

**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:** School Board of Orange County (U363A080041)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
Overall Comments		
1. QUESTION 1	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 2	40	37
<b>B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 3	25	25
<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	12
<b>E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 6	15	13
<b>Sub Total</b>	115	105
<b>Total</b>	115	105

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel 2: 84.363A

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

Applicant: School Board of Orange County (U363A080041)

## 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:

The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable as outlined on pages 7, 8, and 9. The detailed description of the goals and objectives clearly show what the program aims to achieve.

The breakdown of goals and objectives into activities, performance measures, and performance indicators offers a comprehensive description of the purposes of the program. The qualitative nature of the performance indicators ensure that goals, objectives, and outcomes are measurable. (p. 7-9).

Program requirements (appendix E, reference from activities on page 8) are specific and measurable.

The cited research (p. 10-11) demonstrates that the project has considered up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. A comprehensive description of the challenges that leaders face demonstrates that the proposal writers are aware of the complex problems they will have to help new leaders tackle. (p. 10-11)

The design of the BRIDGE program details how it is appropriate to and will successfully address the needs of the target population (p. 11-14). The funding of mentors, recruitment of teachers interested in leadership, the removal of conflict of interest (i.e., mentor and supervisor) mentor relationships, multiple path options for participants, summer institutes to bridge theory and practice, professional development opportunities, specific mentoring to increase retention, and travel to exemplary schools are all carefully planned components of the program that meet a specific need identified by the program in recruiting, training, and retaining highly qualified leaders. (p. 11-14)

The differentiated leadership curriculum (Appendices E and F) clearly shows that learning for aspiring leaders is delivered in a manner that addresses their needs.

The proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning as detailed in the curriculum (Appendix E). The proposed program clearly ties quality teaching to student learning as well as quality teaching to leadership (p. 2) which shows a direct connection of the leaders to an improvement of teaching and learning.

The proposed project is a part of a comprehensive effort to support rigorous academic standards for students as detailed in the curriculum (Appendix E) which details how leaders support teachers in increasing rigor in the classroom. The BRIDGE program shows that it plans for students to achieve when measured against rigorous academic standards (p. 18) when in a school with a BRIDGE leader.

#### **Weaknesses:**

While the performance indicators on pages 7-9 are specific and measurable, some of the performance measures are not specific in their measurability. For example, performance measure 5.1 (p. 9) states that they want PIP participants to show an increase in their scores on a standardized measure of principal skills. However, the program does not set a desired measurable increase (or threshold of a score that is satisfactory to lead in a high-needs school).

There is a wealth of up-to-date knowledge of research and effective practice, but the section (p. 10-11) does not include a specific connection to how this knowledge directly connects to the design of the project proposed.

**Reader's Score: 37**

#### **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:**

Table 3 (p. 17) offers a comprehensive explanation of how the methods of evaluation will include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project. The demographic data, training data, mentoring data, student achievement data, teacher retention data, teacher effectiveness data, focus groups and surveys, post-test and exit data, and comparison data are all directly aligned to the intended outcomes of the project. (p. 15-17).

The use of experts (Leadership and Learning Center) and external evaluators (p. 16-17) indicate that the program seeks to use objective performance measures.

The methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes as detailed in table 3 (p. 17). The collection of data upon entry, monthly, quarterly, annually, bi-annually, and upon exit ensures periodic assessment and feedback not only of participants, but also of the program toward meeting the intended outcomes of BRIDGE.

The comparison of data between groups (p. 18) adds an additional dimension to determining if the program is meeting its goals.

Appendix K offers a comprehensive description of the content and frequency of evaluations, which connect to a strong assessment of the program's ability to reach its goals.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 25

**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 services provided by the proposed BRIDGE project are appropriate to the needs to the intended recipients of the services as described through the objectives of closely recruiting, retaining, and improving the skills of leaders, which offers a strong connection to increase the achievement of OCPS students (p. 20).

Appendix E clearly outlines the services provided to candidates in all three components (ALP, PNPP, and PIP) of the program, which are strongly correlated to research-based practices in order to benefit students by raising teacher performance and, therefore, student performance.

The developments of the training and professional development services to be provided by the proposed BRIDGE project are of sufficient quality as demonstrated by the plans alignment with both NSDC standards and the Florida Professional Development Protocol. (p. 21). Additionally, the description of the activities in Appendix L is strongly linked to quality professional development services.

The development of the training and professional development services to be provided by the proposed BRIDGE project are of sufficient intensity as outlined in Appendix L. The plan includes a comprehensive description of project activities, benchmarks, monitoring strategies, recommendations for change, a timeline, and the parties responsible. All of these sections are of appropriate intensity to prepare leaders for high-needs schools.

The development of the training and professional development services to be provided by the proposed BRIDGE project are of sufficient duration as outlined in the timeline of Appendix L. Services range from monthly to yearly in duration, and the use of mentors when the principal is in the first year of leadership strongly shows an appropriate duration of professional development services.

