

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2013 03:56 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Foundation for Educational Administration (U363A130055)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement (Optional):</b>		
1. Summary Statement:	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	45
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Quality of Project Eval	15	13
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority 1</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority 1</b>		
1. Building Leadership	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Invitational Priority 2</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority 2</b>		
1. Moderate Evidence	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SLP Review Panel - 2: 84.363A

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

Applicant: Foundation for Educational Administration (U363A130055)

## 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 clearly demonstrates how the project is based upon a framework of up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. The project will incorporate leadership preparation strategies identified in the research as being successful, including NJEXCEL, Rising Stars, The School Improvement Framework, New Jersey Leaders to Leaders, the School Administration Manager (SAM) Innovation Project, and Customized Professional Development. In addition, program participants will take part in professional development and mentoring activities during the summer and throughout the school year that align with the New Jersey's Common Core Content Standards (NJCCCS), the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and NJ's Turnaround Principles for Priority and Focus Schools (page 2). The project design has clearly articulated the goal and objectives for the proposed project. The applicant seeks to promote student growth in three high-need districts in New Jersey by recruiting, preparing, and retaining principals and assistant principals who have the core knowledge, leadership skills, and support required to develop high-performing schools (page 5). For example, the New Jersey Leaders to Leaders Program is a two-year induction model, which will provide newly hired principals with mentorship. This will likely provide much needed support to increase the likelihood of retaining effective principals. Measurable outcomes have been aligned to each objective. Case in point, 80 teacher leaders and supervisors will achieve principal certification through the NJEXCEL over the five-year grant period through the applicant's targeting teacher leaders for participation in the proposed program (page 7). The applicant has established a partnership with several entities, which include the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association (NJPSA), American Institutes for Research (AIR), the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce Foundation/Rutgers University, and the school districts of Trenton, Millville and Bridgeton (pages 13-14). The applicant has outlined the partners key roles in the proposed project.

Letters of support have been included in the appendix.

The applicant provides a clear rationale as to how the targeted population was chosen. The three school districts in New Jersey were selected based on both their profiles as representative high-need districts in New Jersey and their commitment to serve as prototypes for developing effective research-based strategies and program models with the potential to improve student achievement through effective school leadership (page 15). Each LEA has a number of schools that qualify as Priority or Focus schools and a high attrition rate. The proposed project aims to: 1) increase the size, quality, and diversity of the aspiring principal candidate pool; 2) provide LEAs with a research-based system for candidate recruitment and vetting; 3) provide a comprehensive research-based induction program for newly hired principals and assistant principals; and 4) provide quality professional development to current educational leaders through the FEA School Improvement Framework (pages 21, 23). Using the criteria provided, the applicant has clearly chosen participants that appear to have an urgent need to recruit, prepare and retain highly effective administrators, thus demonstrating the strong need for successful implementation of the proposed project.

The proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. This is evidenced by the program participants taking part in professional development and mentoring activities during the summer and school year that align with the New Jersey's Common Core Content Standards (NJCCCS), the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and NJ's Turnaround Principles for Priority and Focus School. In addition, the applicant will offer a continuum of six interrelated research-based strategies to assist principals, assistant principals, candidates for school leadership, and teacher leaders in mastering school leadership skills, specifically skills needed for principals to become transformational instructional leaders (page 2). The applicant will assist partner LEAs in developing the infrastructure and institutional capacity to implement the project, sustain strategies and programs that will effectively address the districts' range of needs, and turn around their lowest performing schools (page 25).

The applicant has provided a basic outline for replication. The applicant will work with an external evaluator to develop benchmarks for implementing all program components. The applicant will monitor the benchmarks informally and formally at regular intervals which will aid in determining project revisions as well as replication efforts. Partner LEAs will include project strategies in district strategic plans and school improvement plans in an effort to influence organizational structures, staff responsibilities, policies and procedures (page 29). This process will likely contribute to the ability of the partner districts to serve as models for other districts.

**Weaknesses:**

We discussed this selection criterion, and I do not believe any weaknesses are warranted.

**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 will employ a mixed methods evaluation that will adequately measure the program's effectiveness in achieving its objectives (page 30). An external evaluator identified for the project will design and implement a multi-year evaluation plan, which will include formative and summative assessments. Additionally, multiple data sources and techniques are described that will produce both quantitative and qualitative data on the project. A clearly defined logic model for leadership development and evaluation are outlined to highlight inputs, processes, short-term outcomes, and long-term outcomes (page 37).

The applicant has clearly described the evaluation methods that will be utilized to determine the project's effectiveness. The applicant will collect baseline data for each of the program components which will be compared to data collected quarterly and annually. The evaluation team will work with each district to determine the program benchmarks. By holding regularly scheduled meetings with the leadership team, the applicant will likely be able to verify progress towards benchmarks and verify that objectives are being met with their intended outcomes (page 34).

