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Summary Statement - Summary Statement (Optional):

1. General Comments:

General:

The applicant has presented a strong plan for implementing a promising, researched-based principal and school leader program that will create a pipeline for highly trained school leaders to learn to work within the highest risk Camden city schools. The project builds on lessons learned from The New Teacher Project (TNTP), a New York City-based national program that, for a decade, has successfully trained new teachers and new leaders for high risk communities. This locally directed two-year residency program is designed to fill critical principal and assistant principal vacancies and to institute a continuing capacity building program for new and existing school leaders. The proposal includes a sophisticated evaluation plan that will be conducted by RAND Corporation. The evaluation plan will support the program's implementation and encourage replication of the project as the research evidence of outcomes is disseminated nationally.

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 project's goals, objectives, and outcomes are well defined and detailed in a highly readable table (Table A-1, e21-e23), which states the specific goal-centered objectives and measurable outcomes. Goals 1 and 2 provide specific performance measures aligned with the project's goals and with the local School Leadership Project's (SLP) priorities.

The applicant's design details the amount of time and course work participants will receive within the project's "Competency Model." A week-by-week listing of activities and course content detail how future leaders will spend their residency year (e25-e28). Plans for connecting principals during their residency year include building learning communities of "critical friends" that will exchange ideas and experiences, share professional books, and engage in independent learning experiences, self-assessment, and data-based reflection sessions.

Additional benefits of participation include financial incentives and the availability of continual coaching from successful
practicing school leaders. Candidates who receive high commendations on the Camden PLUS 360 degree evaluation will be certified and become principals in targeted, high-need priority schools. Evaluations of participants will involve portfolios, mentor evaluations, and evidence of performance provided by a validated school culture survey that will also be used to assess the candidate's "instructional culture insight" at the start of the residency experience (e 28).

Goals 2 (improving leaders’ effectiveness) and 3 (building knowledge and capacity) will similarly be measured by validated, research-based instruments (e29-e31). Coaching strategies, activities that engage the leadership cohorts, and the framework for assessment benefit from having been used over the New Teacher Project's 10 years of experience.

The applicant includes evidence of the nature of the community's needs for new leaders, and proposes strategies for addressing those needs (e35) through a comprehensive, districtwide professional development program that includes data-based analyses, development of schools' culture, and mentorship training for leaders and teachers (e36-e37). The project leaders have worked with the district and with state-wide turn around leadership to develop this application, and they document evidence of that coordination in letters of from key stakeholders that endorse the program, which are included in the proposal in Appendix E. The project shows evidence of its commitment to sustaining the current work in Camden schools after the grant concludes, and to implement the Common Core State Standards, new assessments and data systems, and school improvement planning (e37).

The Camden City Public Schools and TNTP applicants describe the intent to build capacity and staff support for hiring, training, resource allocation, and knowledge transfer during the four years of program implementation. The project commits to providing quarterly data analyses and follow-up support during the year following the end of the grant period (e 37). Data collected during this period will be used to replicate the successful elements of this project across its extensive 12-state network (e38). Working with an evaluation team from RAND, the project and its evaluation team plans to publish working papers throughout the project. The project's four year investment will result in a case study and outcome data that will contribute to the national evidence base on school leader preparation and professional development systems (e39).

TNTP, which is the foundation for the Camden program, has been described as an effective project the What Works Clearinghouse (e33).

Weaknesses:

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 proposes to conduct both internal and external evaluations using rigorous design and to disseminate knowledge gained throughout the life of the project (e41).
Table B.1 (e41) defines three evaluation research questions; Table B2 specifies performance measures (e42-e43). The narrative describes the planned use of mixed data collection methodologies, states the frequency of data collections and reporting, and delineates plans for providing formative as well as summative data to address each of the three major research questions (e44-46). The project's impact will be measured by a highly regarded evaluation/research team from RAND, focusing on three key outcomes: (1) changes to the school leadership pipeline, (2) impact on schools' culture, and (3) impact on student achievement. Qualitative measures will address qualitative issues and multi-level modeling (using propensity score matching to adjust for school-level attributes) will enable achievement score analyses adjusted for each school's baseline performances.

