

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/11/2010 02:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Elizabeth City State University (U363A080061)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		
1. QUESTION 1	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Evaluation Criteria		
A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)		
1. QUESTION 2	40	22
B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)		
1. QUESTION 3	25	22
C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)		
1. QUESTION 4	20	18
D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 5	15	14
E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 6	15	15
Sub Total	115	91
Total	115	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel 3: 84.363A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Elizabeth City State University (U363A080061)

Questions

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This proposal has great merit even though its description is complex and at times difficult to read and comprehend. A thorough and thoughtful review of the proposal allows the reviewer to assess its strengths and value.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)

1. A) Quality of the Project Design

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

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

(b) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(d) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to , and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

(e) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

Strengths:

Elizabeth City State University (ESU) is the only public higher education institution in rural poverty stricken northeast North Carolina and is a Historically Black College/University.

The university has formed partnerships with LEAs to implement the project which is entitled Northeastern North Carolina School Leadership Program (NNCSLP). The purpose of this project is "upscale schools" (page 11 of the Narrative) in this area and bring them into the twenty-first century. As indicated, the upgrading would include changing principals' leadership styles and the quality of their performance as well as upgrading the physical environments of classrooms and teachers' pedagogy. The reviewer gets from this proposal an urgent need for change and reform and for increasing the number of certified principals and assistant principals...

ESU would partner with the targeted nine high need rural LEAs and conduct needs assessments with the LEAs on student achievement. A grand total of 842 participants would be served which includes principals, assistant principals and members of School Improvement Teams as well as 54 individuals who complete Master Degrees in Administration (MSA)

as part of this project.

This is one of very few proposals that include School Improvement Teams with representatives from key constituencies including parents, supervisors and teachers. Professional development would be provided for these teams.

An Advisory Council would head the project implementation. The School Improvement Teams functioning as professional learning communities would, in a similar fashion, take the lead in professional development and school reform.

North Carolina Standard for School Executives (NCSSE) would be utilized as a model for providing professional development for current school leaders since a significant percentage of them did not complete Masters Degrees in Administration. This educational requirement did not become effective until December 2006.

Aspiring and potential school leaders would be required to have MSAs. Potential applicants must be referred by their school systems. The support to be provided for enrollees in the ESU program include in person and online courses, portfolio development, study groups, a Virtual Learning Center, and distinguished speakers' series. Each participant will receive the services of a mentor during his/her internship who will be chosen from among Wachovia Regional and/or State Principals of the Year. A referral system will be employed to place candidates in positions.

After graduation, MSA students will have access for up to two years to the VLC and the universities library system.

A statistical significant increase in the number of schools making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and a decrease in the number of low performing schools are goals for the project.

Weaknesses:

This is a complicated and complex description of the Project Design. Many names, quotes, attributions, and dates interrupt the flow of the narrative.

The recommended course sequence/plan of study is in the appendix. The content of the course descriptions are not provided and the Project Design does not illustrate how these courses address the particular needs of principals and schools in rural northeast North Carolina. It is a traditional leadership preparation program and, from course titles, it appears that the coursework could be offered in universities throughout the country that have not targeted collaborations with high need rural schools.

Statements in the Budget Narrative say North Carolina has adopted new standards for School Administration Programs offered by Institutions of Higher Education. Institutions must report redesigned programs by July 2009. It appears that this proposal's grant funds will be used to develop such a program and cannot provide enrollees with a redesigned program at this time.

Further, the design does not indicate how mentors will be compensated. Will mentors work with School Improvement Teams?

The increase in the percentage of schools making AYP and the percentage of decrease in several categories of low performing schools are not stated.

Reader's Score: 22

**Evaluation Criteria - B) Quality of the Project
Evaluation (25 Points)**

1. B) Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

This portion of the proposal is clear. A mixed method approach combining qualitative and quantitative analyses is proposed. The premises and philosophy of the evaluation plan are satisfactory (see page 12 of the Project Narrative).

Formative and summative assessment will be administered. The formative evaluations will be used to "form" and modify plans. A list of pertinent evaluation questions are in the appendix.

