

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/28/2015 10:21 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U367D150015)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	8
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design & Services	35	35
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	16
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Sustainability	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	92
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	1
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	0
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	4	4
<b>Total</b>	107	97

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 5: 84.367D

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U367D150015)

## 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:

One of the areas of significant impact of this project on the National Level is the process used to provide for diverse participants that reflect communities served. The model has afforded an increase in the percentage of educational leaders of color and may impact leadership programs across the United States. ((Page 5)

The proposed program will have partners from various regions in the United States. This should help to promote a National Level impact. (Page 3)

The proposed project includes several elements that will provide contributions to the development and advances of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge and practices. The program has two major focuses. One is the Emerging Leadership Program which addresses the learning needs of school leadership teams and the other is an Aspiring Principal program which addresses the learning needs of potential Principal Leaders. (Pages 6-7)

The likely effect of the Emerging Leadership Program for Teacher Leaders is to improve student learning and student achievement and preparation for career and college ready skills. (Page 8)

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly identify the significance of the additional work that will be the result of the proposed project, but relies heavily on the significance of past work with teacher leaders and principals. (Pages 3-8)

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 clearly defines two major goals for the project. These are aligned with the objectives and are measurable. For example, the goal to increase the number of teacher leaders developed has an outcome to have 1,250 participants over the three year period. (Page 14-15)

The proposed project is a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and to support rigorous academic standards for students. This project includes training for both teacher leaders and principals to provide a strong support of the academic achievement improvements in a building and district. (Pages 15-16)

The quality of the two programs in this proposed project is of high quality and has been supported by research and previous practices. (Page 17)

The intensity and duration for the one and three year programs will lead to improvements in practice. The feedback processes outlined will assist in assuring that improvements do occur within the New Leaders Project schools. (Page 18)

The proposed project will prepare aspiring principals for the shortage that is apparent in the leadership roles in urban, high-need district. The plan is to decrease the turnover rate in those partner schools. (Page 20)

One of the major focuses and objectives of this project is relating directly to improving student achievement in light of the new, more rigorous standards. This effort will address the needs of disadvantaged students. (Page 20)

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 35**

**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 qualifications of the project director, key project personnel and project consultants have relevant training and experiences that relate to the leadership training and the management of the program. (Pages 24-25 and Resumes)

The management plan clearly outlines the objectives, Key Tasks, Timelines, Milestones and persons responsible for the tasks. These elements are adequate to accomplish the goals of the proposed project in a timely manner. (Page 27)

The proposed management plan and the budget summary identify sufficient and reasonable resources will be utilized in carrying out this proposed project including the project evaluation. The time allotment for the key personnel is sufficient and reasonable to achieve the goals of the large participant numbers throughout the three year program. (Page 28 and Budget summary)

**Weaknesses:**

It is not clear what relationship the teams defined in the management plan has with one another. The applicant needs an organizational chart to clarify those relationships. (Pages 23-25)

**Reader's Score:** 16

**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 proposed project uses a "train the trainer" model for the leadership programs. This model will assist the partnership school districts to build capacity beyond the period of the Federal Financial Assistance. (Page 30)

The project also builds an increase in New Leaders' organization's sustainability by providing the updated training and curriculum enhancements that will be used in the outreach work with the leadership training. These products could be used by other entities and are available to partner schools. (Page 30)

The applicant does provide a clear dissemination plan within the management plan for sharing the products and information for public use. This includes publishing the School Leadership Playbook and media venues. (Page 31)

**Weaknesses:**

There were no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**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/ideviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](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 applicant has developed two major evaluation questions that will need to be answered in order to determine if the objectives and outcomes of the proposed project are being met. Each of these questions are effectively linked to measures that are used and the data that is collected. This provides thorough, feasible and appropriate methods of evaluation. (Pages 33-36)

The evaluation plan includes both qualitative and quantitative data collection. Those include surveys, participant placement data, and student achievement data. These measures clearly relate to the intended outcomes of the proposed project. (Pages 33-36).

The use of a randomized control trial of the Emerging Leadership Program would potentially produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations. (Page 37)

The Quasi-experimental study of the Aspiring Principals Program may potentially produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations due to the use of large samples of participants who have received the same treatment and the statistical controls for demographic factors. (Page 37)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide a well-developed plan for evaluation in Year 3. As the project moves from the local areas served to a wider collaboration with other areas, specific goals and objectives are not developed for the extended collaboration.

Reader's Score: 18

### 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 applicant includes the innovative and sustainably technology to make better and more efficient use of resources and time. (Page 48)

##### 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 clearly provide for a plan to integrate STEM education into two Leadership programs.

