

# 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
<b>A. Quality of Evaluation Plan</b>	25	25
<b>B. Quality of the Project Design</b>	25	25
<b>C. Strategy to Scale</b>	25	25
<b>D. Adequacy of Resources</b>	25	25
<b>Selection Criteria Total Score</b>	<b>100</b>	100
<b>Overall Application Impression (Required):</b>  The applicant has submitted a strong application for continuation of funding. The applicant has addressed the project selection criteria with pertinent data and description. The applicant has a clear vision of expanding the project with new cohorts and effecting a strong project implementation.		

## **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.

**Strengths:**

1) The applicant has provided a strong evaluation plan for assessing the project (pages 20-26). The strength of the evaluation lies in the involvement of evaluation team from the university of Kentucky carrying out a rigorous randomized trial (page 20). The evaluation will be expanded with the natural scaling up with 75 additional schools. The applicant will use both formative and summative evaluation and link the formative and summative evaluation. The evaluation is guided by clear evaluation questions. For example, the summative evaluation seeks to answer how schools adapt and apply the project model, and the summative evaluation seeks to answer specific questions such as relationships among leaderships and student achievement (pages 22-23). The evaluation seeks to develop a gradual spectrum of facilitator support as a product of project evaluation.

2) The project evaluation plan proposes the use of rigorous randomized trial that addresses the What Works Clearinghouse stipulations (page 20). On Table # 4, the applicant has provided clear objective performance measures and details for summative evaluation. For example, the project seeks to assess the statistically significantly improved teacher leadership (Table # 4, page 27) which is aligned to the project component of teacher leadership development and indicators of assessments as provided in Table # 1 on page 6. Table # 5 provides clear targets for project achievement. For example the project seeks to have all 75 schools in cohort B to develop a progress monitoring dashboard to support ongoing cycles of school renewal (page 29). The applicant on page 5 has indicated the use of qualitative data such as interviews and observations, analysis of school renewal process, artifacts and progress monitoring instruments.

**Weaknesses:**

1) & 2) 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.

**Strengths:**

1) The applicant has clearly indicated that the project has provided promising results and guides future replication. The findings of the qualifying project evaluation have demonstrated that the project has a potential for expansion supported by replication in new cohorts, continued development and refinements of the model, implement a broader dissemination, and developing a sustainability system (pages 30-32). The strength of the replication is the testing and implementing version 2.0 (pages 32-33). The project expansion is appropriately supported by continuous feedback in real-time and an adaptive approach. The new cohort of 75 schools will help in developing a guide to replication and refine the model of high impact leadership for school renewal with empirical evidence (page 34).

2) The applicant has provided an excellent discussion of the project strategies to build capacity and yield results. The applicant has provided three clear factors that address this criterion (pages 34-36). For example, the second factor seeks to build capacity and yield results by establishing processes and timeline for specific activities such as inclusion of the micro credentialing under the university graduate college provisions and promoting it as a pathway toward an educational leadership degree. Similarly, the project will work with the state department of education to incorporate the project elements into the state continuous improvement process (page 35). Moreover, the applicant also has provided in figure 6 (page 36), a school renewal aligned process and deliverables that substantiates strong capacity building to last beyond federal funding.

**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 in diverse settings. The applicant had implemented the first cohort of 75 schools and follow up school of the second cohort encompass a diverse range of district and school sizes and demographics that serve populations of economically disadvantaged students. The project incorporation of the school model into the state continuous improvement process and expanding the number of local districts and intermediate services will expand the number and variety of settings. Moreover, the project feasibility of achieving favorable results are vetted for continuous project improvement (page 39).

2) The applicant has indicated an effective plan for dissemination of project studies (page 40). The applicant has discussed both internal and external dissemination of the project information. The applicant has already produced significant number of research studies, publications, and presentations. The applicant is planning to publish a book based on project reports and use the state agencies for badging and micro-credentialing to increase the rate and degree of dissemination in schools within and outside the state. Other methods of dissemination include production of gold standard implementation guides and provide broad access to learning modules (page 40).

**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:   25  

**Strengths:**

1) The applicant has successfully discussed a working sustainability plan. The applicant sustainability plan has four clear strategies (pages 41-42). Sustainability is achieved through strategies such as development of human capacity, material capacity, structural capacity, and organizational capacity. For example, the organizational capacity is strengthened through update and enhancement of project elements, utilizing working relationships and establishing a center for school renewal through the university center for educational research. On page 42, the applicant has described the continuation of project activities at various levels such as the school, district, service agency level, school leadership level, state levels and the national levels. For example, at the school leadership level, the state professional associations are partners in the project, and they have provided a venue for dissemination the work to various audiences. On page 43, the applicant has listed partner commitment that clearly specifies project continuation such as by the state department of education, and state-wide collaboration.

