

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/26/2010 01:27 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** California State University, Dominguez Hills -- , (U363A100056)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. N/A	45	45
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. N/A	25	20
<b>Significance</b>		
1. N/A	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. N/A	10	9
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	94
<b>Total</b>	100	94

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - SLP Review Panel - 6: 84.363A

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

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills -- , (U363A100056)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of-
  1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
  2. The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.
  3. The extent to which the proposed project is apart of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
  4. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.
  5. The extent to which project participants are to be selected on the basis of academic excellence.

### Strengths:

The project has a good quality of design based on research and standards from several noted models of best practices on what charter and autonomous school leaders need to know to effectively turn around urban schools (e2, p2). Five major of charter and autonomous schools principals are addressed in the redesign of the credential programs (e9, p9). Sound conceptual framework for the proposal. Coherent time line project design well defined for the participants, administrative credential program and curriculum noted (e13-18, p13-18).

### Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 45

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers-
  1. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
  2. The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

**Strengths:**

The proposed project has a quality evaluative component to assess the intended outcomes WestED and Urban School Imagineers working as external evaluators. Components of the evaluation model in logical detailed format for understanding (e1, p34). Participants outcomes and student outcomes are clearly defined for success(e1, p34)

**Weaknesses:**

Limited information is provided for the rational of using two external evaluators for the proposed project (EO, p33).

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors-**
  1. **The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**
  2. **The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**
  3. **The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.**

**Strengths:**

The CASLA project will increase the leadership skill of charter and autonomous school leaders by creating a comprehensive training which does not exist in Los Angeles or California (e0, p40). The project will address leadership development gaps for the LEA for charter and autonomous schools. Sustained leadership noted which will have long term influence on the instructional practices for student and teachers (e4, p44).

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors-**
  1. **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.**
  2. **How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.**
  3. **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The management plan has a good governance structure between CSUDH and LUAUD. The management team cabinet will perform the daily operation of the project (e0, p45). The cabinet consist of six members to include the PI, three project co-director and director of the formative evaluation (EO,p45) . Roles responsibilities and timeframe established for each activity/ benchmark (e1, p46).

**Weaknesses:**

Limited information provided for feedback for all stakeholders (e6, e7,p51,p52).

**Reader's Score:**      **9**

---

**Status:**              Submitted

**Last Updated:**      05/26/2010 01:27 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/20/2010 07:24 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** California State University, Dominguez Hills -- , (U363A100056)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. N/A	45	40
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. N/A	25	23
<b>Significance</b>		
1. N/A	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. N/A	10	9
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	92
<b>Total</b>	100	92

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - SLP Review Panel - 6: 84.363A

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

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills -- , (U363A100056)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of-

1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

2. The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.

3. The extent to which the proposed project is apart of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

4. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

5. The extent to which project participants are to be selected on the basis of academic excellence.

### Strengths:

STRENGTHS: Strong research supports the proposal. (pages 7-9) The applicant and partners have existing relationships upon which to build. The applicant has a strong history of involvement in this area of staff improvement. (page 15) The project includes mentoring and coaching (page 12) coupled with a year-long field experience with projects and residences. (page 19) There is provision for follow-up with visits from coaches, walk through, and monthly meetings. (page 26)

### Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES: The discussion of curriculum development and implementation was unclear, specifically how it would affect coursework.

Reader's Score: 40

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers-

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

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

**Strengths:**

STRENGTHS: Strong specific benchmarks are tied to the outcomes. (pages 35+) Student data is included in the evaluation. (page 38)

**Weaknesses:**

WEAKNESSES: What instruments are to be utilized and how the data will be analyzed were vague. (pages 33,37) The rationale for two external evaluators wasn't totally convincing.

**Reader's Score: 23**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors-**
  1. **The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**
  2. **The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**
  3. **The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.**

**Strengths:**

STRENGTHS: This proposal explores a unique niche in school leadership and improvement. (pages 28-29, 40+) The project has a national component to it through existing and planned relationships and partnerships. (page 41)

**Weaknesses:**

NO WEAKNESSES NOTED

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors-**
  1. **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.**
  2. **How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.**
  3. **The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

STRENGTHS: There is provision for regular meetings of the leadership plus quarterly meetings with the external evaluator. (page 45) Staffing in the Management Team cabinet have appropriate background to lead this project. (pages 49-52) The application included a specific timeline with appropriate structures planned. (pages 46-48)

**Weaknesses:**

WEAKNESSES: Some costs, most specifically contractual costs, seemed excessive.

