

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2017 03:14 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** New York City Department of Education (U351C170064)

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

	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	24
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	14
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>103</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 5: 84.351C

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

Applicant: New York City Department of Education (U351C170064)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

#### Strengths:

1) The project is designed to serve a large number of disadvantaged students in the New York City system. The student population is diverse and the teaching staff also reflects the diversity of the city; 19.4% of the district students have disabilities, 13.4% are English Learners, and 75.2% qualify for free and reduced lunch. (pgs. 1 – 2)

2) One of the gaps cited is the need to align instruction to new standards. The project proposes to engage teachers in using standards-based instruction and deconstructing standards into learning targets to make learning clear to students. This project will address alignment issues with the new National Core Arts Standards and local standards. There are 40% of elementary school teachers who are not certified to teach arts. They will become a major focus for this grant project. Teachers will learn to deconstruct standards into learning targets so that students will be clear on their learning. In addition, 75% of teachers participating in a PLC reported needing PD for this purpose.

2) Realizing that there are no assurances that teachers can participate in all of the blended professional development (even though NYC teachers have a contractual 80 minutes a week set aside for professional development) and acknowledging that it is “often impractical, if not impossible” for teachers to leave their workplace to partake in learning. (pg. 3), this project proposes leveraging technology (StarTCHR) to engage teachers in online discussion, learning modules, chat, group messaging, and video conferencing. (pgs. 3, 4)

#### Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(2) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

**(3) 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.**

**Strengths:**

1) The services provided by the project include the most current best practices: engaging action research and reflective practice, blended PD and extending learning beyond face to face trainings, formative assessment as an inherent part of art making, learning targets, and the continuous improvement cycle. (pgs. 10 - 12)

1) The applicant provided extensive support in citing research that indicates that both blended professional development and professional learning communities, as proposed by this project, lead to greater teacher effectiveness and student achievement. (pg. 10) Included among the research is Barab et al., 2003; Duncah-Howell, 2010; Kulpa, 2015; Schalger & Fusco, 2003; Vaugh, 2004.

2) The project will likely result in improved instruction and student achievement. This is supported by evaluations of past work. Studies reflect statistically significant gains in instructional practice of treatment groups of teachers as opposed to comparison groups. (pg. 12) This project uses such research as a basis for design.

3) The quality, intensity and duration of the professional learning are well designed to make the project successful. (pgs. 13, 14) The use of blended learning including the development of teacher leaders to facilitate the learning of arts teachers across the arts disciplines, PLCs and structured observations provide an ongoing basis for teachers to learn share and reflect on their work. (pgs. 9 – 12)

**Weaknesses:**

2) There is no information provided which assures that the Aruba Wireless technology (hotspot) will work across the district. This technology appears to be a key component of the expanded access to the online resources. (pg. 3)

**Reader's Score: 24**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.**

**Strengths:**

1) The quality of key personnel for this project is of very high caliber. There is a wealth of experience in each critical area and ample specialist staff to support teacher professional development. Project directors have previously worked on USDOE initiatives in the arts numerous times. The Director for Teacher Development in the Arts launched and oversees the StarTCHR system which will be key to the success of this project. These people bring many years of experience to the table ranging from the classroom to current leadership roles in the central office structure. The Borough Arts Directors and Borough Arts Coordinators are a real plus providing real time accessibility and support directly to teacher leaders. (pgs. 14 – 17)

2) A special consultant will guide the project for the development of professional learning in the areas of standards alignment, learning targets, and assessment and will lead in person training. An expert in the field of formative assessment, she has authored and co-authored and served as an editor for numerous articles and books on the topic. A research and evaluation firm will conduct the project evaluation. The Principal Investigator has 15 years of experience with program evaluation. (pgs. 15, 16,17)

**Weaknesses:**

No specific strategies are provided to address how the applicant will encourage applications from persons who are members of disadvantaged groups.

