

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2017 03:50 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** New York City Department of Education District 30 (U351C170037)

**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	9
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	14
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>94</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 4: 84.351C

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

Applicant: New York City Department of Education District 30 (U351C170037)

## 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:

The applicant's proposed target population focuses on serving and/or addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals in District 30, located in North West Queens and serving 40,011 students. All of the partner schools in District 30 receive Title 1 support, and therefore fall within the requirements for serving economically disadvantaged populations (pg. e73).

The applicant identified specific gaps in services with the proposed project services outlined to address them. Roots, Routes & Rhythms (RR&R) fills a need in New York City public education for teachers to address state and national social studies standards. By integrating the study of state and national history with arts learning and community-based resources RR&R dedicates a full year of professional development activities, research, and artist residencies to exploring the cultural influences of the diaspora communities from Eurasia, Africa, and the Americas on the music and dance we can hear and see today in especially in New York City (pg. 11-14).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not sufficiently document their application with data, or cite the proposed gaps in social studies achievement.

Reader's Score: 9

### 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

**of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant's proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. RR&R is rooted in Jerome Bruner's constructivist approach to teaching and learning by crafting and facilitating: 1) authentic activities that have a strong connection to the real world, 2) active, hands-on learning, 3) the use of students' prior knowledge and experiences in their families and communities, 4) deep knowledge and sustained research in a topic or discipline, 5) student collaborative work, 6) increasing complexity of understanding, and 7) access to content experts. Additionally, RR&R is also inspired by the work of Lucy Sprague Mitchell, who believed in making experiences educational for students by providing a rich and unified context for learning. She cites that this context helps students "connect with themselves, their community, and their local environment so that students see that their learning is relevant to their world, take pride in the place in which they live, connect with the rest of the world in a natural way, and develop into concerned and contributing citizens" (Chin, 2001) (pg. 18-19).

The identified teachers of the RR&R will be likely impacted by the two (2) main goals of the project services. Which are to build teachers' capacity and support teachers' ability to guide their students in seeing the connections between contemporary music, dance and art. This is proposed to be done by (a) using community resources and culturally responsive instruction; (b) addressing the challenges and promises of a highly diverse and shifting immigrant student population through cultural arts integration; (c) using strategies and resources to improve students' literacy and social studies knowledge and skills, while strengthening their ability to create, perform, and respond to the arts in measurable ways (pg 22).

The RR&R proposes to provide professional development services that are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration and will lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. Participants will engage in thirty (30) hours per year of professional development workshops through 5-day summer institutes and in years 1- 3; and thirty (30) hours of professional development throughout each implementation year, in years 2 - 4. Additionally, participants will design arts integrated units of study in collaboration with teaching artists, who will assist with editing and offering suggestions for community and online resources, content, and arts connections on the units of study, as well as provide one-on-one mentoring of educators through summer institutes and professional development sessions (pg. 26).

**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:**

The applicant has identified both key project personnel and project consultants, outlining qualifications, relevant training and experience. The RR&R project staff will include a Project Director and Project Co- Director. Additionally, other roles that have been outlined to support the project include oversight of the artist residency, content and curriculum review and artist selection. All identified staff has extensive experience in arts education.

Likewise, the qualifications, relevant training and experience of project consultants include collaborations with experienced personnel from City Lore's Education Programs, Harvard Graduate School of Education, as well as a wealth of experienced professionals in the field of music and arts education (pg. e87-95).

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant specifically outlines roles and responsibilities for both key personnel and consultants, the only identified key roles were the project director and co-director. This leaves ambiguity and insufficient identification of who would be ultimately responsible for the identified activities and tasks (pg. 87-88).

**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:**

The applicant outlines the objectives on the documented management plan clearly and includes the proposed activities, timeline, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, concisely summarizing the overall activities of the RR&R project (pg. e96-97).

The applicant details the process for feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project by providing quarterly monitoring by the principal investigators who will work with advisory of teachers from Community School Districts 25, 30 and City Lore staff throughout the implementation of the program.

The principal investigators will provide a formal evaluation report that will analyze and interpret all of the data collected throughout the previous year and will provide recommendations on successful aspects suitable for expansion and less successful program components that may need to be modified (pg. e96-97).

**Weaknesses:**

Although the applicant details and proposes to achieve the objectives of the project, vague and undocumented responsibilities, makes it unclear as to if the time commitments of the key personnel are sufficient. Likewise, the

applicant's timelines and milestones are vague, causing ambiguity and misalignment for ensuring the project will accomplish the proposed objectives (pg. e96-98).

