

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2022 04:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S423A220030)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY22 SEED Panel - 4: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S423A220030)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 Points)

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:

(i) 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.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.(7 points)

(iii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(7 points)

(iv) 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.
(7 points)

(v) 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.
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The proposed program is of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice. Participants in the alternative certification pathway will be required to complete a 10-week and will be paired with a principal who has consistently raised student achievement for 5 or more consecutive years. Capacity will further be built through micro-credentials, evaluations using state mandated evaluation systems, and co-authoring white papers. The applicant has adopted a validated Logic Model framework – initially developed by the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Northeast & Islands, in collaboration with WestEd, to support the program's design. The proposed project includes the collaboration of fourteen partners with direct experience relevant to their specific contributions to the project. The proposed project will help meet identified needs by requiring leader candidates to sign an MOU agreeing to stay in their districts following training, and pairing candidates with leaders with a consistent track record for improving student achievement.

Weaknesses:

The proposed program is of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice. To become an instructional leader, candidates will participate in 14-months of study, to include 32 credit hours (e21), which is basically the equivalent of a Master's degree.

Educator preparation will be intense and robust through the project's design. Coursework for the program will teach critical skills and build content knowledge and be completed in conjunction with a clinical education program and monthly

colloquia. Candidates will also have the opportunity to earn micro-credentials to further their knowledge in specific content areas (e21).

Participants in the alternative certification pathway will be required to complete a 10-week residency where they will be assigned to shadow, collaborate and immerse themselves in the role of an instructional leader. Each candidate will be assigned to a principal who has consistently raised student achievement for 5 or more consecutive years and has consistently experienced growth in their school-wide accountability rating (e22). This pairing provides quality and intensity to ensure effective educator preparation.

The proposed program is designed to effectively build the capacity of educators. Through the program educators will have the opportunity to earn seven different micro-credentials, focused on specific areas of study. Micro-credentials will engage educators deeply in the respective areas of study, building their capacity and expertise related to specific topics and issues in education, such as social emotional learning, special education and English language learners (e23-32).

Professors will utilize state-adopted educator evaluation tools to assess each leader candidate, using the same performance domains used to measure effectiveness of educators in the state (e22). Aligning program evaluations to state evaluations better builds the capacity of leaders to function in the school districts they will serve.

Program participants will have the opportunity to become a member of a Network for Improvement that will allow collaboration with leaders across the nation who are successfully leading turnaround efforts in high priority schools and districts. Building such communities of practice will support educators in establishing a shared language, sharing and resolving problems in order to improve their practice (e32).

Each program participant will co-author a White Paper as a mandatory component of the program (e34). Preparing these white papers will further build candidate capacity as they research and synthesizes information related to specific topics.

The applicant has adopted a validated Logic Model framework – initially developed by the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Northeast & Islands, in collaboration with WestEd, to support the program's design (e41). The applicant has also provided a bevy of research to support the various components of the program (e38-39). Based on the proposed research and logic model (e41), the proposed project is clearly grounded in a framework that is likely to lead to building educator capacity and ultimately improving student performance.

The proposed project includes the collaboration of fourteen partners with direct experience relevant to their specific contributions to the project. This combination of partners will support seamless execution of the project and a greater likelihood of achieving the program's intended outcomes.

The proposed project is likely to lead to eventual increases in student learning. Leader candidates will be assigned to a principal who has consistently raised student achievement for 5 or more consecutive years and has consistently experienced growth in their school-wide accountability rating. This pairing will help build candidates' capacity to raise their students' academic achievement (e22).

To address the shortage of effective leaders, the propped project will require candidates to sign an MOU agreeing to use their leadership expertise in the service of leading transformation in historically underserved schools in each of the LEAs represented in the grant, after their training (e20). Requiring the MOUs substantially increases the likelihood that the pool of candidates will remain after training, increasing the candidate pool for the partner districts.

