

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2013 11:13 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U363A130097)

Reader #3: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Summary Statement | | |
| Summary Statement (Optional): | | |
| 1. Summary Statement: | 0 | |
| Sub Total | 0 | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Design | 45 | 45 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Eval | 15 | 15 |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 25 | 25 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Quality of Mgmt Plan | 15 | 15 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 100 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Invitational Priority 1 | | |
| Invitational Priority 1 | | |
| 1. Building Leadership | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Invitational Priority 2 | | |
| Invitational Priority 2 | | |
| 1. Moderate Evidence | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - SLP Review Panel - 8: 84.363A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U363A130097)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement (Optional):

1. General Comments:

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project design of the proposed project. In determining quality of the project design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1.) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2.) 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.
- (3.) 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.
- (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.

Strengths:

The Innovative School Leadership Initiative (ISLI) will expand on two prior California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) School Leadership grants. P.2 The comprehensive program design addresses high need schools that are increasing in number and are currently lead by teacher-leaders who lack principal experience. P.1 Program components will focus on improving leadership practices in 30 low performing charter or semi-autonomous high schools that rank in the bottom 10%-20% statewide. P. 4 Current leaders will be able to acquire certification and be provided mentors to expand and continue professional growth. P. 3

The applicant identifies three project goals and five related objectives and performance measures. The objectives are measurable and address the specific needs of the target charter and semi-autonomous schools. P. 5-6

The inclusive program design focuses on the specific needs of the target schools. A rigorous application process is delineated and includes assessments, school portfolios, essays and interviews/visits which will identify school leaders committed to the project. P. 9-10

Teacher and principal teams will focusing on elements that are grounded in research and best practices such as the Common Core State Standards, Adaptive Leadership, Smarter Balance Assessments and a new teacher evaluation system using a theory of change that will significantly impact student achievement and graduation rates. P. 6-8, 10-11

The comprehensive framework of ISLI provides efficient and effective strategies to address student achievement in low performing schools by providing new and valuable data on an alternative method for delivering school leadership training. P. 1-7

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project evaluation of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1.) 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.

(2.) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.

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

Strengths:

An in-depth process for measuring ISLI's objectives has been designed. For each of the five objectives a description of the quantitative and qualitative data and instruments that will be used to determine change is provided. Student outcomes, principal effectiveness, individual administrator growth and school climate measures are directly correlated with program objectives to measure program outputs and outcomes. P. 25-26, 28-31

The ISLI has developed a comprehensive plan to determine the effectiveness of the program components and strategies to measure effectiveness of the project. P. 26, 28-31 Qualitative measures including the use of observation, interview data, surveys, and inventories will help monitor program implementation and provided on-going feedback. P. 26 A matched comparison group will be used to draw out practices that show promise for replication. P. 26

On-going feedback will be collected to make adjustments or revisions in training, content, and support activities. A strong internal monitoring and continuous improvement cycle is embedded in the evaluation plan using implementation impact surveys, CSCI data, observations, and interviews. P. 27

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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 project design is an innovative method of addressing school leadership. P. 32 The project design will provide new data on recruiting aspiring leaders from within high need schools in urban areas and how training the principal and leadership team's changes school culture, classroom practices, and impacts student achievement. P. 32

The ISLI's framework is based on a theory of change and designed to address changes in school funding, governance, and school structure through incremental steps. Embedded in the system is a strong support system for principals and their leadership teams creating a strong instructional foundation and change in school culture. P. 35

The ISLI's unique model has the potential to initially impact 15,000 students in the target schools but will be closely monitored as a program to address turnaround high schools by LAUSD, the second largest school in the nation. P. 35-36 It will provide charter and semi-autonomous schools nationwide with an innovative model and school structure for improving teacher effectiveness and increasing student achievement. P. 35-36

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

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 the Secretary considers:**

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

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a comprehensive description of the program governance system using a Management Team Cabinet, Management council and ISLI National Advisory Board including the members, responsibilities, training, and meetings. P. 36-37 A detailed description of the project personnel including their qualifications and experience is presented and will provide the project with personnel who can implement and achieve the program objectives. P. 37-39 A timeline is delineated identifying the program activities and benchmarks, person responsible and timeframe which will ensure the program objectives are achieved within budget. P. 40

