

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 04:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	100	75
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CCP 6	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CCP 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. CPP 8	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. CPP 9	1	1
Sub Total	1	1

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Total	105	77

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation grant.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

Strengths:

The applicant provided goals, objectives, strategies, and actions that clearly aligns with the selected priorities (p. e23-e33). These goals, objectives, and strategies are tightly aligned which illustrates the importance the applicant places on a quality design.

The applicant notes a history of working with its partners to implement many projects and indicates that its partners have demonstrated their willingness to sustain the projects objectives after the grant ends (p. e39).

The majority of the costs is reasonable and focused on supporting the goals, strategies, and actions of the grant. The budget narrative is very clear and provides good detail regarding the breakdown of expenditures. The cost is very reasonable considering the low per student cost of \$367 and the expertise and experience the partners and applicant bring to the program (p. e40-e41).

The number of students to be impacted and the cost were included in the application. The cost to scale up is also included.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this criterion.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths:

This application is an exceptional approach to addressing the improvement of achievement in low-performing schools because it ensures that each school has a highly-qualified effective leader that will increase student achievement (p. e42-e454).

The services described in the application are based on the most current information and research available to this program, because it is based on previous experience and evaluations from its previous programs that are in place. Using the principal training provides up-to-date knowledge on how to mentor and support effective leadership with a focus on new leaders.

The applicant provides evidence of updated studies conducted by the project which relates to leadership. This project has achieved past success and demonstrates the need for expansion. This project has support from national, state, and local partners. This well developed model is designed for sustainability and has great potential for continued success.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project

personnel, especially in managing complex projects.

(3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

The applicant includes a comprehensive management plan for the three year duration of the grant. The project management plan provides detailed information regarding the qualification, training, and experience of essential staff for the project through curriculum vitas/resumes.

The management plan is well defined and is appropriate for having the project completed on time and within budget. Timelines and responsibilities are well presented and appear realistic for implementation of the project. The breakdown for the plan (Emerging Leaders Program, Aspiring Principals, Principal Institute, Evaluation; and further breakdown of recruitment, training, support, evaluation and dissemination goals) is quite impressive and is a strength for the proposal.

Key personnel are highly qualified and have extensive experience in their areas of expertise. Furthermore, the strong qualifications of the project leaders are noted in the attached resumes and the past success of this project demonstrates the skilled organization and management of the project leaders. This combination of education and business background will be very beneficial to the success of the project. (Appendix)

The eligible applicant capacity to bringing the project to scale is comprehensive and serves as a strength. The applicant details its strategies to bringing the project to scale. For example, it describes conducting local and national fundraisers and the support it will receive from its partners (p. e59).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted in this criterion.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed experimental study or a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Sustainable use of technology (Effective Practice Incentive Community Knowledge System, web to deliver virtual instruction, Salesforce for recruitment) will significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money or other resources.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to use many high-quality web based tools such as the Effective Practice Incentive Community Knowledge System, web to deliver virtual instruction, Salesforce for recruitment.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **1**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 04:16 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 05:52 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	23
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	100	73
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CCP 6	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CCP 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. CPP 8	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. CPP 9	1	1
Sub Total	1	1

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Total	105	75

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation grant.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

Strengths:

The New Leaders proposal has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy aligned to Priority #1. National recruitment of candidates with the research-based characteristics of strong leaders is an excellent beginning. Offering three levels of participation (Emerging Leaders, Aspiring Principals, and Principal Institute) is a responsive continuum, which helps pinpoint and train the most effective future principals. One compelling feature of the Emerging Leaders program is the requirement for participants to be responsible for leading two to three teachers to improve student achievement. This measurable goal results in determining the most successful participants to receive invitation to the Aspiring Principals program. The application addresses the ways in which this program can be scaled up. They plan to expand only at sites that would result in the highest gains.

Weaknesses:

This program will identify, recruit, and train candidates to become effective principals in high needs schools. Although a powerful goal, the proposal does not address the training needs of existing principals. A combination approach to training new leaders and existing principals would be a stronger innovation and impact more students. The program addresses early tenure supports (p.9) for participants and 2nd year high

school principals. A perceived weakness of the program design is the lack of long-term supports for New Leaders after their first (or second year) in principal assignments.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths:

The proposal represents an exceptional approach to the priority and provides extensive references to up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. There is great potential for New Leaders to revolutionize principal recruitment and training. The data provided clearly justifies that investing in effective principals increases student achievement.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing complex projects.

(3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

This application clearly outlines the responsibilities, timelines, and milestones of their school leadership training initiative. It is evident from the qualifications of the project director and other key personnel that they

have the experience necessary to make results happen and vast previous experience at managing complex projects.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed experimental study or a well-designed quasi-experimental study.
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on
 - (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
 - (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
 - (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The New Leaders project proposal describes a clear focus on increasing efficiency within participating schools by training emerging leaders and aspiring principals with research-based professional development. Data-driven instruction is a strong thread of the proposal along with embedding standards-based curricula. Common terminology and specific outcomes with strategies to help future leaders achieve success are driving forces and no doubt will increase efficiency at the participating schools.

