

SEED +2 Renewal Technical Review Form

US Department of Education

**Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) Grant Review
2020 SEED
Application Technical Review Form
(CFDA 84.423A)**

--	--

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
A. Quality of Evaluation Plan	25	24
B. Quality of the Project Design	25	25
C. Strategy to Scale	25	25
D. Adequacy of Resources	25	23
Selection Criteria Total Score	100	97
Overall Application Impression (Required): The applicant has provided a strong application for funding extension. The strength of the application is in the strong project design and strategies to scale. The applicant should have, however, provided more information of analytics used for the quantitative project evaluation data and concrete examples of financial support to continue the project beyond federal funding.		

A. Quality of Project Evaluation (up to 25 points)

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

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

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 24

Strengths:

1) The applicant has discussed a strong evaluation plan (pages 22-25). The evaluation plan is a combination of internal and external evaluation from the Center for Research and Reform at John Hopkins University. The application has discussed each of the components listed on pages 2-3 of the program and a clear approach and method of assessment to establish effectiveness. For example, to assess component # 2 of recruiting and training in-services school leaders, the program will use an RCT methods where participants will be matched, and baseline equivalence will be used to measure effectiveness. Surveys will be used to augment the quantitative analysis and provide qualitative support (pages 23-24). The applicant has also discussed pertinent data collection methods.

2) The project evaluation plan has used varying methods based on project components (pages 22-25). The project components listed on pages 2-3 also provide goals and measurable objectives for the project. For example, component # 5 was to prepare 80 principals and school leaders for building instructional capacity. The project evaluation plan seeks to analyze this component using one-group pre and post design to identify improvements. The evaluation for these components are operationalized into objectives such as "is there a significant difference between pre and post accountability measures for each of the campuses?" The applicant thus has used objective methods and a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative tools to evaluate the project.

Weaknesses:

1) No weaknesses.

2) The applicant has not adequately provided methods and power analysis of the quantitative data that will be collected. It is unclear what statistical methods will be used to establish the effectiveness of the project.

B. Project Design (25 points).

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

- (1) 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.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25

Strengths:

1) The applicant has adequately indicated that the project has provided promising results and may potentially guide future replication. Each of the project component is examined in the evaluation for the first three years, the lessons learned and changes that will try to increase the effectiveness of the project (pages 26-29). For example, component three that included training for campus leaders through online professional development was assessed and the 46 modules that will be updated and seek to expand the reach nationally. The applicant also provides a clear plan to implement the component that include pre post assessments and testing. The replication potential is clearly indicated in the expanding scope of the project to include more participants.

2) The applicant has provided a detailed discussion regarding the potential of program capacity building. The applicant had examined each of the five components that will be an integral part of the model and their potential to develop capacity (page 30-42). For example, first component of the effectiveness of the M.Ed. certification model was evaluated and the 100 school leaders from the cohort are ready to build instructional capacity with an intensive professional development. The impact of the project includes scaling up by expanding and altering the residency model in the component to an urban school partnership, and experimenting with models such as full year, half day residency (30-31). The applicant has also provided specific objectives to implement the capacity building component. For example, component # 2, the objectives to scale include producing a MOOPIL related to improving instruction and produce a paper how to develop the MOOPILs (page 36-37).

Weaknesses:

1) & 2) No weaknesses.

C. Strategy to Scale (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the strategy to scale for the proposed project. In determining the strategy to scale for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.

(2) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25

Strengths:

1) The applicant has provided an effective understanding of the successful replication of the proposed project (pages 44-49). The applicant has examined each of the component for school leaders and in the subsequent two years' plans of implementation. For example, component # 4 focused on practicing school principals and school leaders will be replicated to 1200 more for each of the two years. The project will provide summer intervention, and the project evaluation will potentially continue the national webinar summer leadership institute model. The successful replication is to be expanded to small and/or rural schools (page 47).

2) The applicant has indicated an effective plan for dissemination of project studies. The applicant has discussed several methods of dissemination of the project evaluation. The methods discussed include presentations at state, regional and national conference meetings, think tanks for two components, publishing research briefs on the ELRC website, summer leadership institutes, webinars and media releases. The project dissemination plan is time-bound (page 43).

Weaknesses:

1) & 2) No weaknesses noted.

D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

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

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 23

Strengths:

1) The applicant has successfully discussed a strong sustainability plan (page 50). The applicant approach to sustainability includes scaling back of the project during the fifth year to help transition the program within the applicant institution's Education Leadership Research Center. The applicant has indicated a working plan of continuing components of the project in a piecemeal approach. For example, the Turnaround Schools Initiative will move to an online venue for support and

observations. The applicant will also charge a minimum fee after the grant funding and continue business partnerships and support.