The ISLI's framework has embedded in it a continuous looping cycle of feedback and continuous improvement that will provide staff and governance with data to monitor progress toward achievement of the program objectives. A delineation of the process is provided and includes the benchmark, person responsible and timeframe. A strong process for monitoring program implementation and progress has been developed. P. 42-43

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

Invitational Priority 1 - Invitational Priority 1

- 1. Projects that implement professional development for current principals (including assistant principals), especially in schools that the State educational agency (SEA) has identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools, or in schools that the SEA has identified in accordance with its approved ESEA flexibility request as priority schools or focus schools to: (1) Help them master essential school leadership skills, such as evaluating and providing feedback to teachers, analyzing student data, developing school leadership teams, and creating a positive school environment; and (2) enable them to support instruction in their schools aligned to college- and career-ready standards.**

General:

The applicant successfully met this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority 2 - Invitational Priority 2

- 1. Projects that provide principal preparation, professional development, or both that are supported by moderate evidence of effectiveness.**

General:

The applicant did not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2013 11:13 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2013 11:34 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U363A130097)

Reader #2: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Summary Statement | | |
| Summary Statement (Optional): | | |
| 1. Summary Statement: | 0 | |
| Sub Total | 0 | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Design | 45 | 45 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Eval | 15 | 15 |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 25 | 25 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Quality of Mgmt Plan | 15 | 15 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 100 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Invitational Priority 1 | | |
| Invitational Priority 1 | | |
| 1. Building Leadership | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Invitational Priority 2 | | |
| Invitational Priority 2 | | |
| 1. Moderate Evidence | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - SLP Review Panel - 8: 84.363A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U363A130097)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement (Optional):

1. General Comments:

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project design of the proposed project. In determining quality of the project design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1.) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2.) 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.
- (3.) 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.
- (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.

Strengths:

The applicant provides strong evidence that the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. The goals and objectives are ambitious yet achievable (e19-e20); further, they envision a holistic approach of training principals and teacher-leaders to improve high school student performance in English and Language Arts, as well as Math, state test scores. The program's team-oriented approach ensures a broad level of stakeholder support. The stated objectives measure attendance, school climate, credentialing, retention, and principal participation rates, resulting in a 360 degree review of the program (e19-20).

The applicant provides strong evidence that the project is appropriately designed and will successfully address the needs of the target population. The targeted schools have high poverty rates and low academic performance; additionally, some of the schools' leaders may not have sufficient credentials or administrative experience to effect significant change (e20). Further, the rigorous application process will recruit school teams who are strongly invested in the outcome of their work (e23-24). The mix of web-based and book based instruction, mentoring, and classroom work will provide multiple methods for engaging principals (e32-34)

The applicant provides strong evidence that the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards. The Los Angeles United School District (LAUSD) has promoted pilot schools, partnership schools, and charter schools (e36). In 2013, the district will roll out new evaluation systems for principals, assistant principals, and teachers that are tied closely to student achievement (e22).

The applicant provides strong evidence that the proposed project's design and evaluation will support replication of activities or strategies, including evidence regarding the effectiveness of various strategies. The program design builds on

the applicant's two previous grant-funded successful programs (e16-17), and includes elements of multiple leader frameworks (e21), including those championed by the Gates Foundation. An annual conference will disseminate findings and replicable designs to other schools (e31), and leaders will share findings at national conferences (e37).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and no weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project evaluation of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1.) 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.

(2.) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides strong evidence that the proposed project's evaluation methods include objective performance measures clearly related to the project's intended outcomes and will produce qualitative and quantitative data. The impressive logic model and summary of evaluation activities (e42-45) suggest a well-organized understanding of the most critical elements of program success and how to measure that success, including credentialing, pre-and post-surveys, rating rubrics, and interviews. The analysis will include student achievement and school climate scores from a control group of schools (e38).

The applicant provides strong evidence that the proposed project's evaluation methods will examine the effectiveness of project implementation strategies. Survey, interview, and observation data, such as the amount of time spent discussing formative feedback, will form the basis for the analysis of implementation effectiveness (e40). The input of teachers, parents, and students will also be sought (e39-40).

