

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/24/2017 03:25 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: Carbon-Lehigh Intermediate Unit #21 (U351C170072)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	10	10
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	16
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Total	105	98

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Carbon-Lehigh Intermediate Unit #21 (U351C170072)

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 proposal addresses a need to introduce disadvantaged students to the technology tools and processes used in design thinking. This will provide students with exposure to thinking and technology skills connected to high paying jobs that exist in the community. (pgs. e20 – e22) There is a 45% poverty rate for the general Carbon-Lehigh service area. (pg. e21)

2) Gaps are defined as training for arts teacher training, specifically training on the use of emerging technologies connected with the job market and bringing the perspective of the artist into the design thinking model. The proposal is to assure that disadvantaged students are exposed to this technology and thinking skills during in-school art classes. The premise is that those who are able to use artistic thinking and creativity in the design thinking process through these technologies will have improved access to those higher wage sectors of the economy. (pg. e22,22)

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) There are nine specific research studies cited (on pages e28 through e32) which cite key practices in arts integration, how the arts make learning meaningful, how they level the playing field for disadvantaged students, and simulate success habits. Studies also support key practices in professional development to insure measurable impact on student learning. (pgs. e31, e32)
- 2) Following the exemplary practices identified by Robinson and Timperley (2007), Green (2003,2007), Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University (2003), and Burnaford and Scripp (2012) this professional development project is designed so that the likely impact will be development of technology production skills in arts teachers and students in participating schools through the use of makerspaces for arts instruction. The integration of arts with technology and the development of design thinking skills by both teachers and students lend themselves to the growing workforce of the area. Insuring that disadvantaged students have this opportunity during in-school art classes provides them the opportunity to become competitive in the workforce. (pg. e32)
- 3) A proposed 72 hours of training over each year of the project includes 40-hour summer intensive trainings, with 16 hours of follow up workshops and 16 hours of online work in a professional learning community. This amounts to a tremendous amount of training for teachers. The summer institutes provide an immersion in learning and a strong foundation for the following trainings to build upon. Using multiple delivery methods enhance the PD by supporting individual learning preferences.

Weaknesses:

None.

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) Key project personnel include staff from the Carbon-Lehigh Intermediate Unit educational service center. The staff qualifications reflect a history of providing services and bring a solid background and experience in working in partnerships with educational agencies and schools in the areas of consulting, student programs, online learning, facilitation of organizations and meetings, and technical support. (pg. e36)
 - 1) Project personnel have demonstrated skills in leadership and management, developing curriculum for professional development, the use of inquiry, intermedia visual art, and program evaluation. The co-director for the project will be the Director of Curriculum, Instructions and Educational Technologies for the service center. (pgs. e37 – e42)
 - 2) The other co-Director for the project is from the Da Vinci Science Center (DSC) and serves as Senior Director of Science and Strategy and the center's Chief Scientist. With a background in professional develop he will lead the creation of the PD curriculum and serve as a liaison for teaching artists who will teach the workshops. Other DSC personnel will provide expertise in inquiry, logistical support and evaluation. An international computer artist also joins the project. The Da Vinci Center has a record of working with afterschool STEM education with high-poverty, high-minority schools. (pg. e35) They provide training to combat discrimination and markets opportunities to families of color. The center explicitly encourages significantly underrepresented women in STEM through their Women in Science and Engineering mentoring and networking events. (pg. e35)
- Both CLIU and DSC facilities are ADA compliant. (pg. e35)

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 15

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 timeline includes spans of months, team responsibilities, and milestones for the first year of the project. (pgs. e44 – e47)

2) The timeline includes opportunities to gather input and feedback from participants including pre and post surveys from the summer workshop, daily feedback during the workshop, coaching sessions, and the use of the professional learning community to support continuous improvement.

Weaknesses:

1) The timeline is general, includes only monthly spans, and does not include names of those responsible to complete tasks. (pgs. e44-48) The timeline only includes the first year of the project which is a planning year. Implementation years are assumed to be similar.

3) Time commitments are based on past projects and only detail the professional development curriculum lead at 15 – 20%, the Project Director at 5% and the Da Vinci Science Center Professional Development Coordinator at 50%. (pg. e49) Based on the narrative is it difficult to determine the actual scope of the project. 5% therefore is light on the part of a Project Director.