**Reader's Score: 17**

### **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:**

The proposed project includes a logic model, which is clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project. The applicant proposes to examine two key questions: 1) What does it take to implement and sustain such a project? and; 2) If the program is effectively implemented, what are the impacts on four key dimensions of teachers' knowledge and practices known to affect student learning? (e.g., collaboration, enhanced content knowledge, strategies for conducting inquiry, and the incorporation of technology).

At the August meeting, a formal evaluation report that will be disseminated with the data collected throughout the previous year will offer recommendations on successful aspects suitable for expansion and less successful program components that may need to be modified (pg. e96-97).

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant vaguely details the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Likewise, the extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory does not indicate the use of documented best practices.

**Reader's Score: 27**

### **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**

**digital credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics.**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project documents the use of media technology produced by the applicant which will include video segments demonstrating specific step-by-step visual arts techniques aligned with those techniques taught to teachers at the PD workshops. This undoubtedly will necessitate the use of 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 (pg. e30).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant vaguely referenced the use of implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations (only digital mapping referenced). Processes 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 was not detailed.

**Reader's Score:**     **2**

---

**Status:**           Submitted  
**Last Updated:**   08/02/2017 03:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2017 05:28 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** New York City Department of Education District 30 (U351C170037)

**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	9
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	14
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>96</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 4: 84.351C

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

Applicant: New York City Department of Education District 30 (U351C170037)

## 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 provides thorough plan for serving disadvantaged individuals. For example, the applicant indicates that District 30 is located in North West Queens and serves 40,011 students. The most common ethnicities served are Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander (most common ethnicity), and with a graduation rate of 62% and 77% of students receiving reduced price lunch (classified as low income). In addition, the applicant indicates that all partner schools in District 30 receive Title 1 support, and fall within the requirements for serving economically disadvantaged populations. The applicant notes that many of Queens's schools serve students that attend schools with 50% or more receiving free and reduced price lunch. (pgs. 11, 12)

2. The applicant thoroughly addresses and identifies several key gaps as evidenced by research-based data. For example, the gaps identified include arts education being intermittent rather than sequential, and assigned rather than student selected. The applicant indicates that professional development resources go towards meeting the demands to increase math and reading scores that create a gap for providing resources for social studies and the arts. In addition, digital education in the schools is often as a standalone computer class for one to two week intervals. Technology integration across the curriculum is lacking. Students rarely have assignments to conduct original research that involves locating, evaluating, interpreting or synthesizing primary resources. The applicant will use an international focus that supports arts specialists interested in expanding knowledge of multicultural art forms. Roots, Routes & Rhythms (RR&R) dedicates a full year of professional development activities, research, and artist residencies to exploring the cultural influences of the diaspora communities from Eurasia, Africa, and the Americas on the music and dance heard and seen today in the United States (especially in New York City). (p. 14)

#### Weaknesses:

2. The research is lacking in the primary area of professional development, and the research is focused more on students. (pgs. e78-81)

Reader's Score: 9

### 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

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 applicant provided extensive evidence that the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. For example, the applicant indicates that RR&R is rooted in Jerome Bruner's constructivist approach to teaching and learning by crafting and facilitating authentic activities that have a strong connection to the real world, active, hands-on learning, use of students' prior knowledge and experiences in families and communities, deep knowledge and sustained research in a topic or discipline, and student collaborative work. The applicant documents other research-based strategies incorporated into the proposed project (e.g. culturally responsive teaching). (pgs. 18, 19)

2. The applicant provides detailed strategies to ensure the services provided by the proposed project will have an impact on the intended recipients of those services. The applicant provides two key goals that will ensure impact on the intended recipients that include building teachers' capacity to use strategies and resources to improve students' literacy and social studies knowledge and skills, while strengthening ability to create, perform, and respond to the arts in measurable ways. The goals set forth demonstrate the intent of the applicant to make an impact. (Pg. 22)