**Reader's Score: 14**

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

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

**(1) The 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.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

1) The management plan and timeline is detailed, clear and precise. Responsibilities of each key position are clear. Responsibilities and assignments for each of the key personnel are appropriate and adequate to insure success of the project. (pgs. 19 – 37)

2) Built into the timeline are regular meetings (face to face and virtual), an online newsletter, opportunities for feedback and revision of various aspects of the project. There is a review of the spending plan target to grant activities each quarter. (pgs. 19 – 37) This is an excellent model for this large-scale project. The evaluation is designed to collect ongoing formative data which is designed to allow for timely and ongoing assessment of progress. (pg. 46)

3) The support for the project is strong with a number of people in roles that are designed to be responsive to the needs of teachers. The key project personnel have dedicated roles which will provide time to the project as needed. This can be seen in the management plan table. (pgs. 19 – 37)

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 20**

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

**1. 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:**

**(1) 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.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).**

**Strengths:**

- 1) Methods of evaluation described in the proposal are built around measurable outcomes and objective performance measures which will produce qualitative and quantitative data. (pg. 48) The proposal includes project outcomes designed to measure the attainment of project goals along with the data types that will be collected for that purpose. (pgs. 39 – 41)
- 2) The methods of evaluation provide multiple opportunities for performance feedback on a regular basis as the project progresses. Tools such as attendance sheets, online records, feedback forms, and badge analysis, along with portfolio assessments and teacher effectiveness measures help to determine success to meeting goal 1, which centers on the impact of PD on teacher effectiveness. Attaching performance outcomes to each goal for the project makes for a strong evaluation process.
- 3) The project uses a theory of change as a basis for design that proposes that sustained and intensive blended PD, clear student learning targets and actionable feedback to monitor and improve student success, that teachers will improve instruction. (pg. 47 – 50) The project uses a quasi-experimental model involving treatment and control groups for comparison purposes incorporating a baseline measurement. The project builds on strong research and previous successful research projects.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Priority Questions****Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology****1. Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:**

**(a) Using high-speed Internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources.**

**(b) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.**

**Strengths:**

The project proposal makes strong use of digital tools to support teacher professional development and professional learning. The current online learning system, StarTCHR, will be expanded to support blended professional development by making resources universally accessible to arts teachers. (pg. 3)

The proposal included building capacity for online chat, group messaging, and video conferencing among arts teachers. (pg. 3,4)

Teachers will be able to receive professional development credits through online modules focused on performance-based outcomes. (pg. 4)

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/24/2017 03:14 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2017 05:58 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** New York City Department of Education (U351C170064)

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

	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	12
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>102</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 5: 84.351C

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

Applicant: New York City Department of Education (U351C170064)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

#### Strengths:

Criteria 1 – The proposed project will serve students in the New York City school district. The applicant indicates that the district serves an ethnically diverse city in which 40% of students speak a language other than English in the home. Over 75% of students in the school district qualify for free or reduced lunch. P. 7. By serving students in the New York City school district, the applicant will address the needs of disadvantaged students.

Criteria 2 – The applicant has identified significant gaps that need to be addressed by the proposed project. Specifically, the applicant indicates that a high number of teachers responsible for teaching the arts do not have the training and credentials as arts educators. In addition, the applicant identifies a need to provide arts teachers with training that will allow arts educators to develop a sense of ownership of the standards. P. 2. The applicant states that there is a need to engage more arts educators in professional development. P. 3. The proposed project is designed to address these gaps by engaging arts educators in sustained blended professional development.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(2) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(3) 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.

**Strengths:**

Criteria 1 - The proposed project will provide services that reflect up-to-date the research on developing teacher effectiveness, supporting arts educators, and integrating the arts. P. 8 – 14. The applicant cites extensive research in support of the use of formative assessment, action research, professional learning communities, and blended professional development. P. 9-13.

Criteria 2 – Because teachers will receive a significant amount of ongoing professional development, reflection, and self-assessment through a blended model, it is likely that teachers will improve their pedagogy and their alignment with the learning standards in the arts. P. 5. In addition, students are likely to benefit from the use of clear learning targets and assessments. P. 7. The applicant's proposal to implement professional learning communities, action research, blended professional development, and formative assessment is like to improve arts teaching and learning in the district. P. 8-13.

Criteria 3 – The extensive professional development services provided to teachers will include 40 hours of blended professional development for each year. In addition, teachers will participate in ongoing professional learning communities and action research. P. 8-10. The applicant will institute an online professional learning community platform and process that will support the continuation of PLCs throughout and after the completion of the project. P. 14. Because the professional development services are based on research on high quality professional development, it is likely that the services will be of high quality. The services provided will be of substantial quality, intensity, and duration because they are ongoing, available on demand, and focused on self-assessment of results.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.**

**Strengths:**

Criteria 1 – The applicant provides specific information about the qualifications of the key project personnel. The key personnel for the proposed project have strong qualifications and experience with working with the arts and leading arts integration projects. For example, the project director and co-director have experience as teachers and as directors of grant programs and arts professional development programs. P. 14-15. The project director “has demonstrated success in designing PD structures that are effective in large school systems, working across hundreds of K-12 schools and in every arts discipline.” P. 14. The qualifications and experiences of the project director and co-director match the requirements of these roles. The applicant provides resumes for the key personnel that support the identified qualifications of the key personnel.