The applicant provides strong evidence that the proposed project will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Annual spring conferences will offer school teams the opportunity to assess their progress and make recommendations to the project team (e31). Individual school results will be measured against those of a project-eligible but non-participating school to identify successes or areas needing improvement (e41).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and no weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 15

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 applicant provides strong evidence that the project will increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies. The project will offer contributions to scholarship regarding alternative school leadership training paths. Unlike traditional principal professional development programs, this proposed model will recruit leadership teams, including teachers, from within high-needs schools to affect student achievement and school culture (e46-47). The program's blend of web-based instruction with mentoring and other more traditional professional development activities will increase knowledge of new, hybrid methods of instruction (e46-48).

The applicant provides strong evidence of the likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. Elements of the proposed program design, including the conceptual framework, theory of change, and the instructional framework, are supported by significant research (e48-49) that emphasizes incremental, consistent, and persistent change.

The applicant provides strong evidence of the importance or magnitude of the results in helping improve teacher and student achievement. By targeting teams within low-performing skills, the project will directly support about 15,000 students. When the overall school district rolls out elements of the program, the program could support as many as 655,000 students (e49, e17).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and no weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 25

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 the Secretary considers:

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides strong evidence of the management plan's adequacy in achieving proposed objectives on time and within budget, as well as clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones. The management team includes personnel with strong backgrounds and experience in principal, teacher, and leader preparation, including administrative experience in public schools (e52-53), as well as experience with developing alternative educational models (eg., distance learning) (e53). The division of responsibility between the project co-directors is sound, with one overseeing administration and the other more focused on program content. (e52). The detailed timeline shows the interdependency among the various tasks and responsible parties (e54-56).

The applicant provides strong evidence of adequate procedures to ensure feedback and a continuous improvement

process. The proposal seems built on strong and ongoing communication and feedback: among principals, mentors, and school coordinators; between evaluators and the management team; and between the applicant and area educational institutions (e56). Another strength of the management plan is the Management Team Cabinet (e50-51, e56), which will meet weekly at the beginning of the project and review formative data at each meeting, including a larger meeting to discuss the overall findings and data every six months.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and no weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

Invitational Priority 1 - Invitational Priority 1

- 1. Projects that implement professional development for current principals (including assistant principals), especially in schools that the State educational agency (SEA) has identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools, or in schools that the SEA has identified in accordance with its approved ESEA flexibility request as priority schools or focus schools to: (1) Help them master essential school leadership skills, such as evaluating and providing feedback to teachers, analyzing student data, developing school leadership teams, and creating a positive school environment; and (2) enable them to support instruction in their schools aligned to college- and career-ready standards.**

General:

The applicant offers strong evidence of the project's ability to help principals master essential school leadership skills, including evaluation, analysis, development of school leadership teams, and creation of a positive school environment. While not specifically addressed in the application, the program design builds on the applicant's two previous grant-funded successful programs (e16-17), and includes elements of multiple educational leader frameworks (e21). The mix of traditional professional development, mentoring, and web-based instruction offers numerous avenues for educational enrichment.

The applicant offers strong evidence of the project's ability to enable principals to support college- and career-ready instruction in their schools. The applicant's work is aligned with that of the LA USD, the Common Core Standards, and numerous research-based paradigms (e48-49)

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority 2 - Invitational Priority 2

- 1. Projects that provide principal preparation, professional development, or both that are supported by moderate evidence of effectiveness.**

General:

Invitational Priority #2 was not addressed by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/12/2013 11:34 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/15/2013 10:50 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U363A130097)

Reader #1: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Summary Statement | | |
| Summary Statement (Optional): | | |
| 1. Summary Statement: | 0 | |
| Sub Total | 0 | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Design | 45 | 45 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Eval | 15 | 15 |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 25 | 25 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Quality of Mgmt Plan | 15 | 15 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 100 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Invitational Priority 1 | | |
| Invitational Priority 1 | | |
| 1. Building Leadership | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Invitational Priority 2 | | |
| Invitational Priority 2 | | |
| 1. Moderate Evidence | 0 | 0 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - SLP Review Panel - 8: 84.363A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: California State University, Dominguez Hills (U363A130097)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement (Optional):

1. General Comments:

General:

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project design of the proposed project. In determining quality of the project design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1.) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2.) 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.
- (3.) 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.
- (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.