Significant resources have been contributed to fund the evaluation (e50). Performance feedback will be presented in annual progress reports, and the project will disseminate emerging findings to program leaders during the project's implementation so the data can be used to make mid-course corrections as needed. Real time data sources will be mined for regular reporting to school teams and leaders for the purpose of making program decisions and course corrections (e49).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

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 strength of this project resides both in its theory-based implementation framework and in the comprehensive outcomes-focused and formative evaluations that are planned. The project is tied into the strong programs developed over the past decade by the New York-based New Teachers' Project, and its evaluation benefits from the evaluation team's expertise and long-standing contribution to research that has demonstrated features of best practices education innovations.

The applicant plans to intensify the focus on a core set of principal activities rather than on the wide-ranging list of 183 indicators used in more established leadership competency development program (e52). The evaluation will examine both the program's effects on new leaders and will also study the achievement outcomes in the schools with newly trained principals and school leaders. The continuing evaluation process will add to the developing knowledge base about how to develop principal's leadership skills so they can re-focus schools on school/student academic outcomes (e53).

System benefits of this project will be the use of the TNTP's Instructional Culture Insight surveys, which will be administered biannually throughout Camden, making available granular, five-year views of district-wide school culture. Regular feedback loops will provide hard data that will contribute to continuing school improvements in Camden while also subjecting the Insight survey to reliability analyses that will contribute to improving the instrumentation available to measuring school leadership effects (e53).
The Camden implementation of the TNTP is expected to contribute to the literature and to other implementations of the TNTP model because it will be implementing and documenting the following new program components (1) intensive post-residency summer training, (2) mentor principals' training, (3) use of Insight survey data throughout Camden schools, and (4) the co-location of program residents and program graduates into high needs schools (e58-59). These model enhancements are promising approaches to developing new leaders' skills capacity to inspire improved teaching and student achievement.

**Weaknesses:**
No weaknesses were identified.

**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 identifies experienced leaders who have track records of success in teaching and in leading teaching/leading initiatives. The team includes a balance of innovators from TNTP and from the Camden community. The RAND evaluator is a similarly established research team with a strong track record conducting rigorous evaluations. In addition to the designated leadership staff, the application defines new roles for leadership coaches, a local site director, and a program manager (e59-e60; see also bibliographies in the Appendix). The TNTP and Camden City Public School management teams will meet monthly or more to track grant activities and to ensure that the project is implemented in a timely manner, according to the activities outline and timelines detailed in Table D.1 (Grant Activities) (e62-e64).

Finally, the proposal demonstrates clearly how it will use formative feedback data from the evaluation, including internal RAND and TNTP reports to create to weekly program status reports and to make iterative mid-course improvements as needed (e64).

**Weaknesses:**
The applicant notes the importance of working to develop the district's capacity to internalize and sustain key elements of the program. However, the statement is a broad commitment without any specifics to study how they will sustain the benefits that the project brings to the district.
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 proposes a research-base program for expanding the pipeline of school leaders in Camden New Jersey and to strengthening the continuing capacity building resources to sustain the initiative beyond the life of the grant.

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 proposes a project that provides both principal preparation and continuing professional development using practices that are supported by moderate evidence of effectiveness.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
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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:

A clear description for the significant need of the project: a district with numerous low performing schools and a recent decision to have the state’s department of education administer the district as a strategy to improve conditions and increase student success and learning in school (page 1).

The alignment with state administration reforms to provide effective leadership to implement and maintain multiple reforms to improve schools and student learning (page 2 and page 21).

Statement of core beliefs as foundation; core beliefs focused on high expectations for student learning (page 2) and critical importance of effective teaching and leadership to impact student learning (page 3).

Program components based on research based evidence of effective training for leaders (page 2).

Three clear, objective, measurable goals stated to support the program (page 4) and each goal with specific objectives, measurable and timely outcomes and measureable performance objectives (chart pages 5 – 7): implementing a residency program to certify promising leaders, improving the effectiveness of current principals and build knowledge and capacity to develop effective leaders beyond this project (page 4).