2) The applicant has successfully demonstrated the incorporation of project purposes, activities or benefits into the ongoing applicant Educational Leadership Research Center (pages 50-53). The applicant has provided a detailed description of how the project components will be incorporated into the center at the level of human, material/structural and organizational capital. For example, the project will continue the current use of online platforms for MOOPILs and Virtual PD through institutional CANVAS and other platforms. The applicant similarly will reorganize the full year residency model to a full-year/half day in an urban setting.

Weaknesses:

1) The applicant sustainability model has a weak financial component. For example, the applicant has not provided information of the level of fees for continuing the project beyond current federal funding. Similarly, the applicant has not provided documentation of continued support by partners for the project beyond federal funding. The commitment of the applicant agency's commitment is also not clearly specified in the text of the project.

2) No weaknesses noted.

SEED +2 Renewal Technical Review Form*US Department of Education***Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) Grant Review****2020 SEED****Application Technical Review Form****(CFDA 84.423A)**

--	--

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
A. Quality of Evaluation Plan	25	25
B. Quality of the Project Design	25	25
C. Strategy to Scale	25	25
D. Adequacy of Resources	25	22
Selection Criteria Total Score	100	97
Overall Application Impression (Required):		
<p>Overall, the proposal is well written. The narrative is clear, concise, and demonstrates a well-supported statement of the problem the project will address.</p>		

A. Quality of Project Evaluation (up to 25 points)

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

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

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25 **Strengths:**

- (1) The applicant presents detailed methods of evaluation that provide for examining the effectiveness of the project's implementation strategies and the project's overall impact. For example, the methodology will focus on the project's objective performance measures and utilize multiple evaluation designs. Such designs include a randomized controlled trial, a quasi-experimental design, and a one-group pre-post design. The evaluation methodology will also be formative and summative in nature (p. 22).
- (2) The proposal outlines detailed methods of evaluation that include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the evaluation methodology will involve data collection and analysis that is qualitative and quantitative or descriptive. Survey data collected will be analyzed using a constant comparative method and will be coded according to themes for identifying trends or patterns (pp. 23-25). The qualitative data will be collected from artifacts such as document analysis, interviews, and field notes. The quantitative data will be from assessments such as the state's principalship certification exams, state assessment and English proficiency test, and campus-level student achievement data.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

B. Project Design (25 points).

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

(1) 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.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: ___25___

Strengths:

- (1) Multiple approaches for implementing and evaluating the proposed project that will result in information to guide possible replication of the project's activities and strategies are demonstrated. The following are examples of the approaches the project proposes to implement. The project proposes to build upon five components. Some of the components centered on virtual mentor and peer coaching, conducting a comparison study to determine the impact of virtual professional learning communities, and assessing learning gains of virtual learning participants. The implementation of the project's design also evidences the activities specific to each component. In addition, the components are aligned with the project's measurable objectives (pp. 25-42).
- (2) Sound evidence that the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance is well demonstrated. As indicated on page 31 of the narrative, for example, capacity-building efforts will include the implementation of a full-time residency model that can be shared in terms of cost, partnerships, and specific activities for the participants. This capacity-building effort would result in school leader participants obtaining a micro-credential as a leader resident that is prepared for an advanced state macrocredential certification in two states. In addition, the participants will obtain an M.Ed. with an emphasis on instructional leadership. These credentials would allow the participants to lead and impact campuses with a high concentration of English Learners and economically challenged students.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

C. Strategy to Scale (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the strategy to scale for the proposed project. In determining the strategy to scale for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.
- (2) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25 **Strengths:**

- (1) The proposal well demonstrates the feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations. Examples of the potential of successful replication of the project include but are not limited to the following. The handbook for the residency program, and the activities from the residency program all have the potential to be replicated in other settings. Also, the analysis of qualitative data collected from the residency activities has the potential to inform adjustments for refinement of some of the residency activities such as the decision-making simulations, and the virtual mentoring and coaching (p. 26). In addition, the development of the Massive Open Online Professional Individualized Learning has the capability of being used statewide and nationally for the attainment of virtual professional development hours for campus leaders in public and charter schools (p. 27).
- (2) The proposal includes sound mechanisms to broadly disseminate information on its project to support further development or replication. The following are examples of the project's dissemination efforts. Project outcomes are anticipated to be shared via at least one state and one national or regional conference. The project and its associated results are also anticipated to be shared via and professional media sources, and through a website (p. 39). In addition, the published virtual mentoring coaching booklet can be accessed online. The project's rural and small school turnaround leadership model can be replicated in other districts in need. (pp. 47, 48).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

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

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 22

Strengths:

- (1) Through varied approaches, the proposal demonstrates the potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the project proposes the scaling back of its budget during its fifth year as a part of its sustainability efforts. A brand new research facility by the University and College. The project has also leveraged its first official partner for the renewal grant (pp. 51, 52). In addition to continuing its business and district partnerships, the project will charge a minimum fee for service (p. 50).
- (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding is demonstrated. For example, the project will develop a National Think Tank that includes universities and rural and small school district personnel to discuss the current characteristics of rural and small school turnaround programs and how to better implement such models with leadership teams (p. 41). Moreover, the applicant anticipates that all project purposes and activities will be institutionalized within the partner university's Education Leadership Research Center by the ending of the grant (p. 50).