Reader's Score: 16

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 evaluation will be conducted by Research for Better Schools as PHMC (RBS) a highly experienced organization in the evaluation of teacher professional development. The project evaluation plan includes objective performance measures utilizing evaluation questions, data collection methods, and reporting that align with federal requirements. (pg. 50) RBS has a long history of evaluating teacher professional development. Most of their work conducted over the past 15 years centers on evaluating the impact of teacher professional development on learning. They have demonstrated the ability to design and carry out evaluations of educational interventions that meet with What Works Clearinghouse standards.

2) The evaluation will include mixed methods in the collection of formative and summative data. (pg. e51, e52) Data will be collected for this purpose at multiple time points over two years to assess the degree that outcomes are being met in the quasi-experimental design of the project.

3) A clear and concise table of the external evaluation process which includes variables, methods, sources, frequencies, and responsible parties is included. (pgs. e53 – e55). The project is supported by strong theory, built on current research, and incorporating strong research practices (e.g., quasi-experimental) and Impact Logic Model. (pg. e74)

Weaknesses:

According to the citation in the proposal (Bobronnikov, 2010), in order to effectively make an evaluation of the project 60 participating teachers are needed to properly study teacher level outcomes. (pg. e51) This will likely impact data reliability in some cases if cohorts of 20 teachers per year are recruited. The abstract for the grant suggests that 40 to 80 teachers will be involved over the entire project. This is a key factor in the ultimate success of the project for teacher outcomes and seems to be a built-in challenge.

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

Strengths:

The project will introduce new technologies to arts teachers and their students. Using this technology will engage students and teachers in seeking digital materials online to incorporate into digital art products.

Teachers will be involved in an online Professional Learning Community. 16 hours of the 72 hours of professional development per year will be delivered through this PLC.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/24/2017 03:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/18/2017 09:17 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: Carbon-Lehigh Intermediate Unit #21 (U351C170072)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	10	10
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	25
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Total	105	97

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Carbon-Lehigh Intermediate Unit #21 (U351C170072)

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 applicant proposes to provide services to students in the Carbon-Lehigh school district. The applicant indicates that 45% of the student population are economically disadvantaged. In addition, the applicant indicates that the district serves towns with concentrated poverty rates of 50 -60%. P. E20.

Criteria 2 - The applicant identifies a need for “increased designed thinking” and “increased capability for teachers to deliver education that will grow these design thinking skills”. P. E22. The applicant also identifies a participation gap in STEM and outside of school programs. P. E24 The proposed project is planned to close these gaps by training teachers to implement the use of in-school makerspaces and new technology tools in the arts.

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 applicant proposes to provide 72 hours of professional development for arts educators P. E32. The training will be focused on increasing teacher’s skills in “using digital design and fabrication tools in the production and teaching of art”. P. E32. The applicant presents up-to-date research on effective practices for professional development.

Criteria 2 – The proposed project is likely to have a positive impact on the participant’s use of makerspaces and available STEM resources in arts instruction. The focus on providing professional development and support to allow teachers to make use of available resources is likely to benefit teachers and students. Disadvantaged students are likely to benefit from increased access to STEAM experiences. P. E32.

Criteria 3 - The applicant proposes to provide a total of 72 hours of professional development over the course of the four-year grant term. P. E33. This will include a summer art and technology intensive workshop, follow-up workshops, and online learning communities. The applicant also states that the applicant will engage groups in train the trainer workshops. The design of the professional development project is based on research and is, therefore, highly likely to be high quality. P. E32. The quality, duration and intensity of professional development has the potential to lead to improvements in arts instruction.

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 indicates a history of taking specific steps to market to members of traditionally underrepresented groups. The applicant plans to issue a “specific invitation for these communities to apply”. P. E36.

Criteria 1 –The applicant provides detailed information about the qualifications of the key project personnel. The project director is a full-time director in the school district. She has experience as a teacher and building administrator as well as experience as an online instructor. The project director has particular strength in promoting the integration of technology. P. E37. The qualifications of the key personnel match their roles and responsibilities. The applicant provides resumes for the key personnel that support the descriptions of the staff qualifications.