**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 applicant clearly addressed this priority by providing leadership training to potential leaders serving high-need student populations. (Page 50)

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 05/28/2015 10:21 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/27/2015 12:19 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U367D150015)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	8
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design & Services	35	35
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Sustainability	15	14
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	90
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	1
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	0
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	4	4
<b>Total</b>	107	95

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 5: 84.367D

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U367D150015)

## 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:

p. 3 In the statement of the problem the proposal indicates a compelling need for qualified leaders in a new paradigm of instructional leadership rather than management.

The proposal offers a significant oversubscription model – multi year sequence of development and in-district advancement opportunities (p. 6)

In the proposal, 1500 teacher leaders/principals are expected to impact 7500 teachers, etc. –and this applicant is already having a lot of impact through substantial funding pages 6-7.

The proposal expects to see improvements in teaching and student achievement: School leaders will be specifically ready to take on CCSS p. 8

#### Weaknesses:

The distinctions made between teacher-leader and school-leader roles are not clear or consistent. The program is already well established with a focus mostly on school-level leadership; the ELP work and claims for gains at the school level are interesting but hard to follow when the proposal goes on to make claims about student achievement (and predicted gains). Data analysis seems to equal intervention, but the scale of the two is not clear. P. 8

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 focuses on developing teachers through a “leadership journey” (page 9) defining this journey in terms of building leadership capacity through a range of activities in a well-defined program.

The proposal is for a comprehensive effort, with an update of the curricular programming to include CCSS p. 18.

The shortages of personnel are well described in a strong statement of need p. 3 and p. 20

The proposed clinical/experiential coaching model suggests a strong evidence-based delivery system (p. 13-14).

### Weaknesses:

Although the applicant shows sufficient quality/duration in the proposed PD offering– (p. 17, the hours/days scheduled for leadership development), as the project spreads, it is less clear how these events will be delivered (p. 19 “local delivery”) with fidelity to the model will be ensured.

Reader's Score: 35

## 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:**

Teams p. 21 are well established in the program. This proposal is for continuing an established delivery system p. 23.

There is a good plan for upgrading the curriculum and tech platforms. P. 26-7

The caseload system and targeted use of expert consultants suggest clearly defined responsibilities for necessary work.

**Weaknesses:**

The proposed management plan may not include sufficient resources, given that the \$15 million asked of SEED is only half the required budget.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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 intends that program improvements (connected to CCSS) will sustain past funded period.

The proposed alignment with new standards – shared through the project – will continue.

The proposal includes the publication of white papers, attendance at conferences, etc, p. 32; There is also a planned development and deployment of a Tool kit for “media” or practitioner outreach.

IHE partnership p. 7 – include significant partnership endorsement (p. 11)

There is evidence of strong retention in schools of trained leaders (p. 31)

The proposal includes strong strategies for dissemination (page 32).

**Weaknesses:**

The train the trainer model, P. 30, is intended to build partner capacity but there is not a clear strategy for maintaining fidelity to the model. "Building capacity for greater ownership" may be in conflict with the new information (like about CCSS) that the organization wants funding to continue to build.

Reader's Score: 14

**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/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](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 RAND and SRI partnerships for evaluation are clearly well-embedded in the organization and the evaluators will be able to access data and offer formative as well as summative evaluations.

There is a plan for evaluating the new delivery systems (p. 33)

The applicant is knowledgeable about the WWC standards and has carried out work in the past to meet standards.

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation measures focus on participation and assessments of participants, but measures of teacher-effectiveness seem to be site-specific and may not take into account the vagaries of different state evaluation systems. P. 35

**Reader's Score:** 18

**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:**

Cost savings are expected from doing "more online/locally" work with school leaders.

**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:**

This priority is minimally addressed.

**Weaknesses:**

Attention to STEM is an unconvincing add-on, not a focus.

**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:**

Good leadership in schools will definitely benefit these high-need students.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 05/27/2015 12:19 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2015 02:56 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U367D150015)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	8
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design & Services	35	35
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
<b>Adequacy of Resources</b>		
1. Sustainability	15	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	91
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
<b>CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness</b>		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	1	1
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
<b>CPP3: Promoting STEM Education</b>		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	2	0
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
<b>CPP4: High-Need Students</b>		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	4	4
<b>Total</b>	107	96

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 5: 84.367D

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U367D150015)

## 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 provides clear details to show the significance of the proposed project on a National Level. For example, the applicant discussed that New Leaders' programs are nationally significant in addressing this problem because of their scale and scope, proven effectiveness, placement rate, training model, and diversity. The applicant wrote that an estimated 27% of principals from high need districts leave their schools each year, many to take less demanding roles in more affluent schools. Numerous charter networks also report that leadership is their greatest barrier to replication and growth. New Leaders' programs are nationally significant in addressing this problem because of their scale and scope, proven effectiveness, placement rate, training model, and diversity.