Measureable outcomes included a focus on improved student learning (Goal 2) and improved school culture for learning...
Recruitment process was explained and a joint venture between the district and The New Teacher Training Project (TNTP), an organization with documented expertise in developing application procedures to candidates as promising effective educators.

Through the certification residency program, candidates will develop and be assessed on comprehensive, effective, measurable and evidenced based skills: instructional leadership and management, data driven leadership, orchestrating a culture of learning and operational management.

Coursework and one-on-one coaching to develop skills of current principals in the district as well as for candidates who complete the residency/certification and become principals in the district.

Training for mentor principals who host a residency candidate.

Use of the bi-annual Insight Tool for all district leaders as a strategy to understand and develop site’s learning culture based on feedback from teachers about school’s learning and teaching environment.

A clear Logic Model to connect Goals, Outcomes with activities in the three different components of the program.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses identified.

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:
A two-fold evaluation plan with an independent, external evaluator as well as an internal evaluation for ongoing program development and improvement.

A highly qualified external evaluator, Rand Corporation, will be contracted to conduct the projects evaluation.

Three clear research questions to focus the evaluations and measure Goals, outcomes and objectives.

Clearly developed evaluation plan with performance measures aligned to outcomes and research questions.

Evaluation included a focus on improvement in school outcomes and student learning.
Clearly explained evaluation tools and comprehensive analysis for each Goal with internal evaluation and external evaluations clearly explained (pages 28).

Clear plan to share external evaluation results (page 33) as outlined on page 22.

A staff member of the applicant was identified to monitor internal evaluation (page 34).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses were identified.

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:
A potential to impact 12,608 students in low performing schools (page e13).

The outcomes will support the growing research in the field of educational leadership and support new knowledge about leadership training, instructional cultural in high needs schools and transforming a significantly low performing school district (page 35).

Clearly identified the gap in the literature that the results of this study will provide: skills effective leaders need to master (page 36) as well as strategic keys for system wide improvement as a results of leadership (page 37).

Applicant will share the results and learning from the project through multiple venues: an annual blog, prominent educational seminars and conferences, a case study in the final year, and working papers throughout the project by the external evaluator (page 23).

Develop understanding of the importance of developing a cultural of learning in schools (page 37).

Results will be relevant and useful to practitioners in the field (page 38).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses were identified.

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:
Clearly described key personnel with FTE and responsibilities to the project (pages 43 – 45).
Clear description of the connection and collaboration responsibilities between staff of partners (pages 43 – 45).
Clear, well developed chart of staff roles and responsibilities aligned with milestones and timelines associated with project Goals (pages 46 – 48).
Budget narrative included costs for key personnel (budget narrative page 3), costs for internal and external evaluations (budget narrative page 6), costs to cover the bi-annual Culture Insight Survey (page 7).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses were indicated.

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 impact of the proposed project will be to develop more effective principals for the low performing skills in the district; the principals will have the skills to improve learning teaching and learning (page 17). Developing residency cohorts of 12 candidates for each of 5 year, in a district with 26 schools, will ensure every school will have an effective principal by 2018 (page 20).

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 program components were clearly supported by research based evidence. For example, using elements found to be effective from the New Leaders and New York City Leadership Academy programs (page 17).

Reader’s Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/12/2013 06:04 PM
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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:

(1)The applicant has established three goals with supporting objectives with outcomes. Each goal is directly linked to supporting the applicant’s overall plan to increase the number of qualified principals within the school district. All objectives are directly aligned to the appropriate goal and have been presented in measurable terms which will allow for a comparative analysis relative to defining success of the project. Additionally, each objective is supported by performance measures. Collectively the objectives support the applicant’s primary purposes in developing the project. P. 9
(2)As outlined the goals and objectives established for the project will effectively meet the needs of the district and its intent to increase the number of qualified principals. The design of the project reflects best practices relative relying on proven research in effective principal preparation for high need schools. Noted highlights of the plan include requiring a residency program, professional development opportunities and mentorship opportunities. These and other related strategies will effectively address the immediate needs of the project and the intended purposes of the grant.
(3) The applicant notes that both the district and state are supportive of the project in the midst of a state takeover. Strategies that are presently underway and will continue to receive support include developing a partnership with TNTP and the Regional Achievement Center which will provide a model curriculum aligned with the Common Core State Standards, interim assessments, data systems, school improvement planning resources and professional development for staff. Collectively, these and other related strategies will impact an impact on teaching and learning at the target schools. P. 21
(4) With a direct intent the applicant has outlined plan to share the project with others. More specifically replication of the project and successful results have been identified an objective of the project. Data will be collected on project
implementation, participant performance, school outcomes, principal evaluation and student achievement data. P. 22