As part of the program, coaches will assist instructional leaders in increasing their capacity to provide critical feedback to teachers to elevate their practice and empower them with the tools to facilitate deeper learning in the classroom (e33).

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.
(6 points)

(iii) 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.
(6 points)

(iv) 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.
(6 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The magnitude of results for the proposed program is likely to be large. Up to 700 administrators and 85,000 will be directly or indirectly impacted by this program. Virtual learning communities and inquiry-based training resulting for micro-credentials will also add to the project's impact. Proposed costs for the project appear appropriate and reasonable (e125). Costs are clearly aligned to the program and its activities. The virtual network is low in cost and likely to easily be maintained beyond the period of funding for this project. The applicant has not provide a clear plan for disseminating results of the project. Information regarding the project will be disseminated in a way that is usable and allows replication of the project by others.

The magnitude of results for the proposed program is likely to be large. The program will provide professional learning for up to 700 administrators (district and school leaders) for all levels of Pk-12 schools, indirectly affecting nearly 85,000 PK-12 students enrolled in high-needs schools (e47).

Through training provided as part of the program that trains leaders to explore barriers impeding equal access to education across student demographic subgroups then deconstruct these barriers using an inquiry-based analysis of strategies, candidates will learn to use and apply inquiry-based strategies in other areas of professional practice (e47). This will indirectly expand the impact of this project and its training.

Developing a virtual professional learning community (i.e., Virtual Deeper Learning Network for Improvement) will further help widen the impact of this project, as virtual PLCs allow for increased efficiency and greater accessibility than in-person networks (e48). This expands the reach and input of educators contributing to the learning and problem solving of one another, related to their professional practice.

Proposed costs for the project appear appropriate and reasonable (e125). Costs are clearly aligned to the program and its activities and costs for travel, salary and contractual partnerships appear in line with expectations. With the expectation to serve as many as 700 administrators (e47), the requested amount of funding appears reasonable.

Virtual support structures, such as the improvement network has the potential to be scaled nationally to support building educator capacity throughout the country (e50). Maintaining a virtual network is low in cost and likely to easily be maintained beyond the period of funding for this project.

To further incorporate the project's purposes, activities, and benefits into the ongoing program, the applicant can develop

a training model that helps in alleviating school leadership shortages by increasing the number of qualified candidates who enter instructional leadership (e51) or create additional Micro-Credentials that meet the needs of aspiring and professional leaders throughout the nation (e52).

Information regarding the project will be disseminated in a way that is usable and allows replication of the project by others. Subsequent to the evaluation, the program will review all process evaluation tools and document the full process of project implementation, including sequence of steps, dosage of interventions, duration of project elements, implementation procedures, recruitment strategies, data collection strategies / tools (e66). This guide will allow others to have a full understanding of the project and how to replicate successful elements.

The applicant will create an impact guide, based on evaluation data and document the outcomes measured throughout project implementation (e67). This tool will codify project results and provide information to others on the project's success and lessons learned, in order to inform practice.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

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:

(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (10 points)

(ii) 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. (10 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant has provided measurable goals, objectives and outcomes for the project, but has not provided specific targets for each measurable objective. The provided management plan includes milestones, responsible parties and a clear timeline for completion. Detailed descriptions of each personnel's duties and responsibilities was provided.

The applicant has provided measurable goals, objectives and outcomes for the project (e52).

The provided management plan includes milestones, responsible parties and a clear timeline for completion (e57). Having a clear management plan with responsible parties, timelessness and responsibilities helps promote accountability and ensure the project is completed on time and on budget.