Criteria 2 – The consultants for the proposed project are strong. For example, the principal investigator has performed multiple large-scale studies and served as the evaluator for previous PDAE projects. P. 16. The consultants also include a consultant who will assist in developing the professional learning process related to standards alignment and formative assessment. This consultant is an expert who has published books on these topics. P. 16. These qualifications match the responsibilities of these consultants and are highly likely to support the effective implementation of the project. The applicant includes resumes and information about the consultants and the organizations that will participate in the project.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address discrimination or provide any specific strategies that will be used to encourage the application of members of groups that are traditionally underrepresented. P. 23-32.

**Reader's Score: 12**

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

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

**(1) The 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.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

Criteria 1 - The applicant provide a clear management plan that includes activities, benchmarks or milestones, timelines, and persons responsible. The activities included in the management plan are specific and clearly tied to the goals of the project. P. 19-37. The proposed management plan includes many discrete steps that must be taken to implement the project. For example, one activity in May-June 2020 is "Upload Content & Arts Assessment Portfolios on StarTCHR". P. 32. The applicant also provides a detailed budget narrative that indicates the budget for the activities listed in the management plan. The clarity and specificity of the management plan is likely to result in the project being completed on time and on budget .

Criteria 2 - The applicant proposes to collect data and feedback throughout the project through PLC discussions, online surveys, feedback forms, and portfolio feedback. P. 35-38. The collection of feedback is scheduled to take place throughout the term of the grant. Formal processes for continuous improvement are scheduled into the project timeline. P. 19-37. The plan for collecting timely and comprehensive feedback and implementing continuous improvement is clear and likely to be effective.

Criteria 3 -. The project director and co-director will devote 100% of time to the implementation of the project. P. 14-15. This time commitment is significant and likely to support the successful implementation of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

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

**1. 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:**

**(1) 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.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).**

**Strengths:**

Criteria 1 - The proposed evaluation includes both qualitative and quantitative measures. The applicant proposes to collect data from feedback forms, teacher effectiveness scores, assessment portfolio rubrics, surveys, and StarTCHR records. P. 40-41. The applicant identifies clear, specific project outcomes, data instruments and methods and data collection timelines. P. 39-45. The evaluation plan is clear and robust.

Criteria 2 - The applicant's proposal to collect data and conduct evaluation activities at multiple times each year will allow the applicant to gather performance feedback information throughout the term of the project. The applicant plans to use a formative assessment process with both teachers and students. P. 46.

Criteria 3 - The proposed project is an extension of a previous successful project. The applicant provides a detailed logic model that describes the applicant's theory of change. The logic model is clear and identifies positive short-term, mid-term, and long-term outcomes for teacher effectiveness and student engagement. P. 50.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Priority Questions****Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology****1. Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:**

**(a) Using high-speed Internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources.**

**(b) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to use implement the professional development project through a blended professional development process. The arts educators will participate in online training in the form of webinars. In addition, teachers will share their lessons online. P. 8-13. The applicant will leverage technology extensively to support teacher professional development.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/24/2017 05:58 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/25/2017 03:48 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** New York City Department of Education (U351C170064)

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

	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	23
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	12
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>98</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 5: 84.351C

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

Applicant: New York City Department of Education (U351C170064)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

#### Strengths:

(1) The applicant thoroughly describes the population to be served. The project will focus on serving the needs of disadvantaged individuals by training 424 K-12 arts teachers who serve 16,900 low income k-12 students in more than 300 Title I schools city wide (e23).

The applicant also describes the socio-economic index and racial composition of the entire school district (19.4% SWD; 13.4% ELL; 75% F/R lunch; 26.5% African American/Black; 40.4% Hispanic; 15.8% Asian; 149% White; 2.3% two or more races) (e27).

(2) The applicant methodically identifies gaps, weaknesses and opportunities that will be addressed by the project by describing a population of arts instructors that include a group that could be trained as teacher leaders who can train peers across the district and elementary teachers who have no art content knowledge but are required in their jobs to teach art (e27). There is also a need to provide arts instructors with professional development related to their art (e28). This project will address all three of these needs.