Information will be presented at major educational conferences which include the American Education Research Association and the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Innovation and Improvement. P. 23

**Weaknesses:**

1. No noted weaknesses
2. No noted weaknesses
3. No noted weaknesses
4. No noted weaknesses

**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:**

1. The applicant has outlined a complete evaluation plan for the project as noted by identifying an external evaluator, defining what data will be collected and when. The evaluation model provided outlines how each goal and supporting outcome will be measured. All performance measures are consistent with providing detailed information relative to the success of the project and will support project revisions and improvements. Data sources include surveys, student growth data and candidate evaluations and scores. P. 28

2. In response to evaluating the effectiveness of implementation strategies the applicant has identified specific research questions. Each question is directly aligned with gathering specific information relative to defining the success of activities. Data sources that will support the evaluation include a review of the annual budget, monthly expenditure reports, program artifacts, assessment materials, observation notes and surveys. As presented the plan will provide relevant data in defining the status of the project and all implementation strategies. P. 28

3. The applicant will conduct as secondary evaluation of the project in order to provide immediate feedback for timely project revisions and modifications. Specific times that data will be collected and shared include the spring and fall as well as when certain data becomes available. All collected data will be shared with the project staff for their immediate involvement thereby allowing the project to remain on track relative to meeting established goals and objectives. P. 33

**Weaknesses:**

1. No noted weaknesses
2. No noted weaknesses
3. No noted weaknesses
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:

(1) The applicant reports that the project will increase the knowledge base of developing effective leadership practices which impact teacher effectiveness relative to improving the low academic performance of low-income minority students. P. 35 The project will also contribute providing knowledge of leader preparation and professional development in urban high need schools. Further support for the project has been noted through research which has been limited in response to professional development programs that have had a positive impact on school outcomes. Additionally, the project will focus on 16 objectives across four domains which narrow the scope of defining effective leadership preparation.

(2) As a school district under state control, the applicant notes that change will be noted by identifying a new superintendent, reforming the role of the school board and identifying and retaining effective principals which in turn attract and retain effective teachers. The preparation of high-qualified leaders has a direct impact in building a sustainable system designed to address teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

(3) In support of defining the magnitude of results that will be attained by the project, the applicant notes the alignment of the project with other nationally known leadership preparation programs such as the New York City leadership Academy and its alignment with their work and practices. Immediate results of the project will be realized through professional development opportunities and the use of the Instructional Culture Insight survey. Improvements will be noted through the inclusion of leaders who complete leadership training thereby improving classroom observations with feedback and an improved teacher evaluation system. Collectively, these and other strategies will effectively improve student achievement.

P. 40

Weaknesses:

(1) No noted weaknesses
(2) No noted weaknesses
(3) No noted weaknesses

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:

(1) The applicant provides a complete list of all staff that will lead and support the project and its day-to-day activities. All identified staff has the required educational background and professional experiences to effectively implement and manage the project. The job descriptions provided for each position are commensurate with the needs of the project and support the intended purposes of the grant. Implementation activities and strategies for each goal and supporting objective of the project are clearly defined as noted by staff responsibility, milestones and timeline. P. 43 and p. 46

(2) The applicant notes that performance feedback data will be utilized as it becomes available to include annual reports from the external evaluator. The leadership team will meet monthly to review the status of the project and implementation strategies. Other noted feedback efforts include the utilization of weekly program status reports and winter improvements that will be made to the recruitment, selection model and residency program. P. 48

Weaknesses:

(1) No noted weaknesses

(2) No noted weaknesses

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 addresses this priority as evidenced by information provided in the project design.

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 addresses this priority as noted by various information included in the development of the application.