The focused training on instructional leadership, operational leadership, and school management (p. 22) are strongly linked to the likelihood that the services to be provided by the BRIDGE Leadership Program will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards for the duration of the program and the 2 year retention goal.

The services to be provided by the proposed BRIDGE leadership program involve a high level of collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services as detailed through the work of Stetson and OCPS as well as experts such as Marzano and other field leaders to provide the Summer Leadership Institutes. (p. 23)

**Weaknesses:**

Because the stated objective of the program is to retain principals for two years after completion of the program (performance measure 3.4 on p. 8), the likelihood that services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards in the long-term is low. Current research shows that to transform a school takes at least 5 years. Therefore, the 2 year retention goal does not lend itself to raising student achievement over the long term.

**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:**

Appendix L includes detailed information on project activities, benchmarks, monitoring strategies, recommendations for change, a timelines, and the persons and parties responsibilities, which strongly demonstrate the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

The budget narrative (p. i) contributes to the strength of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project within budget as demonstrated in the comprehensive expenditures and timeline for the spending.

Key project personnel (mentors, outside evaluators) have sufficient time commitments to meet the objectives of the proposed project (p. 24-25)

There procedures for ensuring feedback are adequate as outlined in table two (referenced on page 25). BRIDGE has clearly built feedback into the structure of its program.

As demonstrated in the "recommendations for change" section of Appendix L, BRIDGE has appropriately designed its program to allow for changes to support continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

Given the intensity and breadth of the services offered by the BRIDGE program, a 25% time commitment from the project director is not appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project even though there are plans to have a clerical support person (p. 24).

There is no description of a principal investigator role or indication that this role may be filled by other personnel (Senior Director of Professional Development Services or other person). (p. 24) It is therefore not possible to determine if the time commitment from the PI is sufficient or not.

**Reader's Score: 12**

**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:**

Priority is given to leaders that are committed to working in OCPS Schools in Need of Improvement/Corrective Action/Restructuring, which clearly demonstrates a commitment to schools that qualify under the competitive priority. (p. 2)

Well over the majority of the targeted district (OCPS) meet the criteria for the competitive priority status. (p. 3)

**Weaknesses:**

While priority is given to schools that meet the competitive priority criteria, some of the project's services may also be given to leaders that will not take over schools that meet the competitive priority criteria. (p.4).

**Reader's Score:** 13

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** School Board of Orange County (U363A080041)

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

	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	25
<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	8
<b>E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 6	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	115	108
<b>Total</b>	115	108

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel 2: 84.363A

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

Applicant: School Board of Orange County (U363A080041)

## Questions

### Overall Comments - Overall Comments

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

##### General:

THIS GRANT HAS AN INNOVATIVE PROJECT DESIGN AND PROVIDES APPROPRIATE PROJECT SERVICES.

THE GRANT ADDRESSES THE COMPETITIVE PRIORITY.

THE MANAGEMENT PLAN IS VAGUE.]

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 BRIDGE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM HAS THREE TIERS: ASPIRING LEADERS PROGRAM, PREPARING NEW PRINCIPALS PROGRAM AND A PRINCIPAL INDUCTION PROGRAM.(PAGE 1)

OCPS IS PARTNERING WITH STETSON UNIVERSITY TO DESIGN AND SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENT AN INNOVATIVE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT MODEL THAT CREATES LEADERS THROUGH THE IMPROVEMENT OF SITE BASED ADMINISTRATION.(PAGE 5)

ALL PARTICIPANTS WILL ATTEND A TWO AND A HALF DAY SUMMER INSTITUTE ANNUALLY. (PAGE 6)

STUDENTS IN THE COHORT WILL STUDY AND MEET STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION IN

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND A MASTERS IN EDUCATION, WITH UNIQUE EMPHASIS ON THE CHALLENGES OF WORKING BOTH IN HIGH NEED SCHOOLS AND IN A HIGH NEED LEA. (PAGE 12)

THERE IS COMMITMENT TO STRATEGICALLY APPOINT THE MOST PREPARED AND QUALIFIED CANDIDATES IN THE HIGHEST NEED SCHOOLS AND TRACK THEIR RESULTING PERFORMANCE. (PAGE 15)

**Weaknesses:**

NO WEAKNESSES NOTED.

**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:**

PRE-POST ASSESSMENTS, WHICH WILL ASSESS NOT ONLY CRITICAL THINKING RELATIVE TO SCHOOL LEADERSHIP AND UNDERSTANDING OF STANDARDS-APPROPRIATE ACTION, BUT ALSO A DISPOSITION TOWARD WILLINGNESS TO WORK IN A HIGH NEED SCHOOL, WILL BE GIVEN AT THE CANDIDATE ENTRY AND EXIT POINTS IN A PARTICULAR GROUP. (PAGE 16)

THERE IS THE USE OF AN EXTERNAL EVALUATOR. (PAGE 17)

THE APPLICATION INCLUDES A DETAILED DATA COLLECTION AND ARTICULATION PLAN. (PAGE 17)