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

This project proposes to use a web-based digital tool called the Effective Practice Incentive Community (EPIC) Knowledge System. The system incorporates multimedia case studies, professional development modules, and tools from the highest-gaining schools across the country. This impressive use of resources will help improve leadership skills of emerging leaders and aspiring principals.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/04/2012 05:52 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 08:07 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Significance		
1. Significance	25	0
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	22
Sub Total	100	22
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CCP 6	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CCP 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. CPP 8	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. CPP 9	1	
Sub Total	1	

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

Sub Total 1

Total 105 22

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation grant.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing complex projects.

(3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed experimental study or a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The proposal has identified Key Program Benchmarks (page16) that are either observable or measurable. The proposal also includes targeted indicators and outcomes to address each of the four research questions. The Logic Model used to identify the indicators and outcomes includes an appropriate timeline for specific evaluation activities. With results available a full year before analyses done by the independent research institution, RAND, the just-in-time implementation and impact analyses to be conducted by New Leaders' internal research team complement the implementation analyses and quasi-experimental impact analyses to be conducted by RAND. RAND will obtain a matched peer control group from all schools in partner areas for the quasi-experimental design. The model includes sufficient data on extraneous variables (e.g., principal tenure information) to measure the impact of program activities. Additional studies include refined models to account for differential learning trajectories and a study of matched comparison schools. Estimated standard errors from previous studies were used to predict minimum detectable effect sizes for improvements in math and reading scores. The difference-in-differences model proposed on page 46 to analyze intermediate outcomes is appropriate for assessing whether or not changes in school-level characteristics precede achievement gains. The combination of analyses done by New Leaders and by RAND will provide high-quality implementation data and sufficient information to allow for replication at other settings. The budget includes sufficient funds to carry out the planned evaluation activities and the individuals at RAND and New Leaders responsible for the evaluation activities have sufficient experience to conduct these activities.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not indicate how an improved school climate and improved teacher effectiveness listed under Intermediate Outcomes in the Logic Model on page 39 will be measured other than by district surveys and teacher evaluation scores. More detail on these needs to be provided. In particular, it should be stated whether or not these are instruments that already exist, perhaps created for some other purpose, or whether they will be created for this project. In addition, opinion surveys do not provide strong evidence of a significant impact. While the proposal includes a detailed value-added model to be used to analyze the data from the quasi-experimental design, details on how the value-added will be measured are not provided.

Reader's Score: 22

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve

children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/04/2012 08:07 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2012 07:21 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	0
Significance		
1. Significance	25	0
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	21
Sub Total	100	21
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CCP 6	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CCP 7	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. CPP 8	1	
Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. CPP 9	1	
Sub Total	1	

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

Sub Total 1

Total 105 21

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation grant.

(3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing complex projects.

(3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed experimental study or a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

1) The application specifies a well-conceived and constructed quasi-experimental design. The design satisfactorily addresses both student achievement outcomes and the intermediate study outcomes of teacher effectiveness and school climate changes. The analyses described control for differences in student achievement measures among schools and districts, as well as school climate surveys. Both the sampling plan and hierarchical model are well-constructed and appropriate for the project design

2) The application provides a reasonably clear and complete description of the summative data collection and analyses for the project. Rand will provide annual summative performance reports, and internal staff will provide feedback during the school school. In combination, these evaluation activities should provide sufficient information to project stakeholders for assessing progress toward achieving goals.

3) Both Rand and New Leaders will publish reports detailing the project description, analyses, key elements, and other information to facilitate replication. New Leaders will publish the tools to hire and evaluate principals, which is critical in enabling others to use the results from the project.

4) The application specifies \$1.97 million for the project evaluation (about 3-4% of the project budget), which is sufficient for a thorough and complete evaluation. The evaluation contractor (Rand) and specific personnel denoted have sufficient experience in large scale program evaluations such as the proposed project, and should be able to effectively complete the evaluation within the project timelines and budget.

Weaknesses:

2) The narrative does not indicate that student achievement will be assessed with any interim performance instruments, but only with the state s large-scale assessment. Thus, there is too much reliance on large-scale end-of-year data on the achievement outcomes, which does not facilitate making implementation adjustments during a school year. Similarly, the climate and teacher outcomes are dependent on one-time end-of-year survey instruments.

4) The application does not provide specific budget amounts for the internal evaluation activities. Therefore, it is not possible to determine if the funding for these data collection activities, analyses, and reports from New Leaders staff is sufficient and reasonable to carry out their evaluation design.