The applicant provides a broad description of the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The applicant will assist school and district level leaders in the structuring their inquiry routines for continuous data examination on the health of each school community (page 35).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant states that it will utilize an action research model to ensure feedback and continuous improvement in project operations. Based upon the description given, it is difficult to determine if the evaluation outcomes will be used to inform continuous improvement.

**Reader's Score:** 13

**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 adequately describes how the project will contribute to increased knowledge and understanding. The project will provide information about how each of the six strategies' individual and combined contributions will likely aid in the development of participants' capacity to turn around high-need schools and improve student achievement. The elements of the program will focus on instructional leadership and high needs districts and the effective use of data and technology (pages 39-41).

The successful implementation of the proposed project will likely result in changing and improving the educational system in various ways, including supporting high-need districts, strategic planning, school leader preparation, building institutional capacity, and sustainability (pages 41-43). For example, support for high-need districts will be accomplished by collaboratively developing and implementing programs and services that both include accepted best practices in educational leadership development and are customized to meet the diverse needs of the partnering urban and rural high-need LEAs.

The applicant presents a sufficient description of how the outcomes of the project are important to improvements in teaching and student achievement. The project will likely result in improving principals' abilities to lead the turnaround efforts, establish school climates conducive to learning, utilize research-based effective instruction to meet the needs of all students, and use data to drive instruction.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 outlines a sufficient staff management structure and plan to effectively guide the implementation and operation of the project. Staff members identified to work on the project are qualified and experienced and will include a project director, a SLP Coordinator, a Curriculum Developer, an Evaluator and other contracted personnel (pages 46-47). Time commitments and responsibilities of key project personnel are appropriate for meeting project goals and objectives within specified timelines. The management plan provides a clear alignment of major project activities, a timeline and person(s) responsible.

The applicant provides adequate feedback to ensure improvement in the operation of the proposed plan. Each month, members of the leadership team and stakeholders at each LEA will meet to review program administration and adherence to project benchmarks, to ensure access to and collection of all necessary data, and to make program modifications (page 34). The evaluation team will be active participants in the monthly team meeting. This will allow the programs to be tailored to each district's needs.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 did respond to the invitational 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 respond to the invitational priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/14/2013 03:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/08/2013 05:56 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Foundation for Educational Administration (U363A130055)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement (Optional):</b>		
1. Summary Statement:	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	44
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Quality of Project Eval	15	13
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority 1</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority 1</b>		
1. Building Leadership	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Invitational Priority 2</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority 2</b>		
1. Moderate Evidence	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>97</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SLP Review Panel - 2: 84.363A

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

Applicant: Foundation for Educational Administration (U363A130055)

## 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:

- This project approaches the problem of ineffective (or even lacking) principals using a multi-pronged and comprehensive approach (assessing those who have strong potential, providing them a pathway to licensure, providing mentoring once on the job, and then providing systems (SAM) so that new leaders can focus on instructional leadership).
- The target districts are some of the highest need in the state and can benefit from the multiple partnerships that if attempted on their own may not be possible.
- The plan also intends on full participation from all leaders (in some degree) in the three districts. As a result, it is more likely that there can be a culture shift and systemic change.
- Each of the elements coordinated has been established and implemented previously (some nationally recognized). The current project will benefit from lessons learned prior to this implementation.
- Specific examples of training components are included that should promote higher student learning and support the principals' focus on instructional leadership. Examples (p. 27) include "story and metaphor," "apply visual learning strategies," "unpacking grade level standards," etc.
- With the central nonprofit organization of FEA coordinating the efforts of all six components, it is more likely they will be able to continue this work in the future with additional districts.
- There is intent to provide professional development that includes both the principal and teacher leaders (p. 3). By including both, it is more likely that school-level change can happen when multiple stakeholders are involved.

**Weaknesses:**

- In outcome 3 (p. 8), it is unclear when the principals should be rated as “effective” or “highly effective.” Directly below that, it is unclear if any positive change is acceptable. The same comment is true for outcome 4 on page 9.
- There is some concern to managing such a large number and variety of programs effectively.

**Reader's Score: 44**

**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:**

- Including the evaluation team in the monthly meetings with the LEAs during the planning phase will help ensure that the data collected is reasonable based on what is available, identify any potential gaps, and tailored to the needs of the districts. This will also help to foster positive relationships that will be in place for the next five years.
- The annual summative evaluations also include a focus on replication in other LEAs. By doing this annually rather than at the end of the grant period, it is more likely the information will be comprehensive and useable for other LEAs.
- There is a plan for establishing baseline data, program benchmarks, reporting progress, and ongoing assessment of implementation. This will be helpful to have these specific data points documented especially when sharing with other LEAs in addition to providing a comprehensive story of what was achieved.

