

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/27/2017 11:28 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** Texas A&M University (U423A170053)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	39
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	14
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Support for Personalized Learning Environments</b>		
1. CPP 2	3	3
<b>Total</b>	108	101

# Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 10: 84.423A

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

Applicant: Texas A&M University (U423A170053)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.

(5) 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.

### Strengths:

The proposal presents a clear articulation of the A-PLUS program that leverages multiple platforms and delivery models to train new principals through a comprehensive set of coursework and professional learning from Texas A&M University. The proposal leverages the research base to inform development and provide the key foundation to the development of the comprehensive training model for all of the proposed delivery models for training effective leaders for high needs schools. The proposal is innovative as it looks to measure the effectiveness of different delivery models of instruction, including traditional degree pathways, online learning platforms, face-to-face professional learning, and coaching (e31). The proposal clearly presents how materials and outcomes from each component can be valuable to the larger community. Additionally, the proposal makes a clear case for informing policy as well as developing sustainable partnerships to maintain the work beyond the grant period. The proposal builds a clear case for how the program could make a significant impact on a high-needs population based on targeted LEAs, recruitment efforts, and applicant rubric priorities.

### Weaknesses:

The proposal has a very robust set of goals that are incredibly ambitious. It would be helpful to have additional specifics regarding how the project will implement all of the items proposed to evaluate the extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to training highly effective leaders.

Reader's Score: 39

### 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 importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project,

especially improvements in teaching and Student Achievement.

**(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.**

**(3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the grant.**

**(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal articulates significance for Project PREP by clearly identifying the lack of current research associated with training highly effective school leaders in bilingual/ESL programs (e47). Additionally, the proposal includes a robust cost/benefit analysis (e49-e50) that speaks to the low cost of the program relative to the number of school leaders trained. The proposal notes that over fifty percent of the budget was going to support participant costs, which was viewed as a strength of the proposal (e50). The proposal presents sustainable measures and opportunities for replication beyond the grant period. Specifically, the proposal details how each of the five specific implementation efforts can lead to replication, which was another strength of the proposal. The proposal speaks to comprehensive means for disseminating the research, including utilizing a MOOC and sharing all resources through an already established website (e51).

**Weaknesses:**

The coaching and mentoring was limited to schools, but the proposal wasn't clear how and when that is going to happen. Additionally, it would be helpful to have additional student data associated with the principals in the surrounding districts to create a more comprehensive case for need.

**Reader's Score: 14**

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

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

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

**(2) 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.**

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal presents goals and processes details with the inclusion of timelines and criteria where appropriate. The inclusion of details, such as the rigorous selection process for principals from current educators demonstrates a clear plan for the project to yield improved school leaders in high needs school environments. Additionally, the combination of experts from Texas A&M University with other community organizations include the state department of education bring together a strong blend of resources and expertise from university, government, and non-profit to create a strong partnership for the execution of this program. The proposal is clear in articulating the student population needs, with a clear representation of underserved populations having the potential to benefit from this grant proposal. These outcomes were embedded into the outset of the narrative that articulated the needs for each of the five components. Additionally, the proposal presents a table of project milestones aligned with personnel responsibilities and a timeline that is robust and details actionable steps to reach the outcomes articulated by the proposal. The objectives support the overall goals of the proposal, and although they are ambitious, they appear within reach based on the details provided in the project management chart.

**Weaknesses:**

In the proposal narrative, it was challenging to see the specific measures associated with the goals and objectives. It would be helpful to present these measures in a table with a timeline and benchmarks for clarity to better demonstrate how the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable. The presentation of this information in a narrative format was challenging, and it is suggested that the information be presented in a table for clarity and improved alignment.

In the proposal narrative, it was challenging to see the specific roles for each of the entities and leaders involved in the project. Specifically, how these entities at each of the various local education agencies will interact to support the different aspects of the project. The proposal would benefit from an expansion of the management of each of the five components to include additional details about how they work together to address those key needs at each site.