3. The applicant provides strategies for arts integration and technology infused professional development that will provide teachers with the foundation needed to understand, and to learn how to implement it in classrooms through arts integrated lessons effectively. For example, the applicant proposes to provide professional development (PD) workshops that will include a variety of delivery methods across different platforms. PD will include five day Summer Institutes (30 hours) that will focus on music/dance (e.g., jazz, rhythmic pattern – clave), interactive workshops, and performance demonstrations by guest artists. The applicant proposes to introduce different art cultures each of the three years. Year 1 will focus on Music and Dance of the Americas, including the United States, Year 2 on Music and Dance of Eurasia and their diaspora communities in the Americas and the United States, and Year 3 on Music and Dance of Africa and the African Diaspora in the Americas and the United States. In addition, the applicant will incorporate family engagement activities, mentoring and collaboration, and the design and implementation of Arts integrated units of study. (pgs. 23, 24)

#### **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:**

1. The applicant provides evidence that key staff has the experiences and training that is relevant for the proposed project. For example, the applicant provides job descriptions and responsibilities as evidence that key staff have the experiences and training in different areas of art as teachers, administrators or consultants. In addition, the applicant provides evidence of hiring staff from underrepresented populations (p. 28). Project personnel will include project director, project co-director, executive director, education program associate director, and other key roles (p. 29)
2. The applicant provides evidence that project consultants or subcontractors are experts in the field of the Arts or management of a project of similar scope and size. The applicant includes principal investigators as project consultants or contractors for the project (p. 30), in addition to the steering committee and PD faculty, Latin Jazz musician and PD faculty, founding director, and additional teaching artists. (pgs. 32-35)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide evidence that it encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color national origin, age, or disability. (pgs. e45-e50)

**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 applicant provided a comprehensive management plan to meet proposed objectives on time and within budget, and includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones that demonstrate the project can accomplish project tasks. For example, the applicant provides the names, titles, and responsibilities of key staff with the experience and qualifications to ensure successful fulfillment of meeting the proposed objectives within budget. In addition, the applicant provided detailed table that provides the project activities, timeline, person responsible, and milestones. (pgs. 35, 36)
2. The applicant provides detailed procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. For example, the principal investigators work with an advisory of teachers from CSD of 25, and 30 staff and City Lore staff who meet every three months throughout the implementation of the program to discuss successes and challenges and to work towards strengthening the program. In addition, the principal investigators will provide a formal evaluation report for the analysis and interpretation of collected data throughout the previous year and will provide recommendations on successful aspects suitable for expansion and less successful program components that require modification. (p. 36)
3. The applicant provides evidence that the time commitments for key staff will be appropriate and ensure that it can meet the objectives for the proposed project. For examples, the applicant indicates that the Project Director, will devote 20% percent of time planning, administering, and implementing the program. At City Lore, the Project Co-Director, will devote

60% of time, and Education Associate Director, will assist in coordinating the program will devote 30% of time to this program. (p. 37)

**Weaknesses:**

- 1) The applicant did not provide the responsible party for each objective/activity provided on the table (p. e99).
  
- 3) The applicant did not provide evidence that sufficient key staff with 100% (1 FTE) commitment to manage a project of proposed size and scope. (p. 37)

The applicant failed to provide a recruitment and retention plan for personnel for the proposed project. (p. e35-e39)

**Reader's Score: 17**

**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 provides an evaluation plan that includes the use of objective measures that will clearly relate to intended outcomes for the proposed project, and provides evidence to ensure the provision of qualitative and quantitative data by the end of performance period. For example, the applicant indicates two key questions will drive methods and performance measures that check for sustainability and impact of four key dimensions of teachers' knowledge and practices known to affect teacher learning (e.g., collaboration, enhanced content knowledge, strategies for conducting inquiry, and the incorporation of technology). The applicant provides a table that provides the summary of implementation and improvement measures for years 1-4, and a table with summary of teacher impact measures. (pgs. 41-42)

2. The applicant clearly demonstrated how the project will ensure that methods of evaluation will provide feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the applicant provides a table with summary of teacher impact measures that include analysis of teachers' formative assessments (feedback to students) resulting from these assignments. Additional summary of dimensions and measures that will track over time in participating teachers is included in the table. (pgs. 41-42)

3. The applicant provides evidence of using a strong theory approach for the proposed project. For example, the applicant's theory of change clearly illustrated in detail on the Logic Model provided. The theory includes short-term and long-term outcomes. The model describes the inputs/investments/activities for teachers and students, and is thorough. (pgs. 37-39)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide a plan for the measurement of all outcomes in the Logic Model for the proposed project. (p. 38)

Reader's Score: 29

## 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:

a. The applicant indicates a plan for the use of technology and Internet access to increase students' and educators' access to digital tools, assessments, materials, and open educational resources. For example, the applicant indicates the City Lore staff or guest faculty and artists will conduct interactive workshops in the arts and technology with guest artists and/or technology experts (digital story mapping, audio or video recording, or still photography) (pgs. 9-11).

b. The applicant presents innovative approach to providing technology-based professional development training for educators that include creating online customized maps with timelines that incorporate images, interview audio and video clips, playlists, and images. The project will include a digital mapping component provided by City Lore that has extensive experience working with digital mapping. The applicant provides details on how City Lore and ESRI partners will provide technology support, including the delivery of open source technology (p. 11).

