

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Houston Independent School District (U363A080171)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
Overall Comments		
1. QUESTION 1	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 2	40	40
<b>B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 3	25	24
<b>C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 4	20	18
<b>D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 5	15	15
<b>E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 6	15	10
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>107</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel 13: 84.363A

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

Applicant: Houston Independent School District (U363A080171)

## Questions

### Overall Comments - Overall Comments

#### 1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

Reader's Score:

### 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:

a. The applicant has provided clear goals and measurable objectives for the project. The project is a part of the district's on going efforts to help educators advance student learning.

b. The design of the proposed project is based on proven best practices and up-to-date research. The applicant has provided leadership development programs since 1985 as an attempt to develop school leaders from the ranks of teachers in the district. Based on the successful history of the project, the applicant plan to build on its success with the SL grant.

c. The applicant has proposed many recruitment and retention strategies to retain participants in the program. Participants will be carefully screened through the Principal Insight program to determine their abilities to lead. Additionally, all participants will develop a document called the Profile of an HISD Leader. The document will be grounded in search-based practices and identifies specific characteristics, competencies and descriptors that all district administrators should possess.

d. The applicant's program is based on the premise that school leaders should be strong in instructional leadership if schools are to be successful. Through various needs assessments the school district has placed student achievement as high priority. The district developed an educational improvement model called ASPIRE ( Accelerating Student Progress and Increasing Results and Expectations).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses

**Reader's Score: 40**

**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:**

a. The applicant's project will be guided by three strong goals with measurable objectives. The applicant's evaluation includes periodic assessments and evaluation measures that will produce strong quantitative and qualitative data.

b. The applicant will employ benchmark measures that will provide periodic feedback and assessment for determining progress toward meeting their goals.

**Weaknesses:**

a. The project should review the frequency of data collection with the evaluator.

**Reader's Score: 24**

**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:**

a. The HISD project will collaborate with the University of St. Thomas as its primary partner to carry out its goals and objectives. The School of Education will provide three courses in leadership development to the academy fellows. The district professional development office will provide additional course offerings to the Academy.

b. The project which is a district-based certification program will integrate its curriculum with the current district initiatives so that the academy fellows will benefit. activities.

c. The overall vision and purpose of the district-based certification program is to ensure that school leaders in the HISD is exposed to the latest best practices of leadership as it relates to student achievement. Additionally, those best practices are embedded in the HISD standards curriculum.

d. The project has a long standing collaborative relationship with the University of St. Thomas.

**Weaknesses:**

b. The applicant did not provide as much detail in regards to the quality and intensity of the program services. The reader was able to piece together from other information in the proposal, but the applicant probably should have provided the information in the appropriate section of the proposal.

d. LEAs have many tremendous offers from partner institutions of higher education to provide quality certification courses. The reader questions why the district is not choosing a more local IHE to collaborate with to provide coursework.

**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:**

- a. The applicant has provided a very detailed management plan with timeline and with clearly defined milestones for completing each project.
- b. The applicant is proposing that the project will have a Steering Committee that will be comprised of the HISD-ACP program director a project manager, representatives from various departments in the district and with the University of St. Thomas. The leadership group will be accountable for planning, directing, coordinating and making decisions for improving the project.
- c. The Steering Committee's primary function will be to facilitate project evaluations, and monitor progress towards attainment of the project goals and objectives.

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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 applicant provided documentation on poverty levels as defined by the criteria for high need. Additionally, the applicant provided a chart of the percentage of teachers teaching out of certification.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not fully provide the information on data for schools needing improvement and/or corrective action, however, high need was established in the proposal.

**Reader's Score: 10**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 02/11/2010 02:04 PM



Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Houston Independent School District (U363A080171)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
1. QUESTION 1	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 2	40	40
<b>B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 3	25	24
<b>C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 4	20	20
<b>D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 5	15	15
<b>E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 6	15	10
<b>Sub Total</b>	115	109
<b>Total</b>	115	109

# Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel 13: 84.363A

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

Applicant: Houston Independent School District (U363A080171)

## Questions

### Overall Comments - Overall Comments

#### 1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

##### General:

The applicant's proposal appears to be a good project.

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:

(a) The applicant clearly provides specific and measurable goals and objectives, identify, recruit, train, and retain a cadre of highly qualified potential principals.(p.1).

(b) The proposed project design reflects up-to-date knowledge and research from (Waters & Grubb,2004), that principal leadership is significantly correlated with student achievement and its impact may range from positive to negative dependent on leadership practices. Additional reference on up-to-date knowledge reflects a report by the Education Commission of States, (ECS: The Progress of Education Reform 2005, Vol.6, No.2), (pp.3&4).

(c) The applicant documents that the proposed project successfully addresses the needs of the target population because a separate focus group was convened to give input on the development of the Alternative Certification Program, (ACP) principal certification program at the district level,(pp.4 & 5).

(d) The proposed project appears to be a part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning because a host of professionals from various institutions and positions were invited to be a part of a focus group to develop the Alternative Certification Program for principal certification, p.5).

**Weaknesses:**

NONE

**Reader's Score: 40**

**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:**

(a) The applicant proposes all project objectives will produce both qualitative and quantitative measures and that they are clearly related to the intended project outcomes, (pp.16-18).

