

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2013 04:01 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement, Inc. (U363A130124)

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	14
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	15	15
Sub Total	100	99
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	99

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement, Inc. (U363A130124)

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 is a partnership between the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) and the Carroll County School System (CCSS). The proposed project is designed to recruit and develop a cadre of effective principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders to increase student achievement of rural high school students (page 2). The project design has clearly articulated the goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes for the proposed project. Many of the outcomes have a direct link to student learning. For example, 100% of school wide performance goals are met for Algebra, Math II, and 9th Grade Literature EOCTs, graduation rates, dual enrollment rates, and AP enrollment rates by end of Year 5 (page 5).

The project design clearly has identified the issues facing the school district. The applicant notes that 25% percent of the high school students fail to earn a high school diploma within 5 years, too few students are enrolled in higher level coursework, and many students are not college or career ready upon graduation (page 2). The academic issues will most likely have lifelong impacts upon these students. The applicant believes that building leadership capacity of the high school principals can have a likely impact on the learning environment of these schools. In order to improve student outcomes, the applicant has outlined the following strategies to develop effective leaders: provide a rigorous evaluation and selection of leaders participating in leadership development activities; incorporate a blended model of professional learning; provide technical assistance for district leaders to refine school leadership competency models, performance evaluations and feedback with the Leader Keys Effectiveness System (LKES); and provide incentive compensation for principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders to retain and reward participating leaders (page 9). The applicant

describes how the project is connected to the district superintendent's vision of transformed high schools that are structured to dramatically improve performance in student achievement as defined in the district improvement plan (page 23).

The applicant clearly outlines how it will provide appropriate results for replication. Key personnel will use an online, shared project plan and create a "scrapbook" to capture project artifacts. Key project personnel will participate in a progress call, and meeting notes will be disseminated and documented in the project scrapbook following the meeting (page 25). Replication of this project will be probable if they use the scrapbook to review the day to day operations, success, and barriers.

Weaknesses:

We have discussed the weaknesses in this section. I feel the weaknesses discussed do not warrant a point deduction.

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 clearly outlines the evaluation process that will measure the program's effectiveness in achieving its objectives. An independent evaluation organization will conduct the evaluation of the proposed project. The evaluation will examine the applicant's ability to fulfill the intended goals and fidelity of project implementation. In addition, the evaluator will provide the applicant with formative feedback to assist with determining the need for program modification (pages 25-26). The logic model provided clearly outlines the activities, outputs, anticipated outcomes and potential impact of the project (page e44). A clear and appropriate description of the evaluation of the overarching goals by aligning intended outcomes, performance measures, data collection and analysis methods is provided.

The applicant provides a clear explanation of the evaluation methods to be used to determine project effectiveness. The charts provided outline the key questions and methods used to determine the effectiveness of the project implementation strategies. For example, in order to determine the extent to which the project is producing outputs identified in the logic model, the evaluator will use descriptive statistics to review the attendance records and coaching logs in order to determine the number of participants and coaching hours to ensure one-on-one coaching was delivered as planned (page 30).

The applicant presents an appropriate description of how the project will ensure feedback and permit periodic assessment. The evaluator will develop dashboard data and generate reports on a quarterly basis. By providing feedback to the program staff frequently, the applicant should be able to make modifications to the program as necessary.

Weaknesses:

The applicant repeats the intended outcomes, performance measures, data collection methods and analysis for evaluation goals two and three (pages 28-29). The intended outcomes, performance measures, data collection methods and analysis should be different for aspiring principals and current principals.

Reader's Score: 14

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 potential of the proposed project to provide contributions to the understanding of educational issues and effective strategies is highly likely. The project may produce a new understanding about developing school and district leadership in high schools and rural districts that may be deemed substantial since high schools and rural areas tend to be challenging when trying to affect positive change (page e15). More importantly, the proposed project focuses particularly on preparing students for success after high school which will be measured by students earning degrees.

The proposed project is likely to result in system change. The program is designed to prepare and retain a cadre of effective high school principals, as well as a system for preparing a pool of ready leaders that will have a strong likelihood of being able to step into leadership vacancies (page 22). In an effort to produce this cadre of effective leadership, the applicant is changing from the traditional programs that call for individuals to participate in isolation to having them participate in the mini-academies and coach-facilitated group processes (page 37). This change is likely to promote more meaningful growth in leadership skills.

