

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 11:58 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

page 1/2 The applicant proposes a project that will address absolute priority 1 by using a residency model program that has rigorous standards. The program will build a pipeline of principals with instructional leadership skills to fill positions in high need schools in San Francisco. The program is multi-faceted and is characterized by intense pre-service components, leadership competency models, a year-long residency, and post residency support for new principals. The program is based on a similar program that has been successfully implemented and shown success in evaluating, supporting and making significant leadership decisions in Camden and Philadelphia. It is expected that this program will successfully address absolute priority 1.

page 2-7 The applicant presents a novel approach that is based on previously successful models and that adds five components that make it unique. This project will be based on a residency model and focuses on five leadership skills that are essential for school leaders (purposeful leadership, instructional leadership, results-driven leadership, strategic leadership and communication) and they are required to show evidence of these skills while managing a team of teachers. Thus the residents actively manage a cohort of teachers, conducting evaluations, giving performance feedback and making talent management decisions while they are mentored themselves. This process is supportive and adds significantly to the resident's experience base. The program contains a practical selectivity factor, graduating only leaders who prove during the residency that they positively affect teacher growth and student outcomes. The program also continues support through the new principal's first year.

Page 7-9 The program that the applicant proposes will test theories that if significant, will add to the knowledge in the field. Results from this project will affect the best practices and methodology for training school leaders. The applicant also states that the district will absorb the leadership support program so that it may be continued beyond the term of the grant. The program shows promise of replication and sustainability.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

page 13-15 The applicant presents three clearly delineated goals and detailed activities designed to address each goal. The applicant also outlines a well-defined plan to achieve the goals. The first goal aims to produce a high-quality principal residency program and it is supported by a competency model based on the critical behaviors of effective school leaders. The applicant proposes a multi-media recruitment effort that is selective. Pre-service, residency and post residency trainings are based on a competency model. The pre and post training coursework is 4-6 weeks in duration and involves leading instruction and teacher development. During the school year residency the participants will be placed in assistant principal positions and manage a cohort of teachers. They will be responsible for evaluation, development and student learning, giving them practical experience with mentors to oversee their progress. The second goal involves developing a leadership system to support district principals that involves coaching, professional development and targeted support for school improvement. The third goal involves advancing knowledge in the field. The proposed program will be sustainable beyond the grant period and findings from the study will be disseminated through blogs, conferences, and white papers.

Page 15/16 The applicant addresses various issues and provides adequate mitigation for each.
weaknesses

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

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

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

page 17-20 The applicant presents a proposal that has well defined objectives. Only the project director, [REDACTED] responsibilities are well defined. The applicant has presented a set of milestones matched to objectives and timelines to guide them. The applicant has also indicated the staff responsible for actualizing them. The metrics to measure progress are also given (page 14/15) and progress of the program will be kept on track by these measures. Performance feedback will be analyzed on a weekly and annual basis and adjustments will be made to the program to fit needs. Collaborative goals will be set.

Weaknesses:

page 20 While the evaluation of the program will be executed by several partners in the program, it is unclear to what extent program participants will be contributors to the plan. The involvement of all stakeholders in a program would strengthen the application.

Appendix F The applicant proposes a project that is a partnership between San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), RAND, and TNTP. Although on pages 17-19 positions are identified with responsibilities it is difficult to determine who holds which position. Resumes of key personnel are submitted but it is difficult to match position to personnel. Without this information it is difficult to determine if the program will be managed well enough to succeed. The project director, [REDACTED] is identified and appears to have been involved with projects of this scope.

Appendix G The applicant presents a MOU from San Francisco Unified Schools, however the "letter of support" from RAND requests funding but it does not indicate strong support.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 11:58 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 12:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

(1) One of the strengths of this proposal is how well organized and complete it is. They demonstrated very well how many high needs students they have in terms of low income, English learners, and disabilities. They believe that if they develop effective leaders for these students' schools (including 8 Title I), they will impact positively the high needs population (page 1).

The applicant will address Absolute Priority 1 (Improving the Effectiveness of Teachers or Principals) and the Subpart A (Developing and implementing models for principals' preparation that deepen leadership skills which have been demonstrated to improve student achievement). The applicant is focusing on teachers and leaders training to prepare effective ones. SF PLUS is using as a model PhillyPLUS which was very successful in Philadelphia and made important instructional leadership decisions.

(2) Even though the vast majority of new principal are prepared by traditional programs, SF PLUS builds upon the growing body of evidence that supports residency models for principal trainings. Several residency programs have high levels of internal and external validity, and in page 2 the applicant explained seven common elements between them and SF PLUS.

But SF PLUS has 5 innovations: focused competency model, management practice, graduating only effective leaders, transforming district leadership, and building on local examples. The applicant explained in a very clear way how the program they are trying to implement, even though is based on what others have previously done, is a novel idea (pages

2-6).

