evaluation design is not a randomized control trial, and thus does not fully meet the WWC standards; it does not describe how it will conduct its sampling. The applicant does not describe how data collected about the program implementation will inform ongoing improvements to it. The applicant does not describe how it will address student learning outcomes, which it lists as a question for its evaluation.

Reader's Score: 16

Priority Questions

CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The proposed design seeks to utilize remote coaching and video study as means of improving new principal support. If successful, it could provide a model and platform for ongoing remote support to schools and institutions most in need of leadership development, while also improving cost efficiency.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a

rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address how its programming addresses STEM learning.

Reader's Score: 0

CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

Students in the participating schools/districts are of high need.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not address how it will support improved learning outcomes for these students.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/29/2015 05:33 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/01/2015 06:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (U367D150013)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	28
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	13
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	0
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	3
Total	107	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 1: 84.367D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (U367D150013)

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:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

The proposal presents a clear articulation of a program based on the LIFT model that will train 40 principal fellows through a blended model of face-to-face learning supported by online video libraries. The proposal articulates the previous research on the LIFT model, articulating an expansion to the online platform to enhance the model for future expansion and scalability. The proposed partner LEA's in Texas, Indiana, and Louisiana builds a clear case for how the program could make a significant impact on a high-needs population (e18).

Weaknesses:

Although the proposal presents a clear research base, it is challenging to understand the details of the specific training that will be offered to principal fellows and/or educators to provide support for school leader and teacher effectiveness. This articulation is necessary to demonstrate an advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices beyond the presence of an online system to gauge national significance associated with the proposed outcomes. Additionally, it would be helpful to see how the proposed program would benefit student achievement. The proposal would benefit from additional articulation of details to establish this connection to students to address potential significance. Finally, the proposal has 40 participants, which is a small population to be able to infer outcomes for scaling and national implications. The engagement of a larger sample size would help the data set be more robust and applicable to the larger national education community.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

Strengths:

The proposal presents goals and processes details with the inclusion of timelines and criteria where appropriate. The inclusion of details, such as the rigorous selection process for principal fellows (e40), demonstrates a clear plan for the project to yield improved school leaders as proposed. Additionally, the combination of experts from NIET and TTU bring together a strong blend of resources and expertise from both a non-profit and university to create a strong partnership for the execution of this program. The proposal is clear in articulating the student population needs, with a clear representation of underserved populations having the potential to benefit from this grant proposal (e18).

Weaknesses:

In the proposal narrative, it was challenging to see the specific measures associated with the goals and objectives. It would be helpful to present these measures in a table with a timeline and benchmarks for clarity to better demonstrate how the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable. Additionally, the proposal would benefit from the inclusion of specific data for personnel needs specific to principals in the areas served. The use of national data does not clearly demonstrate how the need specifically exists in the partner communities. Finally, the selection of coaches that will be involved with the project was also lacking detail. As these coaches are an integral part to the delivery and facilitation of the online program, it is necessary to describe the selection process of those individuals to demonstrate their capacity for high quality instruction and support to align with the proposed outcomes of the project.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.

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

(3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.

Strengths:

The proposal provides a strong balance of NIET members and TTU faculty to blend expertise and instruction on both the LIFT model, as well as traditional principal education programs. The personnel identified have experience with research, grant implementation, and training of future principals (e46-e48). The project management plan detailed in Appendix E, provides a clear plan for execution of the grant with clearly defined responsibilities by institution, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing the project tasks. The proposal outlines appropriate resources and budget support for all actions articulated, including project evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The project management plan detailed in Appendix E would benefit from specific articulation of personnel associated with the management responsibilities beyond the organization level of "NIET and TTU" associations. With the majority of the project personnel identified, it would be helpful to see how each individual's specific expertise aligns with the execution and outcomes of the project. Additionally, it would be helpful to see more milestones associated with this plan to demonstrate expectations and projected outcomes in smaller increments such as quarterly or month-to-month. This additional detail would inform the project implementation and demonstrate greater alignment between the objectives of the

project and the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the state outcomes.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.**
- (3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.**

Strengths:

The proposal articulates a clear plan to expand the impact of the project during the three years of the grant in Texas (e50). The proposal presents a dissemination plan that is sound, and articulates plans to produce materials to share with other agencies. The proposal plans of making finding available to a variety of stakeholders such as nonprofits, state departments of education, and university (e51). The proposal details a commitment to their partners for sustainability in promotion of results.