Finally, the selection of mentor principals that will be involved with the project was also lacking detail. As these mentors are an integral part to the delivery and facilitation of the site-based learning for the program, it is necessary to describe the selection process of those individuals to demonstrate their capacity for high quality instruction and support to align with the proposed outcomes of the project.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation****1. The Secretary considers the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

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

**(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.**

**(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.**

**Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook 3.0: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>; and (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations" to the list of evaluation resources: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/). In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal presents a clear evaluation plan that demonstrates clear relationships between the goals, measures, and methods of the Center for Research and Development for Dual Language and Literacy Acquisition (CRDLLA) to achieve outcomes. The proposal clearly describes the efforts for both a randomized-control trial design as well as a quasi-experimental study through an independent evaluator to measure outcomes with both quantitative and qualitative data sets specific to the goals described in the proposal. The proposal additionally included exemplars of the different data sets utilized as evidence, as well as comprehensive details on the methods used for evaluation of the different components. The approach provides a clear logic model that assesses at multiple stages to gain data around the impact of specific programmatic elements of the study. The approach to evaluation through both outcomes as well as implementation also allows for the leadership team to adjust the project as necessary to address the community needs toward the goals associated with the project. The inclusion of both the impact study as well as implementation study is a strength of this

proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted in the quality of project evaluation for this proposal.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce**

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to address both of the following priority areas:
  - (a) Providing educator development activities designed to improve cultural competency and responsiveness skills that contribute to an inclusive school culture; and
  - (b) Improving the recruitment, support, and retention of educators from diverse backgrounds.

**Applicants must respond to both of the priority areas in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal is centered on serving underserved school communities in Texas that have high populations of bilingual/ESL students. The proposal speaks to an intent to address cultural competencies for principals to create an inclusive school culture. This is represented in the titles of coursework and professional learning that will be included in A-PLUS implementation. Additionally, the project speaks about how the program leaders will recruit students from diverse backgrounds, leveraging the partnerships with the local district leaders.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted in regards to this competitive preference priority.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Support for Personalized Learning Environments**

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to support teachers, principals, or other School Leaders implementing personalized learning environments in their classrooms or in classrooms in their schools, using data to inform their instruction, and increasing students' engagement, voice, and choice in their learning. Projects may support educators' implementation of college and career ready strategies such as project based learning, competency based education, or blended learning.

**Strengths:**

The proposal clearly includes support for school leaders to leverage personalized learning environments, both in their school communities as well as the mechanism to pursue their own development. The inclusion of micro-credentials was noted as a strength in this proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted in regards to this competitive preference priority.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/27/2017 11:28 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/27/2017 07:50 PM

## Technical Review

Applicant: Texas A&M University (U423A170053)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	38
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	13
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Support for Personalized Learning Environments</b>		
1. CPP 2	3	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>96</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 10: 84.423A

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

Applicant: Texas A&M University (U423A170053)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.

(5) 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.

### Strengths:

The applicants are to be commended for the depth with which they addressed Absolute Priority 2, Competitive Preference Priority 1 and Competitive Preference Priority 2. The scope of this proposal is impressive. The five goals represent an exceptional and ambitious approach.

The A-PLUS residency is especially noteworthy. In a well-crafted “simulation,” principal candidates will train college and high school students in using literacy-based STEM curriculum for a summer school program geared toward the younger ELs and LIS. Then they will oversee the implementation of the four-week program including outreach to families prior and project evaluation after. During the program, they will be “wired” and will receive real time coaching—virtually. The intensity of this residency puts leadership theory into practice, thereby building real-world leadership capacity of participants.

Collaborating schools, many of them serving high-need students, have already been identified. The network of partner schools will serve as a pipeline for participants—particularly those of diverse backgrounds. District leaders, including bilingual/ESL directors, will be asked to recommend participants before an open call goes out across the state. In each of the five goals identified in this section, replicable activities are identified. Most, if not all, by-products of the proposal will be shared openly. These will be made available to others in the state as well as nationally.

### Weaknesses:

The sheer volume of goals, activities, and participants is of concern. Narrowing the number of goals would actually strengthen this proposal.

Reader's Score: 38

## 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 importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and Student Achievement.

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

(3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the grant.

(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

### Strengths:

The results, even if only one goal comes to fruition, will be of great importance especially in leading and teaching the ELs and LIS. As stated on page 26, there are relatively few studies that included bilingual/ESL programs as part of school reform movements. With roughly 10% of students across the United States participating in ELL programs, the potential magnitude of the results and benefits to students is high.

This proposal does more than just lay out a plan for how to produce effective school leaders. This plan, its goals and strategies bank on the ripple effect culturally attuned leaders have on teachers, students, and student achievement. It addresses how those leaders in turn support teachers as they build cultural competency and instructional capacity (pp. 27-28).