Detailed descriptions of each personnel's duties and responsibilities was provided. Understanding how each staff member contributes to implementation of the project supports effective management and execution of the project.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has provided measurable goals, objectives and outcomes for the project, but has not provided specific targets for each measurable objective. For example, the applicant has identified as an outcome, that there will be Increases in ELA, Math, and Science proficiency for students in schools of the candidates, but a specific number related to this increase was not identified. Providing clear measures helps produce an objective evaluation of the project and its outcomes.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)**

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

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(iii) 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.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(v) 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.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The proposed program evaluation will result in Strong / Moderate Evidence of Support per What Works Clearinghouse standards. The proposed project is likely to yield valid and reliable results, based on its design. The applicant has indicated that a process evaluation will take place to promote periodic feedback and assessment, but details remain unclear about how this process will be implemented. The applicant has provided objective performance measures (e63) related to the project's outcomes. Qualitative (e.g., site visits, focus groups) and quantitative (e.g., assessment scores, enrollment rates) data will be evaluated as part of the project's design. The applicant will produce an implementation guide and impact guide that can be used in supporting replication of the project and its outcomes.

The proposed program evaluation will result in Strong / Moderate Evidence of Support per What Works Clearinghouse standards (e38). Aligning the evaluation to these standards will help to produce findings that are valid and reliable.

As part of the program, professors will conduct independent assessments of students using validated tools to reduce evaluator bias (e22). This will help to ensure findings from these assessments are both valid and reliable.

The proposed project will include a process evaluation to evaluate implementation of the project. This will include collecting baseline data for each performance measure, analyzing, comparing and then reporting on it (e62).

The applicant has provided objective performance measures (e63) related to the project's outcomes. Qualitative (e.g., site visits, focus groups) and quantitative data (e.g., assessment scores, enrollment rates) will be evaluated as part of the project's design. Providing measures that are clearly measurable reduces bias and ensures objective evaluation of the project.

The proposed project is likely to yield valid and reliable results, based on its design. The proposed evaluation design will include control groups (e60). Including control groups will allow the evaluator to make stronger correlations between the program and student and school leader achievement.

The applicant will produce an implementation guide and impact guide that can be used in supporting replication of the project and its outcomes. The implementation guide will review all process evaluation tools and document the full process of project implementation for dissemination (e66). The impact guide will also be based on evaluation data and will document the outcomes measured throughout project implementation (e67), in order to inform the practice of others.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has indicated that a process evaluation will occur, and that data will be collected annually, and compared to baseline data, but it is not clear from the information provided, what data will be evaluated as part of this process, when data will be collected, what specific tools will be used to collect the data or how data will be used to make any needed continuous improvements.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 points)

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

The applicant will work to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educators through its partnership with several Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), including Tennessee State University College of Education, which is the largest producer of educators of color in the nation. Each of these programs have effectively designed evidence-based preparation programs to attract and retain instructional leaders of color (e16), as such partnering with these institutions will support creation of a new pipeline of leaders of color in the target areas.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities
(up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—

(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.**
- (ii) Elementary school.**
- (iii) Middle school.**
- (iv) High school.**
- (v) Career and technical education programs.**
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.**
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;**

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

The proposed program will offer a micro-credential, Closing the Achievement Gap to help current and future leaders create and sustain environments that provide equal access to outstanding teaching and learning programs for all students and educators (e17). Through the credential, candidates will learn to deconstruct barriers that impact equity, in an effort to close the achievement gap (e18). This credential will be earned over a six-month course of study. Candidates will be prepared to lead in K-12 schools.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs
(up to 2 points)**

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;**

**(2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and
(3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.**

Strengths:

The proposed program will include a competency based micro-credential in Equity in Education / Culturally Responsive Pedagogy / Systemic Change. Leaders will learn to create a sense of belonging, celebration and appreciation for students with multiple intelligences at various developmental stages from childhood to adulthood and across diverse cultural contexts, and help Leaders acquire a deeper understanding of how social and emotional competencies can be expressed and enhanced at different ages from preschool through adulthood (e19). This course will result in eight graduate hours of study and is likely to build capacity among administrators to examine and address students' social and emotional needs directly, and through their education.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/14/2022 04:18 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2022 05:03 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S423A220030)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY22 SEED Panel - 4: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S423A220030)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 Points)

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:

(i) 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.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.(7 points)

(iii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(7 points)

(iv) 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.
(7 points)

(v) 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.
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The applicant documents an evidenced-based approach for increasing the leadership skills of 50 candidates (i.e., two cohorts of up to 25 candidates each, that meet the criteria of “highly effective” teacher leader or non-traditional candidates who demonstrate the leadership core competencies associated with highly effective school leaders) that will serve in traditionally underserved LEAS.