#### Weaknesses:

There were no identified weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 10

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(2) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(3) 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.

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes methods and strategies utilized by the NYDOE to ensure equal access and treatment of participants, such as recruiting through networking, referral, multi-lingual flyers... (e15-16).

(1) The applicant provides a complete description of services provided by the project that reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice by referring to the two projects that the USDOE supported (Artful Learning Communities (PDAE 2008) and Artful Learning Communities II (PDAE 2011) upon which this project is based (e33).

(2) The applicant provides a thorough description of the impact of the services to be provided on recipients by including the research about the positive effect of teachers' participation in PLCs on student achievement (e34). The applicant also describes the positive effect that teachers participating in Active Research (e34), Blended PD and Formative Assessment (e35) has on teacher effectiveness.

The applicant also describes that student achievement in the arts will improve (e37-38).

(3) The applicant provides a detailed description of the manner in which services provided are of high quality, intensity and duration to lead to improvements in practice by outlining how 424 arts teachers across disciplines will be trained in curriculum development incorporating their art; peer observations with descriptive rather than evaluative focus (e38) and professional learning communities both in person and online (e39).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant described how the art educators would be trained for sustainability but did not describe how their expertise would be shared with elementary teachers who have no art background, which was an identified weakness/gap.

**Reader's Score: 23**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.**

**Strengths:**

(1) The applicant provided a detailed description of the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel: Project Co-Directors (One full time Co-Director has 35 years as an arts educator, principal and district administrator. One part time Co-Director was Co-Project Director of Artful Learning Communities I and II); Director of Teacher Effectiveness and Online Learning (Currently serves as NYCDOE Director of Teacher Development in the Arts); Senior Grants Officer (Currently NYCDOE Senior Grants Officer); a Project Coordinator (TBH providing administrative support); the 7 Borough Art Directors (Currently supervising schools) and 124 teacher leaders (Five years teaching experience as NYC arts educators) (e 39-41).

(2) The applicant provided a thorough description of the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants: PD Coordinator (Expert in the field of formative assessment and curriculum development) and a Principal Investigator (Lead Evaluator of NYCDOE's PDAE 2008 and 2011 grants) (e41-42).

**Weaknesses:**

Strategies were not listed for how they will ensure diversity of applicants for the new position.

**Reader's Score:** 12

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

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

**(1) The 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.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

(1) The applicant described a complete and adequate management plan that should result in achieving the objectives of the project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks by narrative description (e 42-43) and also by including a chart indicating Dates, Activities, Milestones/Activity and Person's Responsible (e44-e62). A budget narrative is included that details costs related to all aspects of the project activities and person's responsible (e169-185).

(2) The applicant provided a detailed description of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the project by outlining multiple sources of feedback during multiple times during the course of each year (e43).

(3) The applicant thoroughly defined the time commitment of one Co-Director as full time.

**Weaknesses:**

(3) Time commitments of other key personnel were not included making it difficult to determine whether the objectives of the proposed project will be as effectively met as possible.

**Reader's Score:** 18

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

**1. 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:**

**(1) 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.**

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

**(3) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).**

**Strengths:**

(1) The applicant completely described the extent that evaluation methods include objective performance measures clearly related to outcomes of the project producing qualitative data by the following:

- Data will be collected on teacher participation in professional development
- Data will be collected on the impact that PD has on art content knowledge (e62)

Quantitative data will be collected on:

- Student and teacher performance on standard evaluations (e63).
- (2) The applicant thoroughly described the methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback using periodic assessments by including these methods on a chart (Project Outcomes – 300 targeted arts teachers complete at least 40 hours of PD; Data Types – Attendance sheets, StarTCHR records...;Timeline-Quarterly) (e64-66).
- (3) The applicant provides detailed evidence that the project is supported by strong theory by including the logic model (e75).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found in this section.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology**

**1. Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:**

**(a) Using high-speed Internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources.**

**(b) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.**

**Strengths:**

(b) The existing online learning platform, StarTCHR, will make all resources universally accessible through discussion threads and online learning modules. Aruba wireless high-speed hotspots will increase access to StarTCHR in identified schools. The grant will provide additional features to this system that will allow more teacher collaboration and institute a badging system that teachers can use for certification and recertification (e28-29).

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 07/25/2017 03:48 PM