The applicant provides compelling details to show the potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices. (This can be evidenced by the applicant discussing that in 2013, New Leaders began consulting with major universities to redesign the universities' principal preparation programs based on lessons learned from APP. Current partnerships include the University of Connecticut and The Ohio State University, which are creating new programs to develop leaders specifically for turnaround schools, as well as the University of Missouri, St. Louis. With each university, they focused on developing clear program standards; creating and managing opportunities for authentic leadership practice; integrating coursework, field experience, and assessment; and forming supports for principals beyond certification.

The applicant provided sound evidence to show the importance of the results likely to be attained by the proposed project resulting in teaching and student achievement. This can be evidenced by the applicant discussing that Emerging Leaders increased student achievement during their training year: in Memphis, 100% of participants showed proficiency gains through their teacher teams, with 55% leading double-digit gains (some as high as 30 points). Also, Memphis participants reduced the percent of students at Below Basic Level by half, from 47% to 25%.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide details to show how the effectiveness of the New Leaders program was determined. This makes it difficult to determine the national impact this program would have.

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 provided compelling details to show the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable. For example, the applicant wrote that SEED funding will support New Leaders to identify, select and prepare a greater number of highly effective new teacher leaders and principals, especially those who serve high need students. The applicant wrote that they will achieve their objectives through two school-based leadership programs such as their one year, standalone Emerging Leaders Program, and our three year principal preparation and induction program, or Aspiring Principals Program. The applicant wrote that both programs identify the leadership competencies required to be a highly effective teacher leader or principal, which are bucketed in five leadership domains.

The applicant provided compelling details to show 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. ( For example, the applicant discussed that their project outcomes are that both programs focus on measurable improvements in teacher effectiveness and student achievement, and developing proficiency in leadership competencies required of highly effective new teacher leaders or principals. The applicant also wrote that with SEED support, they will develop more highly effective new teacher leaders and principals with the critical end outcome of increasing achievement for high-need students. Their internal and external evaluation plans will measure the extent to which they accomplish their end outcomes. To ensure that they meet these outcomes, the applicant wrote that they will work closely with their evaluation partners, the SRI and RAND, to track implementation measures and interim outcomes.

The applicant provided distinct evidence to show 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. ( For example, the applicant wrote that quality is demonstrated by their programs having proven effectiveness which was confirmed by RAND which demonstrated that students attending schools led by New Leaders outperform their peers specifically because they have a New Leader principal. Both programs in the SEED project are intensive because their one year ELP offers participants 135 hours of training. Their three-year APP offers participants nearly 500 total hours of training (including the hours noted above for ELP in Year 1).

The applicant provided strong details to show the extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated. For example, the applicant discussed that New Leaders addresses the issue of preparing personnel for fields in which there are demonstrated shortages in three primary ways such as ELP building a pipeline of leaders so that schools and districts can succession plan. The applicant wrote that they have achieved extremely high rates of principal placement: 81% of New Leaders graduates have been placed as principals compared to estimates of only 20-30% from traditional principal preparation programs. Finally, participants who meet our rigorous selection bar and successfully complete their programs are passionate, tenacious individuals who are committed to their schools: 79% of APP principals stay past year three versus the national average of 50%.

The applicant provided compelling evidence to show extent to which the proposed project will focus on addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals. For example, the applicant wrote that New Leaders' mission is to ensure equal access to a quality education for all students, but especially low income students and students of color. The applicant wrote that they serve the highest poverty schools in the highest-need districts. The average population of students receiving Free and Reduced Meals in New Leader schools is 83% which is 9 points higher than the average of their partner districts.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 35**

**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 provides clear details to show the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.

The applicant provided compelling details to show 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. For example, the applicant discussed that Chief Program Officer who leads New Leaders' National and Regional Program Teams, will oversee this project along with the Chief External Relations Officer. Under their oversight, five teams will execute this project. These teams are the National Program Team, which designs New Leaders' programs and ensures programmatic sustainability, Regional Program Team, which recruits, selects, trains and coaches program participants in partnership with districts and charters across the United States, External Relations Team, which grows New Leaders programs and ensures financial sustainability, Research and Evaluation Team, which evaluates programs, and Technology Team, which supports program technology. All teams closely coordinate to ensure success of this project, and team members have deep expertise and experience in their respective areas.

The applicant provides compelling evidence to show the extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation. The applicant wrote that New Leaders believes that their management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out our project. Their plans balance ample resources such as financial, talent, technology, systems and cost efficiency. The applicant wrote that consultants will provide cost effective access to the expertise they need early on. New investments will be thoroughly vetted by organizational leadership to ensure value and work that leads to our outcomes. The applicant discussed that New Leaders have always had a deep commitment to evaluating our programs for effectiveness, as evidenced by their long term RAND evaluation.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide sufficient details to show how the various teams plan to work with each other.

