

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2016 09:00 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	34
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	43
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
<b>Total</b>	100	77

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Development - 5: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

#### Strengths:

The proposal describes the magnitude of the problem in great depth, citing the need to prepare and retain the best teachers who can most ably teach the many high-needs students in inner-city schools. The NCES citation on page 2 shows the disparity in grade-level achievement between both students of color and those from low-income families compared to their white peers. Compounding the problem, as cited, is the great loss of high-performing teachers each year. Quasi-experimental methods referenced on page 7 show numerous advances through the approaches of Leading Educators. The project builds on prior findings and existing relationships.

#### Weaknesses:

It is unclear to what extent the cycles of professional learning are new strategies.

Reader's Score: 34

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
- (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

Goals, objectives, and outcomes (p.12) are developed in the narrative and in an enhanced sample view of Scope and Sequence included as an appendix and to be adapted to this project. Responsibilities, timelines, and milestones are clearly delineated, and key personnel (e.g. program director, program coordinator) are budgeted at 100% of their time. Procedures for feedback and continuous improvement are specifically detailed by week, month, quarter, semi-annual, and annually. State-level and national dissemination of findings includes multiple print, conference, and Web-based media.

**Weaknesses:**

Some outcomes are not written in measurable terms.

**Reader's Score: 43**

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

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

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

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/22/2016 09:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 04:56 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	35
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	38
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
<b>Total</b>	100	73

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Development - 5: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

### Strengths:

The applicant provides research findings on the need for college and career preparation through preparing and retaining quality teachers to teach high academic standards throughout the nation as well as in the Chicago area schools targeted for this project on page 2.

On page 8, the proposal identifies the development of teacher leaders with a focus on content as a promising and proven alternative to existing strategies currently being used throughout the Chicago Common Core Collaborative network of schools.

The applicant does provide evidence of its focus on developing Teacher Leaders as an absolute priority focusing on College and Career-Ready standards on page 9.

### Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 35

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing

**project tasks.**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant includes objectives, and outcomes for the proposed project on page 11 such as Teacher Leader and Mentee Teachers as well as increased content knowledge all designed to increase College and Career Readiness for students.

On page 15, the proposal includes responsibilities, timelines and milestones that are appropriate and designed to monitor the effectiveness of the project.

The applicant does include a mechanism for continuous feedback through monthly meetings, campus based staff meetings, telephone calls and webinars as indicated on page 20 which should be sufficient for project success.

The applicant suggests numerous dissemination methods such as articles, white papers, website and conferences on page 20 that will ensure widespread dissemination of the project details and results.

**Weaknesses:**

The outcomes stated on page 12 are not measurable in some cases. For example, the outcome of increased content knowledge by teachers doesn't indicate what increase would constitute successful growth in content knowledge.

It is not clear what the overall goal or goals are for this project as stated on page 11.

**Reader's Score: 38**

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

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

**(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project**

evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

Scored by another reviewer.

**Weaknesses:**

Scored by another reviewer.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/21/2016 04:56 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/23/2016 11:26 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	35
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	42
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	0
<b>Total</b>	100	77

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Development - 5: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

### Strengths:

The application has a well-developed narrative regarding (1) poor high-performing teacher and school leader retention and replacement (pgs. 1-2) and (2) the lack of teacher pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) with K-12 college- and career-ready standards, particularly in the inner city (the project's area of focus; pg. 2). The application also articulates the need to develop teacher leaders—as team leaders and peer coaches—to support successful implementation of college- and career-ready standards resulting in student achievement gains (pg. 4). The narrative is supported with current research.

The Chicago Common Core Collaborative project's innovation is the incorporation of Cycle of Professional Learning and content-specific standards-based approach (pg. 8) to a Teacher leader development programs for which external evaluation has shown positive outcomes in teacher leadership growth, student achievement, and teacher retention (pg. 7). The application states that to date, there are no studies on the impact of teacher leadership on student achievement in the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) database (pg. 9).

The methods of professional learning communities to select, develop, and reflect upon Common Core standards curriculum and use student data and teacher practice data to identify gaps in teacher PCK well-addresses the implementation of internationally benchmarked college- and career-ready standards and assessments.

### Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 35

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

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

**(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The goal of the Chicago Common Core Collaborative increasing the reach and impact of Teacher Leadership across the city of Chicago in a more cost-effective and sustainable way is clearly specified (pg. 11). The goal is delineated further into 5 measurable outcomes (pg. 12) and five key project actions (pgs. 12-13).

A well-defined management plan complete with clearly defined responsibilities (15-18), timelines, and milestones (pg. 18-19) are present in the application. A Budget Narrative is provided; though there are no justifications for expenses, direct costs descriptions appear to be adequate for the project's proposed actions.

The applicants describe daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, semi-annually, and annually procedures that involve multiple circles of project stakeholders (pgs. 20-21) for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Presenting at national professional conferences and publishing in peer-reviewed journals as well as one the stakeholder's website are adequate mechanisms to broadly disseminate information on Common Core Collaborative project to support further development or replication (pg. 21).