Reader's Score: 21

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that
 - (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
 - (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
 - (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/04/2012 07:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/05/2012 07:59 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Mgmt Plan and Personnel	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
Sub Total	100	75
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. CCP 6	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. CCP 7	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. CPP 8	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. CPP 9	1	1
Sub Total	1	1

Competitive Preference Priority 10

Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. CPP 10

	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Total	105	77

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Validation Panel - 1: 84.411B

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: New Leaders, Inc. (U411B120026)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional):

General:

There are scarcely enough accolades available to evaluate this proposal. An all-encompassing program for providing outstanding leaders for high needs schools is professionally and comprehensively presented. The applicant has spent more than a decade relentlessly building and improving a system of recruiting, selecting, training and supporting effective school leaders so crucial to improving student achievement in this country. The New Leaders Program has been operating in three states and this project will expand it by partnering with 15 districts in 7 low-income communities in a fourth state and by facilitating replication nationally.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
- (2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Validation grant.
- (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.
- (4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

Strengths:

This design has one clear, overreaching goal and several explicit strategies that comprehensively address the project's quality criteria. The design is exceptionally clear and complete, drawing upon 11 years of experience in creating and operating a leadership program with all the necessary components to prepare successful principals not for just high-need schools but for the highest-need schools. The percentages of high-need students this program has been serving are far greater than national averages.

The Rand Corporation has been studying the impact of the applicant's program since 2006 and has isolated the effect of it on student achievement, meeting the moderate evidence required and finding significantly higher levels of student achievement attributable to the New Leaders program.

The program has remarkably strong recruitment processes followed by a rigorous, competitive selection

process.

The program has numerous other strengths, e.g., the applicant's robust capacity to publish and disseminate papers and give presentations to encourage others to replicate its success.

The costs not only seem reasonable but an internal study found them to be equal to or lower than those of other comparable programs and a graph is included showing comparisons.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(3) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths:

This project is truly exceptional in that its purpose is to revolutionize American education by carefully selecting capable people who can be transformed into outstanding principals who will then provide education that can accelerate the achievement of all students, especially, high-needs students, and abundant evidence is provided that the purpose is being fulfilled.

A few examples of many: over 15,000 national applicants have been screened and only the top seven percent selected; a network of 800 new leaders already exists; strong partners such as Teach for America and Stanford School of Education have joined the effort; specific attributes have been identified and candidates must undergo a rigorous selection process, including an 8-hour virtual assessment.

The applicant has been conducting research on principal effectiveness, evaluation and leadership for a decade and has published key reports, received much recognition and in 2011, was recognized as an Exemplar Program by the George W. Bush Institute's Alliance to Reform Education Leadership. In addition, a rich variety of sources that shapes the training is included.

As for evidence of improved student achievement, the RAND Corporation found that 58 percent of students in schools led by New Leader principals outperformed their peers in reading and 55 percent outperformed them in math. Further, the effect size of the program is higher than the effect size of principal experience.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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

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

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing complex projects.

(3) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a State or regional level (as appropriate, based on the results of the proposed project) working directly, or through other partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

Strengths:

C
Strengths

The applicant's management plan is quite thorough and detailed about tasks, timelines and milestones as well as who is responsible and accountable for each. The qualifications of all personnel involved are unsurpassed – a dizzying array of prestigious degrees, backgrounds and accomplishments in both the public and private sectors and yet also much in-the-trenches experience, e.g., serving as high-need school principals and as directors of related organizations such as New York City's office of Parent and Community Engagement.

The applicant's track record is replete with examples of successful fundraising from national prestigious corporations and foundations as well as from local groups, increasing the percentage that local sites have raised from 5% to 75% of their budgets in just a few short years. The applicant's capacity to scale up impact is also demonstrated by the increase of program leaders from 13 in just two cities to 800 in 11 cities.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed experimental study or a

well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

(a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

(b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

(c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

(a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;

(b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). 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 this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

This priority is met through dedicated program curriculum units on human capital management that include data-based performance; data-driven instruction; school scheduling modification and staff development that emphasizes maximal teacher output as measured by solid evidence of improved student achievement. Also emphasized is that school curricula be designed to be coherent and aligned with standards so as to not spend time on activities that do not improve student achievement.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

- 1. We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

The project absolutely fulfills this competitive priority. Funded by the federal Teacher Incentive Fund, the applicant has developed innovative technology for professional development that will be used. In addition, participants will utilize the Effective Practice Incentive Community (EPIC) Knowledge System that includes multimedia case studies, professional development modules and tools from over 200 of the highest gaining schools in the country identified by independent evaluators at Mathematica Policy Research and large school systems using value-added models. Other innovations include a cloud-based computing technology, Salesforce, for recruitment, selection, program data management and fundraising.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/05/2012 07:59 PM