The Logic Model appropriately outlines the conceptual framework and its alignment to the evidence-based professional development activities (e.g., cohort models, credentials, and coaching).

(i) Two cohorts of 25 candidates identified as “highly effective” and consistently raising student achievement levels for a minimum of 5 years will be provided a pathway to earn 32 credits that will complete their certification and licensure requirements as an instructional leader. Pg. e22, 30. 7 pts

(ii) The project design includes appropriate rigorous competency-based assessments designed to assess the skills, knowledge, and effectiveness of project participants using state-adopted educator evaluation tools that will assess and measure effectiveness. A blended coaching model that models teacher professional development will be implemented to improve efficacy and provide ongoing competency-based professional development (pg. e31-32). 7pts

(iii) The applicant appropriately addresses the efficacy of instructional leaders and their impact on teacher

effectiveness, school climate and culture, and the organizations' ability to sustainability, positive results, and gains in student achievements. The proposed professional development and coaching activities are supported by research from a three-year i3 impact evaluation of an intensive professional development and coaching program that meets What Works Clearinghouse Standards Without Reservations that provides one statistically significant positive finding (pg. e38). 7pts

(iv) Documented evidence of collaborative partners (e.g., The Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence-CSLO, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Harvard University) have committed to customized, evidence-based professional development that will provide a pathway for National Board Certification for teacher leaders, customized professional development for instructional leaders, and virtual blended coaching support for teachers (pg. e42-43). 7pts

(v) The proposed project design has been refined to address the challenges associated with the lack of well-trained instructional leaders prepared to lead high-need schools and districts. The proposed strategies (e.g., expanding the pool of highly effective educators to individuals who mirror the targeted population) that will ultimately increase the number of underrepresented groups in the district and increase equity (pg. e27). 7pts

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses were noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses were noted.
- (iii) No weaknesses were noted
- (iv) No weaknesses were noted.
- (v) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement. (7 points)

(ii) 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. (6 points)

(iii) 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. (6 points)

(iv) 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. (6 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The proposed project design will focus on increasing equity in learning and access over the three years, including micro-credentials that explore the barriers that hinder equal access; and addressing equity as the primary outcome for the project. The significance of the proposed project design is supported by appropriate and current research that will provide multiple methods for addressing the inequities in the targeted communities.

- (i) Over a three-year period, the project will address improvements in teaching and learning by providing 700 district and school leaders with professional development activities that will impact 85,000 students in PK-12th grade; and elevate virtual professional learning that will result in increased leader effectiveness and promote inquiry-based instruction using virtual learning networks. (pg. e4) 7pts
- (ii) The proposed costs are reasonable in relation to the number served as the majority of funds are allocated for professional development activities and interventions for staff that will provide direct support to meeting the project objectives and contractual partners that will provide in-service training (pg. e50). 6pts
- (iii) The applicant will invest a variety of resources that are designed to increase opportunities for scalability. For example, expanding virtual learning supports for school leaders in high-need schools and addressing the challenges associated with efficiency, and increasing equity (pg. e46). 6pts
- (iv) The dissemination of the results has strong potential for lasting impact as it relates to training models addressing school leadership shortages, specifically the mid-career changers and other professionals from underrepresented groups (pg. e52-53). 6pts

Weaknesses:

- (i) No weaknesses were noted.
- (ii) No weaknesses were noted.
- (iii) No weaknesses were noted.
- (iv) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

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:

- (i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (10 points)**
- (ii) 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. (10 points)**

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The management plan documents the alignment of appropriate goals to objectives, responsible parties, timelines, and milestones that align to the overall goal of raising academic achievement levels of high-need students through improved leadership effectiveness that has strong potential to increase the impact of the proposed strategies (e.g., launching and sustaining Non-Traditional Certification Pathways that address the need of increasing increase the number of effective and diverse leaders.