The measurements, rating scales and frequencies of administration of the assessments for the School Improvement teams/Professional Development are described on page 14 of the narrative as are the measurements/frequency for MSA program. Rubrics to assess candidates' leadership skills, internships, and satisfaction level per course are on page 15.

Weaknesses:

The outcome that 100% of MSA candidates will meet North Carolina's licensure requirements and become gainfully employed may not be realistic.

A chart to depict the evaluation tasks and measurements, frequencies, responsible parties and entities, and benchmarks would make the plan easier to understand.

The measurements and data collected should be identified as either qualitative or quantitative for purposes of assessment.

Reader's Score: 22

Evaluation Criteria - C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)

1. C) Quality of Project Services

The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment of eligible project participants who are members of groups that have been traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability. In addition the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(a) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are appropriate to the needs of the intended recipients or beneficiaries of those services.

(b) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(c) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(d) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Strengths:

Among the strengths of this section of the proposal are the professional development for School Improvement Teams and the Select MSA Training using SREB consultants. Charts on page 19 have the topical areas for the Professional Development Focus and the MSA training as well as the anticipated number of days these services will be conducted.

Further, an Advisory Council will be formed of representatives from various central offices in North Carolina's public school system; dean and chair of the ESU Education department as well as other key university personnel; Wachovia principals of the year; superintendent or designee; and the project's staff. A MOU will serve as the vehicle to foster collaboration, a sample of which is included in the evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The plan for delivery of services is ambitious and, given its management structure, there is concern whether these services can be delivered.

Reader's Score: 18

Evaluation Criteria - D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)

1. D) Quality of Management Plan

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

(a) 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.

(b) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

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

Strengths:

The titles and functions of the individuals who will be responsible as project director, project coordinator, and external evaluator/curriculum specialist are stated. Vitas are in the appendix.

A very good chart to organize the description of the Management Plan is on pages 24 and 25. The chart lists objectives/milestones, timelines, responsibilities, benchmarks and actions.

The VLC (website) will be used as a discussion board and feedback mechanism for ongoing and continuous feedback

Weaknesses:

The individuals listed for the primary roles in the implementation of project will be working part time. For instance, Dr. Claude Mackey, professor, responsible for overseeing project implementation and budget management is working part time, 2.5% of his time. The time commitment for Dr. Shirley Turnage, the proposed evaluator, is not specified. Roberta Shaw will be employed full time but her educational in occupational/vocational education and certification as a Senior Professional Human Resources Management does not appear to be the most appropriate for a project that seeks to develop a new MSA program and provide professional development for School Leadership Teams.

While it admirable that an Advisory Council of such distinguished individuals have committed to serving to oversee program implementation and progress, it is questionable whether the Advisory Council will or should be involved in the actual management and operation of the project.

Reader's Score: 14

Evaluation Criteria - E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)**1. E) Competitive Priority**

Applicants can be awarded up to 15 points, depending on how well the application meets this priority.

School Districts with Schools in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring. Projects that help schools districts implement academic and structural interventions in schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of Title I, part A, of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Strengths:

The proposal has a strong section on Competitive Priority. Appropriate data are given regarding the demographics of the high need LEAs and school designation/gap analysis (Figure 1, page 2 of the narrative). The goals, objectives, and service are linked directly to the competitive priority issues.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/11/2010 02:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/11/2010 02:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Elizabeth City State University (U363A080061)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		
1. QUESTION 1	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Evaluation Criteria		
A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)		
1. QUESTION 2	40	38
B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)		
1. QUESTION 3	25	23
C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)		
1. QUESTION 4	20	20
D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 5	15	14
E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 6	15	15
Sub Total	115	110
Total	115	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel 3: 84.363A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Elizabeth City State University (U363A080061)

Questions

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Good use of \$2.9 million to train 108 leaders per year.

Focus on 9 rural high poverty LEA's.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)

1. A) Quality of the Project Design

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

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

(b) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(d) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to , and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

(e) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

Strengths:

Good goals.

Continue working with leaders 1-2 years after they graduate from the University.

Weaknesses:

Goal of 100% may not be reasonable.