**Weaknesses:**

NO WEAKNESSES NOTED.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**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:**

THIS APPLICATION STATES THAT COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLANS HAVE BEEN OUTLINED FOR EACH STAGE OF FORMAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT. (PAGE 20)

THERE IS THE USE OF THE NATIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT. (PAGE 20)

THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS RESEARCH BASED, OF HIGH QUALITY, DATA DRIVEN, PRACTICAL AND CONNECTED TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT. (PAGE 21)

OCPS AND STETSON WILL CREATE A SPECIAL COHORT WHERE THE CONTENT FOCUSES ON MEETING THE CHALLENGES OF WORKING IN A HIGH NEED SCHOOL IN A HIGH NEED LEA.(PAGE 23)

**Weaknesses:**

NO WEAKNESSES NOTED.

**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:**

THE MANAGEMENT PLAN CALLS FOR REGULARLY SCHEDULED COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA, PROVIDES CLEARLY DEFINED TIMEFRAME'S AND RESPONSIBILITIES, AND MILESTONES FOR ACCOMPLISHING PROJECT TASKS. (PAGE 24)

THE APPLICATION PROPOSES THE HIRING OF A FULL TIME PROJECT COORDINATOR. (PAGE 24)

**Weaknesses:**

THE PROJECT COORDINATOR WILL MOST LIKELY NOT HAVE BEEN A PRINCIPAL DUE TO THE HIERARCHY OF THE DISTRICT AND THE NATURE OF THE POSITION. (PAGE 25)

NO SPECIFIC DETAILED TIMELINE IS INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSAL.

THE 25% TIME COMMITMENT OF THE DIRECTOR. (PAGE 24)DUE TO THE ENORMOUS CAPACITY OF THE PROJECT, THE EVALUATION AND THE SERVICES PROVIDED, IT WARRANTS MORE TIME COMMITMENT.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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:**

OCPS MEETS THE REQUIRED CRITERIA FOR STUDENT POVERTY AND TEACHER QUALIFICATION TO BE DESIGNATED A HIGH NEED DISTRICT. (PAGE 1)

OCPS WAS SANCTIONED BY THE STATE DUE TO REPORTING 17.8% OF TEACHERS AS NOT HIGHLY QUALIFIED AND FOR NOT MAKING ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS.(PAGE 2)

PRIORITY WILL BE GIVEN TO THOSE PARTICIPANTS WHO COMMIT TO WORK IN SCHOOLS RECEIVING A D OR F UNDER THE FLORIDA At SCHOOL GRADING PROGRAM. (PAGE 2)

IDENTIFIED PRIORITY 61 HIGH NEED SCHOOLS, INCLUDING 53 SINI AND 8 D/F HIGH SCHOOLS. (PAGE 3)

**Weaknesses:**

NO WEAKNESSES NOTED.

**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:** School Board of Orange County (U363A080041)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
1. QUESTION 1	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>A) Quality of the Project Design (40 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 2	40	35
<b>B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 3	25	25
<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	12
<b>E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)</b>		
1. QUESTION 6	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	115	107
<b>Total</b>	115	107

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel 2: 84.363A

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

Applicant: School Board of Orange County (U363A080041)

## 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 spiral approach, coupled with multi-tiered systems of mentoring and professional development, assure coverage of the complexity of this proposal. This proposal builds upon already established efforts to recruit, retain, and train administrators, emphasizing a comprehensive approach to data collection and program implementation. This proposal speaks clearly to the needs of the community.

#### Weaknesses:

A great emphasis is made on the process of mentoring despite the challenges and lack of concrete organization in years past (Project Design, pgs. 11-12). No clear indication is made as to who mentors and supports the mentors themselves and to what context and criteria they will be operating under.

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:**

The proposal aims to ensure a consistent collection of data and an appropriate use in analyzing that data by contracting with an external, independent consultant. Both formal and informal data collection in a variety of forms will be used to assess program participants and hold all individuals accountable.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses have been identified.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**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:**

This grant proposal is initially geared at a limited participant base but identifies the importance, need, and intent to meet the preparation needs of all leaders in the district (Program Services, pg. 19). The proposers have adopted ambitious standards based on State structures and the NSDC, with an emphasis on improving teacher quality.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses have been identified.

**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 variety of sources have been identified to help manage the program efficiently and on budget. Substantial structures have been put in place to maintain a smooth flow of program implementation and management.

**Weaknesses:**

Frequent mention is made of data collection and evaluation, specifically to validate successes (Management Plan, page 25) and has listed the project coordinator as accountable for such data collection, but no mention is made of where the data is going to be pulled from to measure this particular plan.

**Reader's Score:** 12

**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 clearly meets the competitive priority in that it has identified sixty one schools in need of improvement to participate as based on reports from the Florida Department of Education (Competitive Priority, page 3). The opportunity for widespread and multi-tiered improvement is present as the proposers of this grant have also met with nonpublic

administrators and have made an effort to expand its reach.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses have been identified in this proposal.

**Reader's Score:** 15

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