Strengths:

The proposed project contains well-developed goals with corresponding objectives that correlate with School Leadership Program performance measures. The objectives are specified and measurable and clearly show how the goals will be measured (pages 5-6).

Needs for the proposed project are clearly identified, and the applicant's plan illustrates how they will be addressed with a basis in current educational research (pages 6-23).

The applicant's knowledge of program participants is evident throughout the project design, including understanding the "inevitable daily crises" principals encounter (page 7) and recognizing a hybrid design for professional development is preferred (page 12) and that "summer training has proven to be the most popular and effective" (page 16).

The detailed plan for the proposed project is comprehensive and well thought-out. It includes elements specific to those who will participate and will address the state's new educator evaluation requirements (pages 6-7).

The applicant included charts that clearly showed the correlation of project components, timeframes, participants, and expected results (pages 5-6).

Several key elements of the project can be replicated by similar schools (page 23).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project evaluation of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1.) 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.
- (2.) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.
- (3.) 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's evaluation includes quantitative and qualitative assessment measures and has a clear plan for how data will be used for performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. This will help ensure the project achieves optimal results and will be able to provide information for replication (pages 23-27).

The evaluation plan mirrors the objectives and performance indicators. The clear description of what will be measured, when it will be measured, and how the data will be analyzed will help the project fully measure the success of objectives (pages 29-31).

The applicant plans to use experienced evaluators with appropriate credentials (page 32). This will provide valuable information on project implementation and results.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 15

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:

Because the proposed project is a significant departure from traditional SLP projects, results of its implementation can guide future projects and research on training aspiring school leaders from high-need schools to become successful leaders within them (page 32).

The applicant demonstrated knowledge of applying current educational research and theory through its plan for implementation of alternative training, coaching, and distributed leadership with a long-term change model. This practical application of research will increase knowledge of critical issues in education and provide additional information for those

planning professional development for leaders of high-need schools (pages 32-33).

The proposed project is likely to result in system change or improvement, because it is based on current research in educational research and based on local needs common to other school districts (page 34-35).

The proposed project is likely to result in significant improvements in teaching and student achievement, because many students will be impacted directly and this model can be implemented at other sites (pages 35-36).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 25

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 the Secretary considers:

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

Strengths:

The proposed application includes a comprehensive plan for governance, including a Management Team Cabinet, Management Council, and ISLI Advisory Board. The regular meetings of the Management Team Cabinet will ensure the project stays on track and will allow for necessary modifications as it progresses. The plan for a Management Council shows the applicant's awareness of working with a larger school district and its expectation for clear communication and involvement of current leadership (pages 36-37).

Key personnel appear to be well-qualified and experienced in the area of training for school leadership (pages 37-39). Their responsibilities are well-defined.

The timeline provided illustrates a clear vision of the project with activities, timeframes, and responsible parties. It will help ensure the project progresses as expected (pages 40-41).

The applicant plans to continue tracking beyond the grant period, showing a commitment to this project (page 41).

The proposed project includes a well-defined plan for ensuring continuous improvement based on project data through it regular meetings and summer retreats of the Management Team Cabinet and Management Council as well as the planned mid-year review of formative data (pages 36-37, 42).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

Invitational Priority 1 - Invitational Priority 1

1. Projects that implement professional development for current principals (including assistant principals), especially in schools that the State educational agency (SEA) has identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools, or in schools that the SEA has identified in accordance with its

approved ESEA flexibility request as priority schools or focus schools to: (1) Help them master essential school leadership skills, such as evaluating and providing feedback to teachers, analyzing student data, developing school leadership teams, and creating a positive school environment; and (2) enable them to support instruction in their schools aligned to college- and career-ready standards.

General:

The proposed project includes a plan for professional development for current principals in low-performing schools.

Reader's Score: 0

Invitational Priority 2 - Invitational Priority 2

1. Projects that provide principal preparation, professional development, or both that are supported by moderate evidence of effectiveness.

General:

The applicant did not address this invitational priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/15/2013 10:50 AM