Reader's Score: 38

Evaluation Criteria - B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)

1. B) Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

Strong piece of application.

Nice formative and sumative piece.

Good mixed methods of evaluation.

Use of School Improvement Team (SIT).

Weaknesses:

100% of participants may not be able to be accomplished.

Reader's Score: 23

Evaluation Criteria - C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)

1. C) Quality of Project Services

The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment of eligible project participants who are members of groups that have been traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability. In addition the Secretary considers one or more of the following factors:

(a) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are appropriate to the needs of the intended recipients or beneficiaries of those services.

(b) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(c) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(d) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Strengths:

Invited others to participate.

Good charts.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 20

Evaluation Criteria - D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)

1. D) Quality of Management Plan

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

(a) 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.

(b) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

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

Strengths:

Strong team with good experience.

100% of time being used by team members.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 14

Evaluation Criteria - E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)

1. E) Competitive Priority

Applicants can be awarded up to 15 points, depending on how well the application meets this priority.

School Districts with Schools in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring. Projects that help schools districts implement academic and structural interventions in schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of Title I, part A, of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Strengths:

Very good section.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/11/2010 02:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/11/2010 02:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Elizabeth City State University (U363A080061)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		
1. QUESTION 1	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Evaluation Criteria		
A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)		
1. QUESTION 2	40	35
B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)		
1. QUESTION 3	25	23
C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)		
1. QUESTION 4	20	20
D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 5	15	14
E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 6	15	15
Sub Total	115	107
Total	115	107

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel 3: 84.363A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Elizabeth City State University (U363A080061)

Questions

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This is a very well-organized, articulate grant proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)

1. A) Quality of the Project Design

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

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

(b) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(d) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to , and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

(e) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

Strengths:

Research-based model that reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice

The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

The applicant proposes to work in collaboration with nine local education agencies (LEA) to ensure that the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population, primarily LEAs serving rural, economically disadvantaged, "minority" (African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic) populations. Applicant will also collaborate with superintendents and practicing principals in the recruitment, selection, training, and support of school leaders.

Retention and placement strategies are built into the Northeastern North Carolina School Leadership Program (NNCSLP).

Weaknesses:

Overall program design as it relates to proposed services may be a bit over zealous; focus on offering fewer services and doing those services well

Reader's Score: 35

Evaluation Criteria - B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)

1. B) Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

Use of a mixed-methodological approach (i.e., formative and summative approaches) to evaluate the effectiveness of the project lends itself to modifications and expansions as deemed necessary when evaluating human subjects

Weaknesses:

The applicant is not explicit in detailing the extent to which the proposed methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended goals and objectives.

Reader's Score: 23

Evaluation Criteria - C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)

1. C) Quality of Project Services

The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment of eligible project participants who are members of groups that have been traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability. In addition the Secretary considers one or more of

the following factors:

(a) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are appropriate to the needs of the intended recipients or beneficiaries of those services.

(b) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(c) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(d) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Strengths:

Project services are closely aligned with the goals and objectives of the program

Applicant will ensure equal access to and participation in project services so that services provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement in practice among project participants

Services (i.e., professional development, Masters in Schools Administration training) are offered in collaboration with partners who have a vested interest in ensuring that the proposed project will lead to improvements and achievements in practice among recipients of such services.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 20

Evaluation Criteria - D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)

1. D) Quality of Management Plan

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

(a) 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.

(b) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

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

Strengths:

Strong collaborative team

Organized tables explicitly address, objectives/Milestones, timelines, benchmarks, actions and individuals responsible for carrying out the numerous task associated with the project.

Weaknesses:

The proposed project services are voluminous and may be overly burdensome to the project director and other key project personnel.

Reader's Score: 14

Evaluation Criteria - E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)**1. E) Competitive Priority**

Applicants can be awarded up to 15 points, depending on how well the application meets this priority.

School Districts with Schools in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring. Projects that help schools districts implement academic and structural interventions in schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of Title I, part A, of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

Strengths:

Explicit statement with supporting statistical data

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/11/2010 02:04 PM