**Reader's Score:** 15

**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 applicant provided compelling details to show 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. (The applicant wrote that over the grant period, they forecast project expenses of \$33.6 million to identify and develop an additional 1,500 highly effective school leaders to improve the practices of 7,500 additional teachers and the academic achievement of more than 200,000 additional students. Already, they have secured \$16.6 million of private funding toward this project; with \$15 million from SEED and another expected \$2 million, they can fully fund the project. They have raised more than \$100 M in the past four years and have strong base of private donors to meet the overall need.

The applicant provides effective details to show 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. The applicant discussed that New Leaders have built partner capacity through consultancy engagements and through their programs. In addition, district partners reported to RAND that New Leaders influenced their principal selection criteria, principal evaluation, and principal support, improving the district as a whole. The applicant wrote that with SEED funding, they will increase their focus on building capacity for partners who want to take greater ownership. They will offer a new "train the trainer" model where district staff will eventually facilitate trainings and coach participants, continuing to access the resources they create through this SEED project.

The applicant provides compelling details to show 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. The applicant wrote that they will publish white papers to share their lessons widely, publish our School Leadership Playbook; and, through consulting engagements, influence adoption of our approach beyond our program clients. To disseminate these resources, they will focus on two avenues such as presenting at conferences that reach leaders in the education field and promoting their findings through blogs, social media and the press.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

### 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/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and**
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](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 applicant provided clear details to show the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. (For example, the applicant discussed that New Leaders will evaluate the impact of the leadership programs for which they are seeking SEED support with two research questions which are To what extent is the one-year Emerging Leaders Program (ELP) meeting Project Objective 1, and to what extent is the three-year Aspiring Principals Program (APP) (Emerging Leaders Program, Residency, Principal Induction) meeting Project Objective 2.

The applicant provided clear details to show 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. The applicant wrote that each research question measures progress to project objective 1 or 2 and its related outcomes, drawing on a wide range of quantitative and qualitative data. For example one research question which has a quantitative measure asks about the number of program elements implemented according to program design. To collect data the applicant wrote that they will conduct interviews of partner district leaders, staff surveys, and interviews with school staff.

The applicant provided clear details to show the evaluation will permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The applicant wrote that SRI, RAND, and New Leaders will all conduct program implementation analyses throughout the grant period to inform continuous improvement. SRI will conduct annual site visits to ELP only partner districts and draw on New Leaders' internal implementation data. SRI will conduct annual interviews with district leaders, principals, ELP participants, teacher team members, and New Leader staff who support the program in each district. These site visits will allow SRI to gain a nuanced understanding of teachers' and others' experiences with the program and will also provide a deeper understanding of how context affects program implementation.

The applicant provided well-documented details to show the extent to which the methods of evaluation will produce evidence about the projects effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.((For example, the applicant wrote that New Leaders will contract with SRI International to conduct a year-long cluster-randomized control trial to estimate the effect of ELP on participants, teaching teams, and students during the

2016–17 school year. New Leaders will identify 150 ELP candidates that meet its selection criteria, and SRI will randomize half into treatment (receiving ELP training in the 2016–17 school year) and half into control (receiving no ELP in 2016-17 and receiving delayed treatment in 2017–18).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide details to show how their evaluation would provide feedback to key stakeholders.

**Reader's Score:** 18

**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:**

This project identifies strategies for providing cost effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. For example, the applicant wrote that New Leaders integrates innovative and sustainable technology to make better use of our resources and staff and participant time, while creating efficiencies for our school partners. These efficiencies enable them to deliver cost effective virtual trainings that allow participants to engage at their own pace, to streamline our data tracking; and to create a sense of community and more effective communication among staff and program participants in multiple locations.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**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:**

The applicant provided a description about how they plan to measure the impact of the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness by discussing that New Leaders is committed to tracking data for continuous program improvement and managing progress to our goals of increasing teacher effectiveness and raising student achievement.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide details to show how they planned to train elementary teachers in STEM.

**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 applicant discussed that they are dedicated to serving all students, especially low-income students and students of color. They prepare transformational leaders to support high-need students where 83% of students they serve qualify for free and reduced-price meals, 88% are students of color, and 14% are English Language Learners they serve are in the highest need districts and the highest poverty schools in our partner districts. The applicant wrote that they are often asked to improve schools where starting proficiency is painfully low, and even in these circumstances they achieve impressive academic growth.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 05/29/2015 02:56 PM