(i) Specific goals are described. For example, goals associated with increasing the number of leaders who attain advanced certification are aligned to appropriate data sources (e.g., completer rates). 7 points

(ii) The management plan details the implementation milestones, responsible parties, and timelines. For example, finalizing Micro-Credential Offerings will take place from October to December in the 1st year; ongoing in Year 2, with finalization taking place in July 2024. 10 points

Weaknesses:

(i) While specific goals are provided (e.g., raise the academic achievement of high-need schools), measurable objectives are not provided to adequately assess the achievement of the goal, and/or determine if the need to improve is warranted and by how much. (3 points not awarded).

(ii) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)

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

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook. (4 points)

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (4 points)

(iii) 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. (4 points)

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes. (4 points)

(v) 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.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

The proposed evaluation plan meets the What Works Clearinghouse effectiveness standards that includes a Quasi-Experimental Design (QED) assessment of the proposed outcomes to include comparisons associated with the treatment and control group. The evaluation will be conducted by an organization with 22 years of evaluation experience conducting process and outcome evaluations using data analysis reporting and feedback methods addressing quality improvement.

(i) The collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data using a quasi-experimental design that will provide sufficient information on the cause and effects will assess the impact of the project in meeting the needs of the thousands of students that are identified as enrolled in the targeted school districts (pg. e60). 4 pts

(ii) The proposed process evaluation will provide information that will allow for a review of strengths and challenges and test the validity of the model (pg. e61). 2 pts

(iii) Specific qualitative and quantitative data points are documented (e.g., increased percentage of LIFT leaders' schools achieving proficiency on State Math assessments at a minimum of 10% by end of the grant. 4 pts

(iv) Valid and reliable performance data that aligns with relevant outcomes are provided. For example, feedback mechanisms and strategies that will promote continuous improvement are designed and include opportunities for school leaders to attain feedback that will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear using multiple protocols (e.g., focus groups, annual surveys). 4 pts

(v) The proposed evaluation design will provide sufficient feedback to assess the fidelity and scope of the proposed evaluation design. For example, the applicant is proposing to conduct an internal and external evaluation; using program partners to participate in the internal evaluation, which will help to identify challenges early in the process, and that can be adjusted as needed (pg. e66). 4 pts

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses were noted.

(ii) The applicant does not provide specific details on what data points will be assessed to adequately assess this selection criterion (2 points not awarded).

(iii) No weaknesses were noted.

(iv) No weaknesses were noted.

(v) No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity
(Up to 5 points)**

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

A detailed plan for increasing diversity is provided documenting an intentional approach to partnering with various Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) that effectively attract and retain instructional leaders that mirror the targeted population.

The applicant will partner with a number of top-ranked Historically Black Colleges (HBCUs) in the surrounding area that have experience effectively designing evidenced-based preparation programs that attract and retain instructional leaders of color.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities
(up to 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—

(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.**
- (ii) Elementary school.**
- (iii) Middle school.**
- (iv) High school.**
- (v) Career and technical education programs.**
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.**
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.**
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;**

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

The plan for ensuring equity and access is provided with a focus on closing achievement gaps related to the attainment of micro-credentials and the need for equity and adequacy through support and training in differentiated instruction and

assessment (pg. e18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs (up to 2 points)

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;**
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and**
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.**

Strengths:

The applicant addresses the CPP documenting the evidence-based conceptual framework Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL)), that focuses on empowering school leaders with strategies for applying the core standards to the targeted schools in order to address the sense of belonging.