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not define or identify the entity with whom it has leveraged as a partner. The applicant does not demonstrate what the leveraged partner's commitment to the project would be. The proposal also lacks details regarding what the university's commitment to the project would be beyond the grant period.

SEED +2 Renewal Technical Review Form

US Department of Education

**Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) Grant Review
2020 SEED
Application Technical Review Form
(CFDA 84.423A)**

--	--

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
A. Quality of Evaluation Plan	25	25
B. Quality of the Project Design	25	25
C. Strategy to Scale	25	25
D. Adequacy of Resources	25	23
Selection Criteria Total Score	100	98
Overall Application Impression (Required):		
<p>The proposal addresses almost all of the criteria extensively. The project aims to build school leadership capacity as a lever for instructional improvement. Aside from not really detailing the commitments that the University will make to help support the project beyond the term of the grant, the proposal was extremely strong.</p>		

A. Quality of Project Evaluation (up to 25 points)

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

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

(2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: ____25____

Strengths:

The proposal provides methods of evaluation to examine the effectiveness of the project implementation. For example, the proposal identifies an external evaluator and delineates the difference between what the external evaluator will do and what the internal research team will do (p. 23). In addition, the evaluation plan is broken up into five components. (pl. 22-25). Each component communicates the research questions that will be addressed, the data to be collected to address the research question and the analytic approach. The research questions that will be addressed in each of the components are aligned with the key activities from the project and thus are focused on the project's implementation strategies (p. 22-25).

In the evaluation plan, the proposal also articulates the qualitative and quantitative data that will be collected (p. 25). For example, open-ended survey is an example of the qualitative data and English proficiency tests are an example of the quantitative data. In addition, the proposal provides objective performance measures that are aligned with the intended outcomes of the project. (p. 22-25). In general, the evaluation plan suggests that the project will be able to make claims about the impact of the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

B. Project Design (25 points).

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

(1) 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.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. 25 points

Strengths:

The proposal states how the design for implementation and evaluation will provide information for replication. For example, this includes parts of the implementation related to the school principal residency, the implementation of online learning modules and virtual professional learning communities. (p. 26-29). Moreover, the evaluation strategies are focused on the implementation of the project activities to understand impact (p. 22-25). This evaluative information could be used for guiding replication as well. It is worth noting that in addressing this criterion, the proposal also mentions what the project has done and what the renewal is will do to build upon what has already been done. (p. 26-29). For example, a sample of the virtual professional development (which was designed in the first three years) will be evaluated with a control group. (p. 27). This further suggests that the implementation and evaluation of this work could guide replication if it is found to be effective.

The proposal discusses how the project will build capacity and yield results beyond the term of the grant. In general, the work of the project aims to train school leaders for instructional improvement, which serves as a capacity building activity. (p. 26-29; p. 30-42). In addition, the project aims to develop models and systems that can be shared beyond the scope and term of the grant. For example, the project will develop a turnaround leadership intervention model for small/rural schools. (p. 41). This model will be shared with the state education agency with the potential of impacting other, non-participating schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.



C. Strategy to Scale (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the strategy to scale for the proposed project. In determining the strategy to scale for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.
- (2) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25

Strengths:

The proposal provides details to suggest the feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project. For example, the proposal specifically lists the replicable aspects of the project for each of the project components (p. 44-49). For example, the school leadership residency could produce, if successful, a residency model for leadership preparation that could be shared nationally. (p. 44). As part of the project, the residency will be tested in rural and/or small schools in the fifth year. This would provide added variation of context and, possibly, demographic to further support replicability (p. 44).

The proposal identifies a number of mechanisms for broadly disseminating the information on its project. For example, the proposal lists papers presented at state, regional and national conferences, research briefs available on the ELRC website, webinars and media releases, to name a few. (p. 43). This information-sharing could support further project development or replication.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.
- (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: ____23

Strengths:

The proposal communicates that there is the potential for continued support for the project beyond the term of the grant. For example, the program will be transitioned to a center within the university. This center has a structure within which the program can function as part of the department and college (p. 50). In addition, the proposal states that they will offer the programs as a fee for service to ensure that the professional learning supports can continue beyond the term of the grant. (p. 50). Finally, the proposal states that the project team will continue to maintain partnerships with businesses and school districts to further explore how others may share in this work in the future (p. 50).

The proposal demonstrates that there is potential for the project to be incorporated into the organization at the end of funding. Specifically, the project will become part of the Education Leadership Research Center at the university. (p. 50). All project purposes and activities will be institutionalized within the Center, aligning with the major functions of the center, such as conducting and apply research for and with school districts in the state of Texas. (p. 50).

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not make clear the specific commitments that the University will make to continue the support for the project.