(b) The applicant states that the methods of evaluation, qualitative and quantitative measures will be tracked over the course of the program, and the grant evaluators will remain in contact with the grant manager, ensuring that data gathered is used to improve and inform the program. Also a formative and summative evaluation report will be prepared which can be used to gauge program success, (pp.17 &18).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide clear dates when some of the formative data would be collected,(pp.17&18).

**Reader's Score: 24**

**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:**

(a) The applicant states that the services proposed are appropriate to needs of the recipients because all project professional development activities are aligned with the goal for each academy fellow to become a reflective practitioner who focuses relentlessly on student achievement, understands the power of collaboration, supports teachers and their own professional growth,(p.18).

(b) The applicant states that the training or professional development services will lead to improvements in practice among the recipients because as a district-based certification program the curriculum can be integrated with district initiatives so that its academy fellows may fully benefit from job-relevant professional development experiences, (pp. 18 & 19).

(c) The applicant states that the services provided by the proposed project will allow the project participants to have direct access to the latest best practices on district initiatives as standard-based curriculum, power standards, and formative and summative assessments, (p.19).

(d) The applicant proposes to collaborate with the University of St. Thomas as its primary partner to carry out its goals and objectives. Additionally, several district's departments will be involved, Professional Development Services, Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, Research and Accountability, Budgeting and Finance, (p.19).

**Weaknesses:**

NONE

**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:**

(a)/(b) The applicant provides a detailed adequate management plan to achieve the project objectives within budget. Additionally, timelines, milestones, and responsibilities for project activities appear to be clearly defined (pp. 21-25).

**Weaknesses:**

NONE

**Reader's Score:** 15

**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 applicant meets the required priority by high need.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not display the information in the proper section for this priority.

**Reader's Score:** 10

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Houston Independent School District (U363A080171)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
1. QUESTION 1	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 2	40	38
<b>B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 3	25	23
<b>C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 4	20	15
<b>D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 5	15	14
<b>E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 6	15	12
<b>Sub Total</b>	115	102
<b>Total</b>	115	102

# Technical Review Form

Panel #13 - Panel 13: 84.363A

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

Applicant: Houston Independent School District (U363A080171)

## Questions

### Overall Comments - Overall Comments

#### 1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

##### General:

It was hard to focus on the specifics of the project beyond the goals and coursework. It was felt the project authors did not anticipate the degree of specificity required by readers to adequately assess the project. The information may be inherent in the project itself, known to the authors but was not communicated to the degree sufficient for complete understanding.

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:

The steps of the project design and implementation are specifically spelled out, making the design highly reproducible by other districts.

The selected candidates for the cohorts of aspiring principals are objectively assessed through both online and face-to-face interviews and rubrics.

The goals and objectives of the project are specific and measurable, as outlined on pp. 14-15.

The curriculum is directly aligned to Texas Standards for Domains and Competencies for certification.

Components of the program are directly supported with research literature.

The program specifically outlines benchmarks for assessing participant progress, growth, and mastery of the competencies imbedded in the curriculum.

The participants in the ACP will have both a staff mentor to guide activities and progress and facilitate growth in the program but also have a site based mentor who will guide field experiences in the internship.

**Weaknesses:**

It is not clear if fellows will be asked to sign an agreement to stay within the district for two years as part of the tuition reimbursement.

Increased student achievement in the high need LEA schools where participants will be placed is not included as a program goal.

**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:**

The project has included an external evaluation of the project.

Use of statistical analysis will assess the effectiveness of the program.

The use of experimental design is commendable for this purpose as well.

The project incorporates the use of both quantitative and qualitative measures.

**Weaknesses:**

More frequent data collection is needed if the project intends to incorporate changes in the design (p. 17). If the Steering Committee will be reviewing the reports (p. 20) the frequency of data collection should be under consideration.

**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:

The project involves collaboration between UST and district personnel in delivering program services.

The program proposes to teach participants about the use of the Value-Added Student data to inform decision making as part of the curriculum.(p.19)

#### Weaknesses:

UST is only delivering 3 courses in the curriculum. While job-embedded curriculum delivered by HISD is practical and expected to be relevant, foundational knowledge cannot be bypassed.

The services do not include a description of major personnel, or their job responsibilities for the project.

Resumes are included in the appendix, however, it is not clear which individual is doing what job. It is therefore difficult to determine if the quality of the services were adequate or if the background and educational experience can fulfill the needs of the project. This connection is missing.

The applicant still did not include student achievement in its goals, despite highlighting the potential impact of the program on student achievement (p. 19), using both value-added data and traditional data.

Reader's Score: 15

## 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:**

Program benchmarks were found on p. 11 under "Project Design".

A portion of the management plan on p. 23 is directly aligned to program goals.

Specific benchmarks are outlined and a timeline included on p. 23.

**Weaknesses:**

The management plan lacked clarity because elements of the management plan were included in other sections. It would have helped the reader to locate these in the same section.

**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:**

A need was established through high need eligibility criteria.

**Weaknesses:**

The competitive priority was not specifically addressed. There was periodic mention of placing principals in high need LEAs but no specific description of the LEA's in the district, with regard to Need of Improvement, Restructuring, or Corrective Action was provided.

**Reader's Score: 12**

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