The ultimate goal for the program is to develop an understanding of the social, emotional, and cognitive developmental levels and age-appropriate tasks and challenges will inform the design of SEL standards, instruction, and assessment in the targeted schools.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/14/2022 05:03 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/14/2022 03:49 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S423A220030)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	96
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Educator Diversity	5	5
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
1. Promoting Equity	3	3
Competitive Preference Priority 3		
1. Meeting Student Needs	2	2
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	106

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - FY22 SEED Panel - 4: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence (S423A220030)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. A. Quality of Project Design (35 Points)

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:

(i) 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.
(7 points)

(ii) 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.(7 points)

(iii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(7 points)

(iv) 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.
(7 points)

(v) 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.
(7 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overall, the design of the proposed project is appropriate to and has promise to successfully address, the needs of the target population relative to sufficient professional development, capacity-building efforts, and collaboration of identified partners to ensure the project's successful implementation at the secondary level.

As indicated on p. e20, two cohorts of up to 25 candidates will be invited to pursue an accelerated 14-month pathway to becoming an instructional leader. As indicated in the narrative, for example, as a part of the preparation sequence, candidates will be required to complete a 10-week residency where they will be assigned to shadow, collaborate, and immerse themselves in the role of an instructional leader. A six-month course of study leads to 8 graduate credits respectively in the following areas that include but are not limited to: social-emotional learning differentiated Instruction and Assessment, Instructional rounds, and rigorous teaching and learning (pp. e25, e26).

The project design evidence sound capacity-building efforts that will yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. As a part of its capacity-building efforts, for example, the applicant proposes to implement a competency-based professional learning approach to empower leaders to eradicate low student achievement in historically underserved schools and leaders must be trained at every level – which includes – teacher leaders who aspire to become school leaders; assistant principals; principals; and central office leaders who have a shared language and framework for improvement (p. e36)

A comprehensive conceptual framework that demonstrates evidence-based activities to support the quality of that

framework is presented. For example, the proposed conceptual framework focuses on confirming the impact of instructional leadership on teaching and learning, inclusive principal quality of the impact of intensive professional development and coaching. Further, the applicant's conceptual framework is aligned with a logic model that demonstrates a causal relationship between the projects, objectives, inputs, activities, outputs, and the project's anticipated short, mid, and long-term outcomes (pp. e39-e41).

The collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services is well demonstrated. For example, the Center for Strategic Leadership and Organizational Coherence will provide coaching support to all instructional leaders and the Harvard University Strategic Data Project will provide customized professional development for instructional leaders, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning will provide instructional leaders across the target districts with tools for improving science protocols (pp. e42-e44).

The applicant well demonstrates a project design that is appropriate to and has promise to successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. For example, the project anticipates placing teachers in high-needs schools that are 50-100 percent free and reduced lunch and that are also designed as D and F schools based on the target state's performance rating. Other identified needs the project anticipates addressing include but are not limited to the lack of a pipeline of well-trained instructional leaders, and leaders lacking access to on-demand professional learning (pp. e45, e46).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. B. Significance (25 points)

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

**(i) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
(7 points)**

**(ii) 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.
(6 points)**

**(iii) 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.
(6 points)**

**(iv) 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.
(6 points)**

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overall, the applicant clearly demonstrates that the significance of the project is relevant to the identified needs of the target population. The significance is also appropriate to accomplish the specific activities anticipates carrying out relative to addressing the administrative leadership needs identified.

The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project includes but is not limited to increasing equity in education for the target area, expanding the impact and virtual professional learning, and promoting inquiry learning. As indicated in the narrative, the overall significance of the project will focus on testing the effectiveness of a multifaceted professional learning model designed to improve the leadership performance of current and future leaders by giving them tools and skills to solve problems of practice that impact student outcomes (pp. e47, e48).