Weaknesses:

The proposal didn't clearly define if the online platform and video-based library would be shared with the larger community. The ability for other organizations and communities to benefit from the research and model would be contingent on access to these resources. The proposal would benefit from detailing if these resources would be made available, and what plans the project has around creating user guides and/or implementation guides to support replication and scaling efforts. Additionally, the proposal was unclear about the project's plans to continue to sustain and support the online technology through NIET. The sustainability of the project related to impact and results beyond the grant period would be contingent on these online supports being available, and the proposal would benefit from inclusion of plans on how the materials and online system will continue to be supported.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.**

Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:
(1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/ilocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and
(2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/.

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

Strengths:

The proposal articulates a plan to use project management staff from NIET and TTU to provide the evaluation for this project. The plan details use of process and outcome data to provide information to inform implementation and effect on principal training. The proposal articulates a balance of both qualitative and quantitative data to inform the evaluation. The evaluation will be a quasi-experimental study with matched school comparison to meet the What Works Clearinghouse guidelines with reservation.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan would have been improved with an alignment of the data measures with the research questions proposed for evaluation (e56-e58). It was challenging to see how the research questions would translate into the actual evaluation plans for the project, and having these metrics articulated in alignment with the questions would provide additional detail to inform the extent of the evaluation. Additionally, the proposal references the evaluation is student achievement data in the research questions, but does not clearly articulate how that data will be obtained from partners or used in the comprehensive evaluation of the outcomes of the program. This information would be helpful to establish a more direct connection between the plans of the program to have an impact on student achievement outcomes. Finally, the proposal lacks detail on the recruitment and selection of the matched schools to be used in the evaluation. This makes it challenging to evaluate how effective the evaluation will be without more details about this process.

Reader's Score: 16

Priority Questions

CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The proposal focuses on the cost-saving advantages of a technology-based professional learning platform, as it saves on both time and travel. The proposal focuses on the use of an online platform to remove costs associated with face-to-face professional learning to save resources. This meets the cost-effective, high-quality service provisions specific to this competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

The proposal doesn't take into account the costs associated with maintaining the technology needed for this implementation effort. The costs of both hardware and personnel dedicated to this effort will impact the overall cost of the effort. It would be helpful to see these costs recognized and factored into the proposal's articulation of cost-effectiveness. However, this concern was not enough to prevent the proposal from receiving the full points associated with this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

There were no strengths noted for this element of the proposal.

Weaknesses:

Although the proposal notes having an impact on STEM learning outcomes, it was unclear how any of the recruitment, programming, or outcomes were directly tied to STEM learning for students, teachers, or principals. Without additional detail about how these elements are being directly targeted toward STEM learning goals, the proposal did not have enough detail to qualify for this competitive preference priority point.

Reader's Score: 0

CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.

- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The proposal clearly demonstrates the high-needs populations of the students involved in the research, which will be the focus of the coaching efforts associated with this research for all of the committed district partners involved in the effort. This demonstration qualifies them for consideration and points awarded specific to the competitive preference priority for supporting high-needs students.

Weaknesses:

It would be helpful to see how the recruitment of coaches specific to the program also engages in efforts to reach out to traditionally underrepresented populations of teachers to increase engagement and build infrastructure that may not exist in the community. This effort would address the high-needs population in both the teacher population and student population.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/01/2015 06:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/27/2015 01:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (U367D150013)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	13
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	0
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	3
Total	107	89

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 1: 84.367D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (U367D150013)

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:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

The program will allow principal candidates to engage in a real internship experience and not work as a full-time teacher (pg. e17). The partnership of higher education and the institute should allow for the program to be modeled by others in the future (pg. e21-e22). This project will provide a model for other colleges of education seeking to infuse blended research-based best practices into their principal preparation programs (pg. e27).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a case for the ways in which their principal preparation program will drive improvements in student achievement or teaching. This project would contribute to the literature in regards to effective principal preparation if the applicant was going to actually demonstrate that student learning did increase (pg. e32).