The most distinct feature of the dissemination plan is the intent to share the program design, materials, and results freely.

### Weaknesses:

In regards to reasonableness of costs, yes, since a number of interventions will be made widely available, the number of potential beneficiaries of the services could be high. The impact could be exponential. However concrete numbers, in terms of participants and money, are necessary to accurately assess this section of the application. Pages 27-28 lack specificity.

Reader's Score: 13

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

(2) 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.

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

### Strengths:

The inclusion of an iEducate student on the advisory board (p. 31) is forward thinking. Rather than just utilizing them for the summer program, they (or at least one) will have the opportunity to begin to build leadership credentials. It is also

commendable that two bilingual/ESL teachers are also being included on the advisory board. Teacher buy-in is a key component of successful programs.

**Weaknesses:**

Because of the strong research-based nature of this project, it is unclear how exactly the idea of continuous improvement will be applied—and still stay true to treatment and control group methodology. Section C.3 (p. 32) is underdeveloped. Also, it is stated that, “The A-PLUS team will meet monthly to discuss updates and improve the project.” The degree to which the project may be improved/changed is not indicated.

**Reader's Score: 18**

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

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

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

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook 3.0: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>; and (2) “Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations” to the list of evaluation resources: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/). In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

**Strengths:**

What a unique research question—Is morale high and collaborative spirit maintained in A-PLUS? (p. 34)!

There is a thorough evaluation plan for each of the five goals previously identified in the Design section. The plan is very detailed. Sound evaluation methodology is in place for each.

**Weaknesses:**

A suggested follow up to the question, “...number of graduates assume principal position after 2 semesters” (p. 36) would be—What are graduates’ perceived reasons for not assuming a principal position within this timeframe? There are so many variables that it would be interesting to collect at least the perceived “why not’s.”

As noted in the Design section, the sheer number of goals, activities, and outcomes is of concern. Narrowing the design and correspondingly the amount of data collected may keep the project more manageable.

**Reader's Score: 20**

## Priority Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to address both of the following priority areas:

(a) Providing educator development activities designed to improve cultural competency and responsiveness skills that contribute to an inclusive school culture; and

(b) Improving the recruitment, support, and retention of educators from diverse backgrounds.

Applicants must respond to both of the priority areas in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

#### Strengths:

This proposal meets CPP 1 by purposefully seeking participants from diverse backgrounds. An overarching goal of the project is that at least 51% of participants identify as people of color (p. e20).

There is a strong focus on ELs and LIS in each of the five goals. Interventions are designed to heighten awareness of ELs and LIS and build leader and teacher capacity to best serve these students.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

### Competitive Preference Priority - Support for Personalized Learning Environments

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to support teachers, principals, or other School Leaders implementing personalized learning environments in their classrooms or in classrooms in their schools, using data to inform their instruction, and increasing students' engagement, voice, and choice in their learning. Projects may support educators' implementation of college and career ready strategies such as project based learning, competency based education, or blended learning.

#### Strengths:

This proposal includes an ambitious plan to create 183 new MOOPILs (Massive Open Online Professional Individualized Learning units) many of which can be completed individually or applied towards degree/certification completion. The MOOPILs provide the opportunity for individualized learning for adults involved in this project and others through open sharing.

#### Weaknesses:

There is no mention of teacher implementation of college and career readiness strategies, individualized learning (for students), project based learning, competency based education, or blended learning for students in this proposal.

Reader's Score: 2

---

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/27/2017 07:50 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/28/2017 07:55 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** Texas A&M University (U423A170053)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	40	38
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	15	13
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	25	24
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Support for Personalized Learning Environments</b>		
1. CPP 2	3	3
<b>Total</b>	108	103

# Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 10: 84.423A

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

Applicant: Texas A&M University (U423A170053)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(2) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

(4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.

(5) 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.

### Strengths:

The applicant has designed a multifaceted quality intense plan to serve groups of leaders and teachers that focus on bilingual education and low-income populations in five different project components. The diversity of the population is specific and unique as well as the delivery of services. (Pg. e148-150)

The applicant has designed a project to serve five components that represents the collaboration of over 75 target schools and thousands of leaders and teachers in one of the five components. (Pg. 24) The application provided a chart of the breakdown of students by school, low income, ESL, the total number of students, the number of teachers, the number of at risk and other demographics of target participants. (Pg. e143-144)

The applicant reports research that supports professional development delivery methods from virtual, summer institutes, college specific degrees, mentoring, coaching and on-site training, all of which are being implemented in the project. With the five components and the different cohorts/groups, the project will serve that represent schools with the greatest need in bilingual and low-income students. (Chart e143-144)

### Weaknesses:

The applicant reported on overall demographics for the state but failed to collect and present the breakdown of administrators and teachers by degree, gender, race, diversity, and other areas of the target principals and leader population to be served. (Pg. 2) The data would have provided the baseline of actual data from project sites. If student data for the schools can be collected, staff data should be included.