2) The applicant has successfully demonstrated the incorporation of project purposes, activities or benefits at various levels (pages 42-44). On page 42, the applicant discussed the potential of project incorporation of activities and components such as leadership training at the school, district, agency, professional association and state levels. Strong partnerships are key to project activities' inspiration into the existing organizations. For example, four of the 16 school districts, have already incorporated

the school renewal principles into their system of school support for member schools through their instructional divisions, and the others have indicated by their support letters. Similarly, the university will institute a badging and micro-credentialing system to convert the micro-credentialing into graduate credits towards an educational leadership program. The applicant thus has created a clear path towards project incorporation.

**Weaknesses:**

1) & 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
<b>A. Quality of Evaluation Plan</b>	25	25
<b>B. Quality of the Project Design</b>	25	25
<b>C. Strategy to Scale</b>	25	25
<b>D. Adequacy of Resources</b>	25	25
<b>Selection Criteria Total Score</b>	<b>100</b>	100
<b>Overall Application Impression (Required):</b>		
<p>The overall design of the project is well developed and reinforces the overall goals the proposal anticipates accomplishing. The details of the design is what makes the project feasible for successful replication, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.</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 outlines detailed methods of evaluation that provides for examining the effectiveness of the project's implementation strategies and the project's overall impact. The following are examples are inclusive of the project's overall evaluation design.

- The designs includes the utilization a randomized trial process vetted by What Works Clearinghouse to guide the overall evaluation process (p. 20).
- An internal research team will use the continuous progress monitoring approach for collecting and using formative evaluation data to inform the implementation of Renewal Project components and activities (p. 20).
- The applicant will contract with external evaluators at the University of Kentucky for conducting further summative evaluation and efficacy testing as we expand and modify the Project treatment to a new Cohort
- The evaluation will examine whether extended practice has long-term effect on student achievement (p. 22).

In addition, the proposal includes clearly identified formative and summative evaluation questions that are anticipated to provide data relative to the integrity and fidelity implementation of the project's supports (p. 23)

The evaluation design will also involve the construction of a new propensity-score matched comparison group that meets What Works Clearinghouse for the building of evidence of project efficacy for Cohort B (p. 29).

(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 utilize three validation instruments to measure positive efficacy results on principal leadership, teacher leadership and their impact on student achievement. As measured by three different validated instruments (p. 11). The evaluation process will also involve the collection of multiple forms of quantitative and qualitative data to inform feedback loops for monitoring and adjusting the interventions for both cohorts (pp. 5, 20).

**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) The applicant presents a myriad of systematic approaches for implementing and evaluating the proposed project that will result in information to guide possible replication of the project's activities. As indicated on page 20, for example, the systematic approaches include but are not limited to:

- replication of the project's intervention in new cohorts of schools while yet testing the intervention refinements;
- continued research and development to further refine and validate the project for school renewal; and
- dissemination and scale-up of the project within and outside of the state.
- Utilization of a five phase Evidence-based and Organizational Learning processes

The proposal will also concentrate efforts on embedding the project into organizations and systems at local district, professional association, University, and lead state agency levels supported by partnerships and collaborations between those levels (p. 20).

(2) The design of the proposed project presents a robust process to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The process includes but is not limited to:

- replicating adjustments and refinements;
- establishing processes and timelines for specific activities to implement and test intervention adjustments and refinements and to sustain the dissemination and utilization of the project; and
- implementing a five-phase process that is anticipated to produce specific deliverables that move the school systematically toward implementation of a research-based student success change initiative (p. 36).

**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 thoroughly 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 state-wide partnerships and collaborations to provide broad access to schools all state and beyond (p. 37). The replication process will also include the training of school and instructional improvement personnel from the instructional divisions. In addition, the applicant proposes working with school leader professional associations to disseminate the project's approach through their school leader professional development programs (p. 38).
- (2) The proposal includes a plethora of mechanisms to broadly disseminate information on its project to support further development or replication. As noted on pages 39 of the proposal, for example, the applicant has produced a significant number of research studies, publications, and presentations for national dissemination. With the possibility of assistance from The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the guides, materials, and tools published by the project will be translated into a published book. The project is also proposing to collaborate with an educational entity that delivers high quality professional learning opportunities for K-12 educators for the obtaining of continuing education credits and micro-credentialing (p. 40).