As outlined in the project and budget narratives, the applicant well demonstrates costs that are reasonable to serve two cohorts of up to 25 candidates in an effort to raise the academic achievement of high-need students by improving leader effectiveness (p. e12). Costs outlined in the budget narrative such as personnel, travel, supplies, and stipends, are also reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project (pp. e127-e139).

The incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding is evidenced. As indicated in the narrative, for example, project funding will allow CSLOC and partners to launch and refine a virtual improvement network that can be scaled nationally to build capacity in educators throughout the country. Additionally, the project's partnership will continue to s to build virtual support structures and study and learn from the work that is emerging across the country, the partnership will seek to significantly increase the number of districts serving high-need schools and students (pp. e50, e51).

The proposal outlines a general process plan for which the results and strategies of the proposed project can be disseminated. For example, the project partner has the potential to create additional Micro-Credentials that meet the needs of aspiring and professional leaders throughout the nation. The grant funding also offers two of the partner universities the opportunity to pilot a clinical education program in the target state which has the potential to become a model for training new, nontraditional leaders and attracting non-traditional professionals into school leadership roles (pp. e51, e52).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

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:

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

(10 points)

(ii) 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.

(10 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overall, the applicant presents a comprehensive management plan that is sufficient to successfully implement the project's goal, objectives, and measurable outcomes. The proposal also outlines personnel to the project with clearly delineated roles and responsibilities to ensure the appropriateness of timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

One broad goal with clearly specific objectives and measurable outcomes that are appropriate and have promise to sufficiently address the needs of the target population is presented. As indicated on page e52, for example, the applicant's overall goal is to raise the academic achievement of high-need students by improving leadership effectiveness. Objectives with measurable outcomes aligned to the goal and that are appropriate to the design of the project include but are not limited to providing a pathway for 2 cohorts of 25 aspiring educational administrators by launching and sustaining a non-traditional certification pathway that results in licensure and certification to teach in PK-12 schools and to increase the number of leaders from traditionally-underrepresented groups who attain licensure/certifications (p. e52).

The proposal boasts a comprehensive management plan to achieve the project's goal and objectives. For example, the proposal includes a visual representation that clearly delineates the responsibilities of project personnel as well as timelines, milestones, for accomplishing project tasks, and project personnel responsible for each task or activity. The proposal also outlines the qualifications of core personnel for the project. The project director, for example, will be responsible for coordinating all components of the grant, as well as managing fiscal resources to ensure timely expenditure of funds, and lead the advisory board to encourage collaboration (pp. e55-e58).

Weaknesses:

The project's objectives were not stated in measurable terms.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**1. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (20 points)**

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

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(iii) 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.

(4 points)

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

(4 points)

(v) 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.

(4 points)

Please provide Overview Statement on top of first Strength comment.

Strengths:

Overall, the proposal's method of evaluation is thorough, feasible, appropriate to the context for which the project proposes to be implemented, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and intended. Further, the evaluation methodology has promise to produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that meets the WWC standards.

The applicant's methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations is clearly demonstrated. As indicated in the narrative, for example, the project will conduct process and outcome evaluation that links all partners through collaborative data collection, data analysis, reporting, and feedback, promoting continuous quality improvement throughout its duration. The evaluation will also examine outcomes for schools led by project leaders compared to outcomes by non-project leaders. Further, the evaluation methodology will involve the project evaluators constructing an action model for each year of the project that includes all events, linking the implementation timeline and logic model with evaluation activities to ensure all facets of the evaluation process are aligned (pp. e59, e60).

The proposal well demonstrates that the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the formative evaluation process will be used to determine if the project is being implemented as intended. Process evaluation monitors ongoing implementation in comparison to the funded scope and sequence of the project to monitor fidelity and promote timely, thorough completion of project services (p. e61). Additionally, summative outcome evaluation will be used to assess the effectiveness of the project and the outcomes of implementation on the targeted population as well as to measure indicators that correspond to the project's domains to determine the magnitude of results and project effectiveness in meeting needs (p. e52).

