

**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: Terrebonne Parish School District (U363A080107)

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	12
E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 6	15	15
Sub Total	115	105
Total	115	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel 9: 84.363A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Terrebonne Parish School District (U363A080107)

Questions

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This project makes good use of established partners, understands the local context in which this project exists and builds upon current initiatives.]

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 goals and objectives are nicely laid out. The project addresses the administrators of highest need schools first and the resulting tiered approach to allocation of resources is a strong feature of this proposal. Support strategies of principals in the program will also heighten project success.

Weaknesses:

Two year retention goals do not support significant change. There is little information regarding the current retention issues and so, it is difficult to determine the success of recruitment and outreach strategies.

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 methods of evaluation and data collection are strong. Program Logic Model and the Performance and Evaluation Measures are good components.

Weaknesses:

Would like to see more detailed information surrounding performance feedback in order to determine the strength of this feature.

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 partners are extremely strong and includes very good use of resources. The narrative fully addresses the criteria.

Weaknesses:

None 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 details of the timeline are clearly laid out in Chart 7. The adequacy of the feedback mechanisms is clearly communicated in Chart 9. The fact that the relationships between the partners has already been established in past projects, strengthens the overall management plan.

Weaknesses:

The narrative of this section is too brief to fully understand the adequacy of the management plan. The FTE of the project coordinator does not seem sufficient. Chart 8 is confusing and asterisks do not lead to additional comments.

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:

Clearly laid out and in place. The additional narrative regarding the mental health of administrators is an important extenuating circumstance.

Weaknesses:

None 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: Terrebonne Parish School District (U363A080107)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		
1. QUESTION 1	0	
Sub Total	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	24
C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)		
1. QUESTION 4	20	18
D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 5	15	12
E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 6	15	15
Sub Total	115	107
Total	115	107

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel 9: 84.363A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Terrebonne Parish School District (U363A080107)

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:

Identifying the areas of weakness and putting forth a comprehensive project design tied into the indicators of these weaknesses to directly address each need is a strength of this program(p.6).

Weaknesses:

More detailed information about the mentor component of this design is encouraged. Specifically, how will the mentors be chosen and what will this relationship look like and what kind of support will it provide for the candidates.

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 use of an outside team of evaluators and the clear description of the methods to be used is a strength of this program evaluation plan(p.11).

The monthly progress reports and the annual reports used as a means of performance feedback are clearly defined.

Weaknesses:

Describing how the information from the monthly progress reports and annual reports will be disseminated to project stakeholders and then used to drive continual improvement is encouraged.

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:

The collaborative nature of this program with the phased approach to delivery of project services is a strength. The services to be provided to all schools through the life of the grant is laid out(p.18). This approach begins with the poorest performing schools and makes the longest commitment of support then to those schools most in need.

Weaknesses:

Providing more details about what the on-site mentoring component of your program looks like and will be implemented is encouraged.

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 roles and responsibilities of the project personnel as well as the projected timeline for meeting the proposed benchmarks are clearly defined(chart7-p.21).

Weaknesses:

The project coordinator is listed at an estimated FTE of 20% and a concern arises that this position might require more of a time commitment. In addition, demonstrating more of a time commitment from district personnel to go alongside the two outside teams on this project is encouraged. It feels like oversight of this is left to outside teams.

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 competitive priority of this project is clearly addressed and described in project narrative.

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: Terrebonne Parish School District (U363A080107)

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	39
B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)		
1. QUESTION 3	25	22
C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)		
1. QUESTION 4	20	20
D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 5	15	12
E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 6	15	15
Sub Total	115	108
Total	115	108

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Panel 9: 84.363A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Terrebonne Parish School District (U363A080107)

Questions

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

A very comprehensive application with clear rationales for the project and project details.]

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 goals, performance measures and expected outcomes are clearly described. Clear headings and subheadings are provided clarity throughout. The need for the program is clearly articulated.

Weaknesses:

More details on the Performance and Leadership Development Specialists and how they are selected would be helpful to have been included.

Reader's Score: 39

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 data collection process is comprehensive and well-defined.

Weaknesses:

More elaboration on the role the feedback will play in monitoring and adjusting services would have resulted in a perfect score.

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:

The narrative provides clear delineation of the target audience and benefits of the project to participants. Services are clearly aligned to goals and objectives.

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:

The management program is clearly described.

Weaknesses:

Chart 7 is a little cramped and difficult to read. 20% of the coordinators' time seems insufficient for the magnitude of the grant.

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 schools involved are clearly in need of improvement and the project is designed to address the challenges of said school.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

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