The applicant presents a sufficient description of how the outcomes of the project are important to teaching and learning. The project has been designed to ensure that participants have the knowledge and skills which research show will result in greater student achievement. More importantly, the positive impact of this program will have far reaching effects on the community as students will be able to graduate and become gainfully employed or continue on to earning a postsecondary degree.

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 management plan clearly identifies the key personnel responsible for ensuring that the proposed project is implemented with fidelity. Key personnel include a project director, project manager, Director of District Leader Development and Technical Assistance, Executive Liaison for the project, and Director of Management Consulting Research. The key personnel appear to be qualified to complete the responsibilities of the proposed project. The management plan provides a chart that clearly illustrates milestones, a timeframe, and person(s) responsible (pages 47-48).

The applicant has provided adequate details regarding its plan to ensure feedback and continuous improvement of the proposed project. The external evaluator will ensure feedback through quarterly progress meetings, monthly all staff progress calls, and a data dashboard (tracking project outcomes by goal and objective). In addition, the Executive Liaison will complete one-on-one calls with the superintendent as a mechanism for sharing any confidential or sensitive concerns about the project, and the work quality of the applicant (pages 51-52).

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.

The proposed project is aimed at improving student outcomes through development of strong school and district leaders. The three goals include: improving the effectiveness of current high school principals and assistant principals in leading change and school improvement; identifying and developing a pipeline of strong aspiring leaders equipped to successfully lead innovative high school designs; and creating district conditions that retain and grow effective high school leaders.

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 respond to the invitational priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2013 04:01 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/08/2013 05:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement, Inc. (U363A130124)

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	44
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Quality of Project Eval	15	14
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	15	15
Sub Total	100	98
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	98

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement, Inc. (U363A130124)

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:

- Performance measure 1 (p. 4) is detailed and focused on student achievement. The data also includes the percent change from current numbers. Goal 1 and objectives (p. 5) are specific and also linked to student performance outcomes.
- Goal 3 has specific performance outcomes including a means to remove ineffective leaders (p. 7).
- Particular elements for selection (p. 9-10) should provide a fair and less biased selection as well as protecting confidentiality (and maintain positive relationships within a school); an outside organization will oversee the process.
- The intent is to involve all current leaders in the program (p. 10). This is more likely to provide system change with 100% involvement. Furthermore, this process will begin with an evaluation to determine baselines and needs.
- The mini-academies combined with the on-site coaching should be helpful in direct application of the information as well as applying the information to the unique situations of the school. While the seminars are short in duration, this is an ongoing program.
- This project also recognizes the need for district leaders to be effective in their support of and evaluation of school leaders and as such, provides training and mechanisms to help them be successful. Their participation also reflects buy-in to the project and creates a common language.
- Existence of an evaluation plan and incorporation of a "scrapbook" are intentional plans to provide real-time and comprehensive information that will be helpful when sharing information with other districts (p. 25).

Weaknesses:

- Performance measure 2 (p. 4) does not give a measurable outcome.
- For Goal 2 (p. 6), it is unclear if any increase is acceptable or if there is a number of “cadre” they are working towards. It is also not clear how an “aspiring leader” will make these changes within the entire school (rather than their own performance in the classroom if they are still a teacher).
- Incentives can be powerful; however, it is unclear how these will be maintained after the grant funding ends.

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:

- The evaluation plan includes a detailed logic model, and summative outcomes are linked to specific measures, data collection methods, and analysis. It also seems most assessment measures are already established and implemented.
- The formative evaluation plan is also detailed where outcomes, performance measures, data collection, and analysis are specified for each activity within the logic model. There is an intention to use this information in developing the replication guide.
- The data dashboard should provide useful real-time information; however, the effectiveness of this tool would be directly linked to a participant's willingness to use it.

Weaknesses:

- It seems that the information on Evaluation Question 3 has been copied from the row above. The information does not match the question (p. 28 – 29) or what was provided in the logic model (p. e44).

Reader's Score: 14

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:

- With the detailed plan, project design, and replication efforts, it is likely that the project will be able to contribute to the knowledge about effective practices, especially within a rural setting.
- The partnership of the two organizations, the previous success and experiences of GLISI, the buy-in from the district leadership, and the focus on specific student and leadership outcomes should provide strong opportunities for system change within this district. Furthermore, the plan has specifically designed processes to create opportunities for replication.
- The specific student outcomes reflect the emphasis on college readiness (e.g., AP courses and scores) which will further promote positive change for students beyond high school.