The applicant well demonstrates that the proposed methods of evaluation will involve 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. The proposal includes a visual representation of the goal, objectives, outcomes, and performance indicators that are aligned with the project's logic model, which is aligned to each objective. Further, the methods of evaluation will involve the use of a data-driven decision-making process to continuously improve to ensure the program will accomplish its identified goals, objectives, and target outcomes (pp. e53, e54). 2 pts.

The proposal's evidence sound methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. As noted in the narrative, the project's data collection and analysis will ensure each measurable outcome is assessed using reliable, objective, replicable procedures, providing feedback to assess the effectiveness and promote continuous improvement. Additionally, the evaluation feedback loop is designed to engage school leaders and solicit feedback to ensure diverse perspectives influence project quality and generate sufficient data to facilitate the objective process and outcome evaluation (pp. e64, e65).

The applicant outlines specific details regarding how 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. As indicated in the narrative, for example, external evaluators will conduct an objective and thorough evaluation of the project, and project partners will form a replication support team to disseminate evaluation results to stakeholders and promote the replication of successful strategies informed by evaluation data. Additionally, evaluation strategies promoting dissemination, replication, and scalability of the project include the development of implementation and impact guides (pp. e66 e67).

Weaknesses:

The evaluation tool is limited to data that will be collected from surveys.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Increasing Educator Diversity (Up to 5 points)

Under this priority, applicants must develop projects that are designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce through adopting, implementing, or expanding high-quality, comprehensive teacher preparation programs that have a track record of attracting, supporting, graduating, and placing underrepresented teacher candidates, and that include one year of high-quality clinical experiences (prior to becoming the teacher of record) in high-need schools.

Strengths:

The applicant presents sound information that the proposal is designed to improve the recruitment, outreach, preparation, support, development, and retention of a diverse educator workforce. For example, the project's design consists of evidence-based preparation programs to attract and retain instructional leaders of color (p. e17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 3 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunity for Underserved Students—

(1) In one or more of the following educational settings:

- (i) Early learning programs.
- (ii) Elementary school.
- (iii) Middle school.
- (iv) High school.
- (v) Career and technical education programs.
- (vi) Out-of-school-time settings.
- (vii) Alternative schools and programs.
- (viii) Juvenile justice system or correctional facilities;

(2) That examines the sources of inequity and inadequacy and implements responses that include pedagogical practices in Educator preparation programs and professional development programs that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status so that educators are better prepared to create inclusive, supportive, equitable, unbiased, and identity-safe learning environments for their students.

Strengths:

The proposal presents evidence that the applicant proposes a project designed to promote educational equity and adequacy in resources and opportunities for Underserved Students As noted on page e17, for example, one of the partner universities will provide mentoring and support to male teachers and school leaders of color at every level to attract professional men of color with the military, human service and management experience from nontraditional backgrounds and support them in obtaining alternative certification and licensure to serve as school leaders.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not indicate if project participants being prepared to serve as principals would serve at the elementary or secondary level.

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Meeting Student Social, Emotional, and Academic Needs (up to 2 points)

Projects that are designed to improve students' social, emotional, academic, and career development, with a focus on Underserved Students, through developing and supporting Educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and development that—

- (1) Fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress;**
- (2) Identifies and addresses conditions in the learning environment, that may negatively impact social and emotional well-being for Underserved Students, including conditions that affect physical safety; and**
- (3) Is trauma-informed, such as addressing exposure to community-based violence and trauma specific to Military- or Veteran-Connected Students.**

Strengths:

The applicant well demonstrates that the proposal fosters skills and behaviors that enable academic progress. For example, one of the project's partner IHEs will design a competency-based micro-credential in social-emotional learning that current and future leaders (p. e18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/14/2022 03:49 PM