**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:   25  

**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 established a micro-credentialing and on-learning system for training new leaders and facilitator/coaches and providing ongoing support for those already trained and using the project's approach in their schools and districts (p. 43). The state's education agency has committed to the incorporation of the project's elements and processes in the State's continuous improvement system (p. 43). The applicant also proposes the establishment of a center for the project through the Tate Center for Educational Research at Western Michigan University to continue research and development funded by both future grants and fee for service revenues (p. 42).
- (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. As indicated on page 44, such examples include:
- The project's renewal plan includes other organizational commitments to incorporate the project purposes, activities, and benefits into ongoing programs or systems (p. 44).
  - The partner university will institute a badging and micro-credentialing system in conjunction with the Graduate College prior learning assessment system so that educators who complete the project's modules and assessments will be able to gain micro-credentials and convert those micro-credentials into graduate credits toward an educational leadership degree program.
  - The applicant proposes the incorporation of the project into the state department of education's continuous improvement process that addresses ESSA requirements for school meeting the continuous improvement identification (p. 44).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses note.

# 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
<b>A. Quality of Evaluation Plan</b>	25	25
<b>B. Quality of the Project Design</b>	25	25
<b>C. Strategy to Scale</b>	25	25
<b>D. Adequacy of Resources</b>	25	25
<b>Selection Criteria Total Score</b>	<b>100</b>	100
<b>Overall Application Impression (Required):</b>		
The proposal addresses all of the criteria extensively. The project proposes to continue and expand its partnerships with schools, school districts and the state department of education as they continue to refine their model of school renewal.		

**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 describes evaluation methods to help the project examine the effectiveness of the project implementation strategies. For example, the proposal lists that there is an external evaluator as well as an internal evaluation team and denotes that their responsibilities are directed to summative and formative evaluation respectively. (p. 20). Also, the proposal provides the specific questions that will guide the evaluation process, articulates them with respect to their summative or formative purpose and aligns them with data and analytic approaches, which will help the evaluation address its questions (p. 20-26).

The evaluation plan in the proposal describes both qualitative and quantitative data (p. 26-29). Moreover, the evaluation plan provides objective performance measures for the project (p. 26-29). Each of these performance measures are explained and related to the intended outcomes of the project. (p. 26-29).

**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 demonstrates that the implementation and evaluation designs will result in information to guide replication. For example, the proposal states that the project will replicate the HIL model intervention in new cohort schools and test the HIL project intervention refinements. (p. 30-31). In addition, the project mentions that research and development will continue to further refine and validate the HIL model for school renewal. (p. 30-32). Plus, the project will develop a network of trained school leaders at the school, district and state levels. (p. 30-33). These components, and others, for the project suggest that the project will provide guidance for replication.

The proposal states how the project will build capacity and potentially yield results beyond the term of the grant. For example, the project will build the capacity for instructional improvement in 75 schools (p. 34). Moreover, the school renewal process will provide a model for strengths-based capacity building for educational leaders. (p. 35-36). This suggests that the model may offer benefits to educators moving forward.

**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 communicates the feasibility of scaling up the proposed project in several ways. For instance, the project has multiple ways for sharing the work of the project and communicating with educational professionals. (p. 37-38). For example, the schools that they will be working with will encompass the full range of district and school sizes and demographics of Michigan schools (p. 39). This suggests that the work from the project will communicate to many different contexts. Moreover, the department of education has recognized the results of the project so far, which suggests that the efforts align with the priorities of educational leaders at the state level. (p. 39).

The proposal lists a variety of ways that the project will disseminate information about the project. For example, the proposal states that the project has already produced research studies, publications and presentations for national dissemination (p. 40). Moreover, the project has produced guides, materials and tools to support practitioners use of the project. (p. 40). Also, working with the graduate college at WMU, the project will offer micro-credentialing for school leaders to demonstrate command and understanding of the school renewal model (p. 40).

**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:   25  

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides several ways in which there is the potential for this work to continue to receive support beyond the term of the grant. For example, the 16 school districts have committed to continue on as partners with the project. This includes continuing to provide cost-share associated with the project. (p. 43). Plus, the graduate school will continue to support the project as they establish a microcredentialing system through the university. (p. 43). Moreover, the proposal notes that the department of education has incorporated elements of the project into the state's continuous improvement system. All these examples, as well as others, suggest that there is the potential for continued support in the future for the project.

The proposal states that with renewal funds, the project will embed the school renewal model into the work of several organizations. For example, the university will institute a microcredentialing system for educators that participate in the project (p. 44). Moreover, the state education will acknowledge completers of the HIL learning modules to earn continuing education credits (p. 44).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.