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

Strengths:

Goals and objectives were provided and were related to the project (Appendix E). The project will provide an intensive year long, job-embedded learning experience under the guidance of mentor principals and coaches (pg. e32). The project is based on a program that has already been piloted allowing for improvement to already be made (pg. e32). The program

will be able to target weaknesses in traditional principal preparation via technology-enabled video capture for sharing and feedback, and exemplary data-drive instructional leadership (pg. e33). The program is targeting to expand the program to the entire state of Texas and nationally using the model from this project (pg. e35). The project appears to be sufficient in frequency and quality of the coaching the principals will receive (pg. e37). One of the screening criteria for participants is the desire to work in a school with high needs students confirming the focus on serving the needs of disadvantaged individuals (pg. e40).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not describe how the professional development will be administered to participants. The applicant provides a description of the program as it relates to pre-service principals, but does not describe the components of the program for principals (pg. e36). Principal fellows will service as an interim assistance principal for one complete school year, but it is unknown if this is an extra assistant principal for the school because of this grant or if the applicant is selecting assistance principals as participants only. More information on the needs of the participating districts for shortages of principals is needed to strengthen the proposal.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.**
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**
- (3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.**

Strengths:

The key personnel were identified and appear to have the appropriate backgrounds to carry out this type of project (pg. e46-e48). A timeline with milestones was presented to help keep the project on time (Appendix E). Responsibilities were outlined to ensure key personnel know who is responsible for specific objectives (Appendix E). The personnel and timeline with milestones provides sufficient evidence that the project can be carried out on schedule and within budget.

Weaknesses:

Identifying specific personnel within the organizations involved would strengthen the management plan to ensure a responsible person takes ownership of the tasks (pg. e46-e48).

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**

- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.
- (3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

Each year of the project will increase capacity to be able to offer the program in the whole state of Texas and then nationally (pg. e50). The project will generate materials that other agencies can use to implement reform models of principal preparation (pg. e52). Training modules, training materials, and handbooks will be created and available for others to use (pg. e52). A summary of effective processes and techniques in principal recruitment, selection, preparation, mentoring, and training will be available (pg. e52). The applicant will present the results and outcomes at appropriate national conferences. Results and outcomes will be disseminated via print and online via web-sites (pg. e53).

Weaknesses:

A plan for supporting principal fellows after the grant funds end was missing (pg. e51). It was not clear if the online platform would be able to be shared between the two partners and how that will occur.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:

- (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iodocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/.

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

Strengths:

Progress monitoring and feedback are a main part of the evaluation allowing for continuous improvement (pg. e54). A quasi-experimental design will be employed meeting the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations. The activities outlined in the evaluation appear to be feasible and appropriate for the stated goals (pg. e54-58). The different measures outlined for collecting data on the principals appear to be appropriate and feasible, such as the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (pg. e57). The applicant plans to collect periodic feedback on the program and on performance allowing for changes or adjustments (pg. e54, e56).

Weaknesses:

The performance feedback is based on participant assessment data and not driven by student achievement data (pg. 54). Recruitment and selection of matched schools was not described (pg. e55). Only one of the evaluation research questions are focused on looking at the impact of the program in regards to student achievement even though it states that it is a main focus on the top of page e56. (pg. e56-e57).

Reader's Score: 16

Priority Questions**CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness****1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)**

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The use of online materials and technology for sharing and coaching will be cost-effective.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education**

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The project will prepare 40 exemplary leaders in 11 school districts with students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch ranging from 48-94%.

Weaknesses:

A direct link to the actual schools the principals will work in to the students in need would strengthen the proposal.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/27/2015 01:09 PM