#### Weaknesses:

a. The applicant did not provide sufficient details on how digital mapping will benefit teachers, or specific/thorough approach for the delivery of training. (pgs. 9-11)

b. The applicant did not clearly describe the integration of open source technology for the project. (p. 11)

Reader's Score: 2

---

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2017 05:28 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2017 01:59 AM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** New York City Department of Education District 30 (U351C170037)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	9
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	24
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	13
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	29
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	2
<b>Total</b>	105	94

# Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 4: 84.351C

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

Applicant: New York City Department of Education District 30 (U351C170037)

## 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:

There is interesting local information about diversity of Queens County and the number 7 subway line being the "International Express" (pg. e73).

#### Weaknesses:

The proposal states that subjects like arts and social students have been left behind (pg. e74) or that instructional time in social studies has decreased (pg. e75), but doesn't provide exact data or a citation.

Reader's Score: 9

### 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 proposal cites data from a previous AEMDD grant with similar services, which provides both current research and very comparable research on which to base this proposed project (pg. e77).

Pages e83-87 demonstrate a clear sequence of intense and sustained services for teachers, which makes it likely that the proposed services will have the intended impact on the recipients of the services.

**Weaknesses:**

It was a little unclear about the quality of the professional development services, as most of research cited to support the program design was about improving student outcomes (pgs. e78-81) instead of providing research on the efficacy of professional development programs for teachers. There was only a brief mention of teacher research on page e82 instead of a discussion of it in the narrative, and this grant is supposed to have a focus on professional development.

**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:**

The proposal offers excellent qualifications for the main contractor, City Lore, including testimonials from past participants (pg. e86) and evidence of City Lore's past impact on students in a previous AEMDD grant (pg. e77).

**Weaknesses:**

The proposal lacks a GEPA form (pg. e11) or an explicit statement in the narrative outlining a commitment to hiring practices that encourage applicants from traditionally underrepresented groups.

The proposal outlines the roles of the directors and evaluators (pgs. e87-e93), but not of the teaching artist contractors (pg. e93-96).

**Reader's Score:** 13

**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:**

The evaluator has a clear role and measures in place for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement (pg. e97).

**Weaknesses:**

The management plan on pg. e96-97 is vague, with no differentiation between activities and milestones, nor an assignment of responsible party to each activity listed per row, rather just a listing of activities and listing of people responsible. For example, the plan outlines that 40 teachers will be recruited (pg. e96), without offering any details about how they'll be recruited, who will recruit them, how they will be incentivized to participate, or retained, especially since the teachers are committing to a four year project.

None of the staff positions is full time, which doesn't seem like enough staff support to administer the logistics of such as large proposal (pg. e98).

**Reader's Score:** 17

**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:**

The teacher advisory committee (pg. e101) is a smart way to not only planning and reflection, but also continuous feedback and ways to refine the project.

The logic model (pgs. e98-100) is comprehensive and has clear outcomes for all participants, including teachers, schools, students, and teaching artists.

All of the impact measures in Table 3 (pg. e103) are support by specific research in the footnotes, which shows how this design is supported by strong theory.

**Weaknesses:**

Pg. e99 mentions that one of the longer term outcomes is to increase student achievement in ELA and Social Studies, but the logic model is the only place this is mentioned, without any details about how this will be measured in the evaluation narrative.

**Reader's Score:** 29

**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 proposal identifies a key need for students to be able to locate, evaluate, interpret or synthesize primary sources (pg. e74), and states that often students are only taught how to use Wikipedia or Google.

**Weaknesses:**

The digital mapping sounds interesting (pg. e72), but there aren't many details about it and the proposal doesn't really address how it will continue to benefit teachers (versus benefit students). There wasn't any mention of how teachers would be trained to use open source materials (pg. e65) or digital mapping.

**Reader's Score:** 2

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/02/2017 01:59 AM