Weaknesses:

No major 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:

- All of the major partners have extensive experience, and the organizations have an established infrastructure.
- Timeline is tied to individual goals and objectives.
- There are specific processes designed for or already developed to help with sharing project information with participants and stakeholders.
- Budget is detailed and each category is broken down to the smallest components. Furthermore, the budget reflects thoughtful planning as shown in considering copyright costs and hiring substitutes.

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 not respond to the invitational priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/08/2013 05:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/08/2013 09:48 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement, Inc. (U363A130124)

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	14
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	15	15
Sub Total	100	99
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	99

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement, Inc. (U363A130124)

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 describes a well-developed project design. The three central goals of the project are to improve principal effectiveness, identify aspiring leaders, and create district conditions conducive to retaining and growing effective leaders. The applicant clearly identifies and describes the objectives and measurable outcomes associated with each project goal (pgs. 5-7). The project features two specific summative performance measures which focus on improved student academic performance and effective leadership (pg. 4). Project staff will implement four strategies which are participant selection, professional learning, technical assistance, and incentive compensation (pg. 9). All 13 current administrators at the five high schools will participate (pg. 10). The aspiring leader selection process is thorough and involves district leader endorsement and invitation, written application, and panel interview (pgs. 9-10); one to three leaders per school will be selected. Retired educators with experience as successful principals and central office leaders will serve as coaches (pg. 13-14). The project proposes a blended coaching model which includes classroom-based instruction, authentic practice, guided reflection with a coach, and team-based training (pg. 11). This all-inclusive strategy, which fuses content, hands-on practice, and feedback, is an excellent approach to develop and enhance leadership skills. Data dashboards will be created to integrate data and predictive indicators which will be used to produce relevant reports for principals and school leadership teams (pg. 17). An appropriate compensation plan for participants will be based on school and district goals (pgs. 18-19). The project design will satisfactorily result in solid information to be used in future replication (pgs. 24-25).

Weaknesses:

Our panel has discussed this selection criterion, and I feel that no 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 presents an evaluation plan which will provide informative on implementation, summative, and formative feedback. An independent evaluation firm is responsible for carrying out the evaluation (pg. 42). A logic model clearly describes the activities and expected outputs, outcomes, and impact (pg. e44). Reasonable measures, data collection procedures, and data analysis methods are indicated for most of the project outcomes. The plan features an online "scrapbook" which is an excellent way to display the day-to-day operations of the project. This replication guide will incorporate program documents, staff interview responses, and logic model gap analysis findings (pg. 29). Appropriate qualitative data will be collected including responses from post-session feedback surveys, online coaching rating surveys, principal working conditions surveys, interviews, and focus groups (pgs. 30-34).

Weaknesses:

The plan fails to accurately state the performance measures, data collection method, and data analysis for use in evaluating the district conditions for retaining and growing effective high schools leaders (pgs. 28-29). Appropriate and relevant information, such as qualitative data and description of the incentives, was not presented and would have completed the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 14

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 reasonably describes their high-needs situation. Principal turnover is high in that the five high schools had an average of 2.4 principals in the past five years (pg. 21). This rural school district has also experienced severe personnel cuts at the school and central office level. Although the district's high schools have persistently resisted change, a new superintendent has recently established a performance evaluation plan that is building relationships and trust throughout the district (pg. 39). The project is designed for both individual and system capacity (pg. 37). The group leadership activities are developed so that instructional leadership responsibilities are distributed throughout the district, which will contribute to a stronger support system. Aspiring leaders will possess the skills to serve as administrators but will still be prepared to serve as teacher leaders in their schools (pg. 37).

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 reasonable management plan which includes two partners, Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Carroll County School System. The institute will provide overall project oversight and management, while the school district will provide commitment, leadership, and openness to change (pg. 42). The program director (.80 FTE) will be responsible for program development and implementation, as well as budget management (pg. 45). The program will also employ a project manager (.20 FTE), director of district leader development and technical assistance (.30 FTE), executive liaison (.05 FTE), and director of management consulting research (.40 FTE). A timeline states the project goals and objectives with the relevant program activities, personnel responsible, and requisite dates for completion (pgs. 47-51).

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 not respond to the invitational priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/08/2013 09:48 AM