Reader's Score: 38

### 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 importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and Student Achievement.**

**(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.**

**(3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of the grant.**

**(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.**

**Strengths:**

The project is multifaceted and reaches a comprehensive sampling of administrators, leaders, teachers (2,320 total) and community that will benefit from the components of A-PLUS proposal implementation. (Pg. 27-28)

The magnitude of components addressing different members of multiple districts results in a comprehensive report of outcomes utilizing treatment and control group for comparison resulting in improved education teaching and improved student achievement.

The cost of the project for direct services (principals, school leaders, ESL, etc.) is reasonable when you consider the replication of the components to national and state coverage.

A strong component of the proposed project is the extensive dissemination of materials developed, plans, policies, evaluation instruments, and lessons developed and other products will be accessible through several organizations and research sites. The collaboration occurs between project participants at local sites and sharing among other school staff participants. The number of participants to be served is substantial and the tracking of student achievement scores will be documented to show evidence that the courses, training, professional development, and internships have improved student achievement.

The substantial number of leaders that receive training will be a base for continuing elements of the

**Weaknesses:**

The substantial cost to provide Master's degree (fee, tuition, travel, book, meals, lodging) will be too expensive for the schools to continue after funding ends. Also, the coaching and mentoring will be limited to only the leaders in the participating schools that have the element of time to coach or mentor fellow leaders.

**Reader's Score: 13**

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

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

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

**(2) 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.**

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

**Strengths:**

The proposed project has outlined objectives, outcomes, evaluation tools, responsible parties implementing the objective or component. All objectives are measurable with each component clearly defined. The objectives of each component provide detail assessments, observations, survey and several other evaluation tools. Each objective is well defined and

documented with the extensive evaluation process. (Pg. 36-41)

The procedures for feedback included assessment results during the year to monitor progress and both summative and formative comprehensive evaluation results. Progress assessments are scheduled in the evaluation plan to provide feedback during the project year.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not include management components contributed by participating school administrators or other leaders from the sites other than the Advisory Board.

**Reader's Score: 24**

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

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

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

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook 3.0: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>; and (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations" to the list of evaluation resources: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech\\_methods/](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/). In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

**Strengths:**

The evaluation component of the project was extensive and comprehensive with assigned personnel collecting, analyzing and reporting different aspects of the proposal activities (components).

The evaluation provided for periodical assessments and reporting. It also provides a yearly evaluation summary as well as the end of project results of findings and products. The evaluation component is conducted by past evaluators from past grants of this size and the methods appear to be reliable and valid with documentation.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were identified

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Priority Questions**

## Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to address both of the following priority areas:

(a) Providing educator development activities designed to improve cultural competency and responsiveness skills that contribute to an inclusive school culture; and

(b) Improving the recruitment, support, and retention of educators from diverse backgrounds.

Applicants must respond to both of the priority areas in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

### Strengths:

The project was designed to address the needs of schools with high cultural needs in bilingual education and bilingual students and low-income populations.

The training and professional development were uniquely designed to address the cultural and responsiveness skills of bilingual student needs as well as low-income populations.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified

Reader's Score: 5

## Competitive Preference Priority - Support for Personalized Learning Environments

1. Under this priority, we provide funding to projects that are designed to support teachers, principals, or other School Leaders implementing personalized learning environments in their classrooms or in classrooms in their schools, using data to inform their instruction, and increasing students' engagement, voice, and choice in their learning. Projects may support educators' implementation of college and career ready strategies such as project based learning, competency based education, or blended learning.

### Strengths:

The area of support for teachers, principals, and school leaders was a central focus of each component of the proposed project. Personalized learning in classroom and training in this area was defined and included in the above support and training elements.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.as the project is a proposal addressing the support

Reader's Score: 3

---

Status: Submitted  
Last Updated: 07/28/2017 07:55 PM