

**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: Texas A&M University System (U363A080027)

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	38
B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)		
1. QUESTION 3	25	18
C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)		
1. QUESTION 4	20	18
D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 5	15	15
E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 6	15	15
Sub Total	115	104
Total	115	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel 3: 84.363A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Texas A&M University System (U363A080027)

Questions

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

The Texas A and M University System's (TAMUS) proposals is a strong well developed proposal that has creative approaches to developing high quality principals for high need districts in Texas. It uses technology to an advantage and at the end of the grant period expects to produce 845 aspiring principals. Seven TAMUS universities will work collaboratively with 39 high need LEAs. It has a clear management plan and an effective evaluation.]

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 strengths of the program are the collaboration with the LEAs, the use of technology, on-going support for novice principals, and the resources provided for them.

The proposal details the establishment of Project Leadership: Education and Development (LEAD), a principal preparation program for 845 aspiring principals, with seven universities in the Texas system and 39 High need LEAs. The component parts of Project LEAD are recruitment, training, and retention.

Recruitment, selection and training of candidates for Project LEAD will be done jointly by the universities and their partner LEAs. Candidates must be recommended by their superintendents and meet university requirements for admission. Coursework will be done in a "blended environment" consisting of face-to-face and online coursework, with the majority of the coursework delivered online. At the conclusion of 12 credits, the candidates will be eligible to fulfill assistant

principals' or principals' position (as per Texas certification standards). During the coursework, candidates will be required to participate in professional development conducted by the LEAs.

Each candidate will have an onsite mentor and a university mentor who will make periodic visits to LEAD members' schools. Additionally, the proposal describes on page 15 of the Project Narrative a website, PACT, which will have self-guided and facilitated support and resources for principals. The facilitated resources modules will have "hand selected" "ementors" who are experienced or retired principals. The website will have interactive capabilities. Training will be provided to mentors to ensure consistency and quality of the support. A website facilitator will be hired to manage the site and the ementors.

LEAD cohort members receive paid tuitions for which they must commit to serve at least three years.

Given the budget request is for \$3.6 million over a five year period to produce 875 potential principals, the proposal is cost effective.

Weaknesses:

The success of the project will be impacted by the ongoing support and collaboration among the universities and their LEAs. This will require nurturing, trust, feedback, and assessment of the relationship. The process of maintaining this relationship was not addressed in the proposal.

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 evaluation involves the use of internal and external evaluators. Performance measures are directly aligned with the project's goals and objectives on pages 8 through 11 in the Project Narrative.

The project evaluation provides for performance feedback periodically, thereby allowing for on-going assessment of goal attainment.

Appendix E (Table 6) gives in detail the GPRA (Government Performance and Results Act) Program Performance Measure and Indicators Plan for the evaluation. It is specific and well developed and ties performance indicators, program goals and objectives.

An evaluation logic model is outlined in Appendix F (Table 7) with outputs and outcomes.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation design does not give roles and functions of the internal evaluator or the external evaluator. Also, the criteria for the employment of the external evaluator are not provided. It is suggested that project disseminate and distribute among the LEAs and universities in the TAMUS the evaluation outcomes in the database.

Reader's Score: 18

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 strengths of the proposal's services are the PACT website which provides self guided and facilitated support, online courses, modules to assist principals in preparing for certification, and the ongoing professional development conducted by the universities and LEAs.

The services focus on preparation, certification, and placement. The course and professional development will include research and activities relevant to the principals' placement. Instructors will have expertise in Texas education administration. Courses will deal with topics concerning racial isolation, working in high poverty districts, and accountability.

As noted in the Project Design section, mentoring will be provided by an onsite experienced administrator, a university mentor, and ementors through the facilitated module of the PACT website. The strengths and weaknesses of the LEAD candidates can be assessed on an ongoing basis as a result of the mentoring they receive.

Weaknesses:

The variety of individuals involved in the mentoring must share their evaluations with each other and make certain that inconsistencies and conflicting information are not given to the LEAD cohort members. The process for the sharing and feedback should be structured and developmental.

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 Management Plan is detailed in Appendix C (Table 5). The goals and objectives are clearly aligned with activities, management stages, beginning and target dates, the responsible persons, measure types, and performance indicators. The plan is very well done.

A competent principal investigator is identified; his background and experience is appropriate. The project coordinator will be employed 100% of the time on this project.

Weaknesses:

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 information regarding how the proposal meets the Competitive Priority criteria is given on page 25 of the Project Narrative. Appendix A (Table 2) provides data on each of the individual districts with which the universities will be collaborating, including data on ethnic distribution, poverty, and teacher certification. The table provides important and useful data in designing, implementing, and evaluating the project.

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: Texas A&M University System (U363A080027)

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	37
B) Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 Points)		
1. QUESTION 3	25	19
C) Quality of Project Services (20 Points)		
1. QUESTION 4	20	19
D) Quality of Management Plan (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 5	15	15
E) Competitive Priority (15 Points)		
1. QUESTION 6	15	10
Sub Total	115	100
Total	115	100

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel 3: 84.363A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Texas A&M University System (U363A080027)

Questions

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Good application that should help the community.]

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.

Number of candidates by the end of the project is 845. This seems to be in line with the funding requested.

Weaknesses:

Concern: The ability to oversee/coordinate the project with 39 different LEA's and 845 candidates.

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:

Good piece.

Internal and external evaluators.

Retention an important component of the program.

Weaknesses:

Only semi-annual and annual reviews.

Reader's Score: 19

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:

Four stages of development along with the needs assessment for each participant.

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 19

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:

Good graphs and tables.

Very clear as to where they are and where they want to end up.

Weaknesses:

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:

Good use of working with LEAs.

Innovative strategies will be a strong part of the grant.

Working with "home grown" future principals will help make this grant work.

Weaknesses:

Needed more facts related to the plan.

Need to show why this project is needed in the area.

Tell us how many schools have a need for a strong effective leader based on the number of schools being served at this time.

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: Texas A&M University System (U363A080027)

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	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	104
Total	115	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel 3: 84.363A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Texas A&M University System (U363A080027)

Questions

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Overall Comments: Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

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 39 high-need local educational agencies.

Recruitment, induction and retention strategies are built into the Texas A&M University System (TAMUS) Leadership Education and Development (LEAD) initiative.

The proposed project offers both face-to-face mentoring and electronic

mentoring (ementoring).

Coursework is delivered in a "blended" environment, both online and face-to-face, with the majority delivered online.

Weaknesses:

Proposal lacks specificity in project design to the extent that there is ambiguity as to whether the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address the needs of the target population (i.e., course work, criteria for selecting mentor principals).

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

External and internal evaluators are used to provide performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress toward achieving project goals and objectives.

Dissemination plan will provide performance feedback to various constituents and stakeholders.

Weaknesses:

The project design lacks specificity as to how varying aspects of the program will be carried out; leaving ambiguity in the assessment of progress towards achieving intended outcomes.

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 needs assessment provided by the proposed project will allow the applicant to better discern needs of the intended recipients

The "LEAD mentoring" graphic, on page 19, is effective in helping the reader visualize the extent to which services provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration for improvement and achievement among recipients of those services.

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

Professional development services 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:

Proposed project services do not explicitly outline how services to be provided by the proposed project are appropriate to the needs of the intended recipients of those services

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:

Strong collaborative team

Weaknesses:

The proposed management plan does not thoroughly and explicitly address, objectives/milestones, timelines, benchmarks, actions and individuals responsible for achieving project goals and objectives.

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:

Proposal contains an explicit statement with supporting statistical data

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

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