**Weaknesses:**

- The actual quantitative and qualitative methodologies are not described. Because the project will have an external evaluator, there will be expertise in appropriate methodologies but some additional description would have been helpful.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**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 has described a plan to both share information (p. 38), and use technology to share information real-time (p. 39) with participants. It will also focus on sharing how each element's "individual and combined contributions" affected these districts. This is important as some other LEAs may benefit from one, some, or all of these elements.
- By continuing to strengthen these multiple partnerships, it is likely that further change can happen for these districts as well as promoting change state-wide or higher.
- The application has made a thoughtful effort in terms of sustainability (p. 43) in designing program elements that will not continue to rely on external funding. This is also important in terms of sharing with other LEAs who may not have the benefit of grant funding.
- This project will continue to build on previous SLP efforts that will help promote the possibility of supporting even more LEAs in the future. These are statewide organizations with developed infrastructures and processes.
- The comprehensive design that targets multiple areas in the process of building leadership capacity can have a direct impact on student learning, especially with the elements that help to shift the principal's role as building manager to instructional leader.

**Weaknesses:**

- No real weaknesses.

**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:**

- Project director has already been identified and has appropriate experience and credentials, including prior experience with large federal grants (including the previous SLP grant) as well as experience as a teacher and principal in large urban districts.
- The remaining team members also have prior experience in these elements as well as working specifically within FEA.
- Budget is detailed and comprehensive. It was unclear in the application until this point that participants would get tuition reimbursement. This alone should generate excitement and buy-in from participants, especially for those where cost was a barrier previously.

**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 applicant did respond to the invitational 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 respond to the invitational priority (i.e., they claim they did); however, the application content did not speak to "moderate evidence".

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/08/2013 05:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/08/2013 09:45 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Foundation for Educational Administration (U363A130055)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement (Optional):</b>		
1. Summary Statement:	0	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	45	45
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Quality of Project Eval	15	14
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	25	25
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority 1</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority 1</b>		
1. Building Leadership	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Invitational Priority 2</b>		
<b>Invitational Priority 2</b>		
1. Moderate Evidence	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>99</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - SLP Review Panel - 2: 84.363A

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

Applicant: Foundation for Educational Administration (U363A130055)

## 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 has designed a comprehensive project that incorporates six research-based strategies and programs into a cohesive plan to improve principal recruitment, preparation, retention, and continued professional learning and ultimately lead to increased student achievement (pg. 6). In particular, the customized professional development will be designed to meet not only districts' needs but also those of individual schools (pg. 9). Inclusion of the National School Administration Manager (SAM) process is a robust tool that will help principals allocate more time to instructional leadership and less time to routine administrative tasks (pg. 12), which will ultimately lead to improved teacher and student performance. The three school districts are designated as "special needs" due to their inability to close achievement gaps. Two districts are located in the poorest county in the state, a county in which 31.4% of residents do not possess a high school diploma. The applicant successfully demonstrates that the project will address the areas' needs, including a pro-active and positive approach to principal recruitment and clear focus on developing instructional leadership (pgs. 19-24). Progress toward benchmarks will be monitored informally each month, formally each quarter, and at year's end; this information will be readily available and usable for program revision and potential replication (pg. 29).

##### Weaknesses:

Our panel has discussed this selection criterion, and I feel that no weaknesses are warranted.

### 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 project evaluation will involve a first-year planning phase and a four-year focus on program objectives and outcomes (pg. 30). The evaluation team and leadership teams will work together to establish relevant baseline data, which is a fair and reasonable process. Progress toward five performance measures will be assessed after collecting program participation and student achievement data (pg. 31). Additional data from surveys, focus groups, observations, and teacher and principal effectiveness instruments will be reviewed to determine progress toward objectives (pg. 33). The applicant indicates that feedback will be given on an ongoing basis, which will help to identify successful strategies, areas for improvement, and potential components for replication (pg. 35).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to sufficiently describe the data analysis techniques involved for determining level of school climate, improvement in school performance, and student growth. Since data from numerous measures will be used in the evaluation, knowing the methodology approach would have been informative.

### 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 has proposed a solid project that will contribute to increased knowledge and result in improvement. The applicant reports that this program is the only non-traditional educational leader certification state program approved by the New Jersey Department of Education (pgs. 3-4). Several pieces of the project, including use of technology, focus on high-need districts, and effective use of data, will be transformative and result in sustainable outcomes. The evaluation is another important component that will be used to illustrate the program's successes via multiple sources of publication (pg. 38). The districts have recognized that their policies and organizational structure need to be revised in order to enact change, and thus will work collaboratively with project staff; this openness and willingness will enable positive systemic

change (pg. 40).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 presents a satisfactory management plan. The full-time project director has appropriate responsibilities which include providing program leadership, supervision, and fiscal oversight. The half-time program coordinator will be responsible for participant recruitment and mentor/coach assignments but will also manage some program components (pgs. 46 and e105). A sliding scale for time commitment is designed for the curriculum developer, which is very reasonable, considering the bulk of developing training materials will occur during the first few years (pgs. 46 and e105). A technology coordinator (.50 FTE) and administrative assistant (.60 FTE) round out the project team. The project timeline clearly details the milestones, time frame, and personnel responsibility for completion (pgs. 48-50).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 did respond to the invitational 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 respond to the invitational priority.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/08/2013 09:45 AM