**Reader's Score:** 9

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 05/20/2010 07:24 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/19/2010 02:25 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** California State University, Dominguez Hills -- , (U363A100056)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. N/A	45	45
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. N/A	25	24
<b>Significance</b>		
1. N/A	20	20
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. N/A	10	6
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	95
<b>Total</b>	100	95

# Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - SLP Review Panel - 6: 84.363A

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

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills -- , (U363A100056)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of-

1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.

2. The extent to which the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of training in the field.

3. The extent to which the proposed project is apart of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

4. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

5. The extent to which project participants are to be selected on the basis of academic excellence.

### Strengths:

#### STRENGTHS:

California State University Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) proposes to develop the Charter and Autonomous School Leadership Academy (CASLA) an educational leadership program aimed toward the principals of charter and autonomous schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The two educational entities will partner in the effort. There is a great need for such training - there are approximately 250 charter schools and autonomous schools in LAUSD, with no training program for the specific needs of the principals of those schools. And research shows charter and autonomous school principals have limited school leadership training. CASLA will produce 130 highly trained principals over the five-year grant period.

CSUDH School of Education has administered previous grant-funded leadership programs directed primarily toward principals of traditional schools. That proposed academy will build on that experience. In addition, extensive research has been done to properly design CASLA to fit the needs of the leadership in the targeted systems.

The application presents a comprehensive, detailed plan of action for CASLA. The role of instructors, mentors and coaches are clearly described. Incentives are noted with convincing rationale. Timelines, activities and strategies are provided for each track of training.

There are at least 4 project elements that have potential for national replication: breaking down barriers, leadership standards, training model, and national assessment, all as apply to charter and autonomous schools.

A detailed recruitment, application and selection process will be used to assure the academic excellence of all participants

### Weaknesses:

#### WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 45**

#### **Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers-**

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

##### **STRENGTHS:**

Two external evaluation companies will assist in the evaluation process. Urban School Imagineers will provide formative evaluation services; WestEd will be responsible for summative activities and all other evaluation procedures. They will actually be intricately involved in many aspects of the project. The evaluation plan is aligned with the goals and objectives of the project - it is presented in detail.

#### **Weaknesses:**

##### **WEAKNESSES:**

The rationale for the need of two evaluation firms as external evaluators is not convincing.

**Reader's Score: 24**

#### **Selection Criteria - Significance**

**1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors-**

**1. The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

**2. The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.**

**3. The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.**

#### **Strengths:**

##### **STRENGTHS:**

The project offers a unique opportunity to principals and aspiring principals of charter schools. There is no other training specific to that population. Since such schools are coming into the fore, the model and its partnership developed here will

be of interest across the nation.

There are several strategies that are of special interest; the applicant highlights them in this sections as noted above (Program Design.)

Overall, this project should result in much improved leadership in the targeted schools, thus positively impacting teaching and student achievement.

**Weaknesses:**

WEAKNESSES:

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors-**

**1. 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.**

**2. How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.**

**3. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

STRENGTHS:

A very structured management plan is presented. A management team, responsible for day to day operation; a management council that advises on local needs' project planning and revision; a National Advisory Board that advises on national charter needs and trends and advises on the direction of the project.

A timeline is given in great detail with activities, benchmarks, responsible person, goals and timeframe.

The senior personnel are listed; summaries of their background are provided, with extensive CV's attached in the appendices. Their credentials are impressive.

Diversity of outlook is assured through the diversity of the senior personnel, the several oversight teams and the advisory board members.

**Weaknesses:**

WEAKNESSES:

The project seems top heavy in staffing. All the contractual line items are devoted to staffing in addition to the personnel

line item - a total of approximately \$800,000 a year in staffing - to train 130 students over a five year period. The rationale presented for the numerous consultants - especially the two external evaluation firms - are not convincing. The application does not indicate the creation of new courses - just modification of existing courses, which hardly necessitates the several curriculum specialists through the whole grant period (including the fifth year). The first year budget does not reflect the fact that there is little activity other than planning in that period.

**Reader's Score:** 6

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 05/19/2010 02:25 PM