(3) The application included a lot of evidence (researches and studies) of other programs that are incorporating the residency model but they have little to say about each one of the five innovations they are proposing (page 7). The new knowledge generated by the implementation and evaluation of SF PLUS will be significant and then they will be able to replicate the program in other districts and other states (page 8).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant effectively mentioned and described three goals for the SF PLUS. And each goal has few objectives. Figure 3 in page 9, is the SF PLUS Logic Model: Goals, objectives, short, intermediate, and long term outcomes. Other strength in this proposal is the clarity and coherence of the project goals and the extent to which they will achieve its goals (pages 10-13). Each goal is described in great detail between pages 11-17. The goals are Recruitment and selection, Preparation of effective teachers, Equitable distribution of effective teachers, and research development and sustainability. The goals are in direct alignment with Absolute Priority 1B. In addition to the description of the goals, the applicant described in detail an explicit plan of how they will achieve the goals (pages 11-14).

(2) The applicant anticipated four primary risks to successful project implementation. The proposal mentioned those potential risks and explained how they will mitigate those risks. The applicant based SF PLUS in previously done programs, researches, and studies so it was important to ensure that the project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals because is taking into consideration every possible scenario that could go wrong and making a plan of action.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

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

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

(1) The applicant created Figure 8 to describe the staff relationship (i3 Project Director, Leadership Coach, Site Director, and Program manager. Table 9 (page 17) very well described the Project goals (with all the objectives), staff roles and responsibilities, milestones, and timelines. The metrics are included in Table 6 (in other section) but are mentioned and described in details. This section reflects at what extent the management plan will do things to assure the achieving of goals.

(2) The project is a joint initiative between several entities which include SFUSD, TNTP, US Department of Education and the external research team from RAND. Each one of the organization showed their support and Appendix G includes all the letters and MOU evidencing it.

(3) The evaluation of SF PLUS will review the performance feedback data to be able to make improvements every winter and the training components will be revised each July. That way they are ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the project.

(4) The program has [REDACTED] as i3 Project Director for SF PLUS. They described how much experience she has in these type of projects. Reading the narrative and reviewing her CV it is clear that she is appropriate for that position.

Weaknesses:

(1) In page 20, the applicant mentioned the Site director and the project manager and it is not clear the responsibilities or the description of both positions. It was difficult aligning people with roles. Also, it is mentioned that the evaluation of the program will be a collaborative effort and it was not clear who is part of that collaboration. Further explanation needed.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/18/2014 12:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2014 10:23 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	80

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

The proposed initiative is aimed at improving instructional leadership across the district by building a pipeline of promising new school leaders to fill critical principal vacancies and developing leadership talent for high needs schools. Residents of this program gain hands on experience managing people, conducting formal evaluations, and making high stakes talent management decisions. The district is partnering with TNTP, an organization which has developed similar programs in Camden and Philadelphia (p.1). The program's contributions to the development and advancement of theory are outlined on p. 7-8). TNTP plans to replicate the SFPLUS model in other districts and states across the country.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

A clear logic model is included (p.9). Clear measurable goals and outcomes for the program are listed and explained on p. 10-12. The risks to the project's success and strategies to mitigate those risks are listed on p. 15-16. This section is well organized.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

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

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

Resumes of the project leaders show that they have experience managing projects of this scope and size. A table is included that outlines objectives, staff roles and responsibilities, milestones, and timelines (p.17-19). Procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement are discussed on p. 20).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the extent of commitment of key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/19/2014 10:23 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 05:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	15
Total	100	15

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

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

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

- (1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

- The applicant has presented a series of Research Questions that seek to evaluate the impact of the program on future school leaders' success and the impact they have on their schools, as well as seeking to evaluate the fidelity of implementation of the program (p. 22). These questions appear to be appropriate and adequate to address the evaluation of the program. The questions are also tied to the stated goals and objectives. A logic model is presented on p. 9, and provides a good illustration of the expected outcomes for the program.
- The research design for each research question is described fully, along with the data that will be collected to answer the questions. In each case, the design appears to be sufficient to address the question (pp. 22-23).
- An analysis plan is included in the narrative for each question (pp. 22-23) and in a separate section of the plan, a detailed description of the establishment of a minimum sample size and MDE size is presented.
- The key components and outcomes of the program are presented, along with a measureable threshold for acceptable implementation (pp. 24-25). The stated thresholds seem rational and would seem to indicate a degree of success for the program, if reached.
- The budgeted amount for the evaluation would appear to provide the needed resources to complete this evaluation. In addition, the evaluator identified to conduct the evaluation is reputable and has the experience and expertise to complete an evaluation of this size and scope.
- Overall, an excellent evaluation plan.

Weaknesses:

- No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/17/2014 05:58 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 02:14 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	15
Total	100	15

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 2: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: New Teacher Project, Inc. (U411C140039)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

A partnership between San Francisco Unified School District and TNTP to train 45 leaders in three cohorts in a residency program at a cost of \$3,978,910 and meeting the needs of 20,000 students.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the

proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

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

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

Key questions are addressed by the project evaluation and appropriate methods are used to evaluate each question. (Pages 21-25)

The evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact. (Pages 21-25)

The evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measureable threshold for acceptable implementation. (Pages 21-25)

Additional analyses are planned to compensate for a low sample size. (Page 24)

Implementation and performance data will be collected during the grant period to help monitor whether the project is on track to meet its goals.

The proposed project plan includes sufficient resources in time, personnel, and finances to carry out the project evaluation effectively. (Page 25, vitae, and budget)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are evident.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/17/2014 02:14 PM