**Weaknesses:**

The measurable outcomes of the cost-effectiveness component of the project goal are not described; however, the application does include as milestones financial and management reports (pgs. 18-19).

**Reader's Score: 42**

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

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

**(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

**Strengths:**

n/a

**Weaknesses:**

n/a

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/23/2016 11:26 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/22/2016 09:52 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

**Reader #4:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	0
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
<b>Total</b>	100	16

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Development - 5: 84.411C

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

#### Strengths:

NA - scored by another reviewer

#### Weaknesses:

NA - scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
- (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

#### Strengths:

NA - scored by another reviewer

**Weaknesses:**

NA - scored by another reviewer

**Reader's Score:**      0

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

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

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

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

The applicant identified key questions for its evaluation that address student growth according to state standardized assessments, shared leadership and school climate as well as implementation fidelity (page 23). These questions are aligned with the project design and logic model (page 4).

The applicant plans to assess the project's impact for students of teacher-leaders, mentee teachers, and students of non-mentee teachers (page 22). Compared with the control group, this can provide important information on the proposed project's efficacy.

The applicant identified appropriate expected outcomes for teacher and student participants in its objectives (pages 11-12). They correlate with the project design and evaluation plan.

The evaluation meets What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards, because the applicant plans to use randomized controlled trials and an experimental design (page 22). The evaluation plan is designed at an appropriate scale with an adequate minimum effect size (page 25).

The applicant's plans for principals to pre-select teacher-leaders will provide a way to compare impact for experimental and treatment groups by teacher-leaders and mentee teachers (page 24). This will provide specific research data on program efficacy for teacher participants at varying levels of leadership.

The logic model provides information about the proposed project's inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes (page 4). This is aligned with the project design and evaluation plan.

The applicant has identified a well-qualified, experienced external evaluator for the proposed project and has clearly defined responsibilities. It has allocated sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively (pages 21-22, 25, resumes, budget narrative).

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation plan to assess fidelity of implementation is designed to only monitor attendance, school visits, and participant satisfaction (page 23). There is no plan to assess whether new strategies are actually being implemented as designed.

The applicant described minimal data that will be collected for evaluation: student-level achievement data, teacher-level files, and annual 30 minute surveys for teachers (pages 24-25).

It is unclear if adequate information will be collected to respond to the key questions identified in the evaluation plan. It is unclear if the 30 minute surveys will report subjective information on teacher perceptions or objective information on the project's efficacy (page 25). The evaluation plan does not include information on tools that will be used to measure shared leadership, learning climate, and instructional capacity or how this data will be analyzed (pages 22-24).

The applicant did not describe any analytic approaches it will use in response to data collected for key questions (pages 22-24).

The applicant did not describe how its evaluation will adequately represent implementation for diverse settings or diverse student groups (pages 21-25).

**Reader's Score:** 16

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/22/2016 09:52 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2016 05:38 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	0
<b>Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan</b>		
1. Project Design/Mgmt. Plan	45	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
<b>Total</b>	100	15

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - i3 Development - 5: 84.411C

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Leading Educators, Inc. (U411C160040)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Design and Management Plan

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

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.
- (4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

**(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant lists four key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, including impact and impact research questions (page 23). Most of these are aligned with the project objectives (page e17). All of the research questions are aligned with the proposed theory of change (page 4).

The methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Evidence Standards with reservations. The selection process meets WWC standards because the applicant proposes to randomly select 10 schools to serve as the cohort 1 treatment schools and the remaining schools in the district will serve as comparison schools. An additional 10 schools will be randomly selected to serve as cohort 2 schools in the second year of the study, permitting the evaluation to examine one-year and two-year treatment impact (page 24). The applicant proposes to use a reliable and validate instrument, the 5Essentials survey to examine the effects of the treatment on essential components for school success (page 14).

The applicant proposes to contract with RAND, an organization that has extensive experience in evaluating education programs (pages 21-22) to carry out the proposed evaluation. The evaluation team includes experts in experimental and quasi-experimental design to implement the proposed impact and implementation studies (pages 21-22). The applicant proposes to allocate 15% of the total budget to the evaluation (page 25), which should be sufficient resources to carry out the evaluation as planned.

**Weaknesses:**

The key questions do not directly address two of the project objectives: increasing teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, and ensuring 75% of the teacher leaders are still working in a Chicago Common Core Collaborative school (page 12). The measures for assessing fidelity are limited to attendance and participation; no measure of quality of fidelity is included to ensure that the project is implemented as designed or if schools vary regarding the degree of fidelity of implementation (page 23).

The applicant does not have confirmed commitments from many of the proposed partner schools including Schools That Can, Oak Park Schools, and the Noble Network of Charter Schools (page e17) and does not discuss how it will ensure it will have the participation of the 20 schools required for its proposed evaluation design (page 14). The applicant states that it will use student-level achievement data on scaled scores for standardized exams for all tested grade levels (page 24). However, the applicant does not identify the names of the assessment(s) that will be used or how it will create valid analysis models during years that students are not tested. This is particularly important because the applicant proposes

to analyze data across a four year period: 2017-18 through 2020-21 (page 24).

**Reader's Score:** 15

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/21/2016 05:38 PM