Criteria 2 – The applicant identifies key project consultants who will serve as members of the project leadership team. For example, proposed staff have extensive experience working with the DaVinci Science Center. They possess significant knowledge about integrating STEM and providing professional development for educators. P. E38-E40. The project consultants also include an individual with significant knowledge and experience in the arts.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 provides a management plan that includes activities, timelines, milestones and responsibilities for key personnel. The management plan includes activities related to data collection and analysis, PLC implementation, coaching and demonstration visits, annual reports, and teacher workshops. P. E44 – E47. The applicant also provides a detailed budget narrative that includes budgetary allocations for the activities in the management plan. The management plan clear, detailed, and likely to result in the project being completed on time and on budget.

Criteria 2 – The applicant proposes to gather feedback throughout the term of the project. For example, the applicant plans to collect feedback through end-of-workshop surveys. The applicant also intends to collect informal verbal feedback during coaching sessions and during “huddles at the beginning or end of each day.” P. E49.

Weaknesses:

Criteria 2- The applicant does not indicate a formal process or timeline for planning and implementing improvements based on feedback. In the absence of a formal process for planning for improvement, it is unlikely that feedback will result in continuous improvement. P. E49. Although the applicant indicates the intention to collect feedback through huddles and coaching conversations, the applicant does not indicate how the applicant will ensure that the feedback provided will be analyzed and used to make improvements to the project.

Criteria 3 – The applicant indicates that the project director and key consultant will provide 5% and 15-20% of their time to the project. P. E49. In addition, the professional development coordinator will commit 50% time to the project. It is unlikely that these time commitments will be sufficient to support the effective implementation of the project.

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 plan includes a variety of performance measures that will produce both quantitative and qualitative data. The proposed data collection procedures will include annual surveys and interviews. P. E53-55.
Criteria 2 – The applicant proposes to use annual teacher and student surveys to gather data for the project. The applicant indicates that the applicant will also receive feedback through “quarterly leadership meetings, regular and repeated workshop planning meetings and teacher coaching”. P. E55
Criteria 3 – The applicant provides a clear and detailed logic model that supports the theory of change. The applicant identifies numerous short-term, intermediate and longer-term outcomes. For example, one significant short-term outcome is “increased used of advanced technology and diverse media, as reported by art students compared to non-participant classrooms”. P. E74.

Weaknesses:

Criteria 1 – The applicant does not indicate specific goals or measurable objectives by which the effectiveness of the project could be measured. For example, the applicant identifies “teacher’s fidelity of implementation of technology integration” as a variable. P. E53. However, the applicant does not indicate the level of fidelity that would indicate success.
Criteria 2 – The applicant proposes to collect survey feedback annually as a part of the evaluation plan. Although the applicant indicates that the applicant will gather feedback through leadership meetings, coaching and planning meetings, more frequent formal evaluative feedback such as feedback provided through the surveys is necessary to ensure appropriate monitoring of the project.

Reader's Score: 25

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 focus of the project includes training teachers to implement the full use of technology tools and makerspaces for arts instruction. In addition, the applicant will provide online professional learning communities to engage teachers in continued implementation. P. E34. Leveraging technology for student instruction and teacher professional development is a central goal of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/18/2017 09:17 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/25/2017 12:25 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: Carbon-Lehigh Intermediate Unit #21 (U351C170072)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	10	10
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Total	105	103

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Carbon-Lehigh Intermediate Unit #21 (U351C170072)

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 serving the needs of disadvantaged individuals because the area served is among the highest rate of poverty in the state having a combined poverty rate of all schools in the county of 45% with some areas served between 50-70% (e21). Eligible schools will be those with a poverty rate of 50% or greater (e26).

(2) The applicant methodically identifies specific gaps or weaknesses in services that will be addressed by this project. To address the needs of Art Educators to understand the process of design thinking so that they can create lessons that expose economically disadvantaged students to a curriculum that integrates the arts into technology (STEAM) in Maker Spaces (e22-24).

Another gap or weakness in services is lack of training on various technological tools (CNC software; 3D printing; Arduino etc.). The project will provide the needed training on these tools as well as how they might be integrated into their art form (e25-26).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified 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 provides a thorough description of a commitment by the district to ensure equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability. They have done so by referring to their foundational commitment to inclusivity and citing specifically that teacher recruitment and participation will be open to all and accommodations will be made for those with disabilities (e26-27).

(1) The applicant provides a complete description of services provided by the proposed project that reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice to a great extent by citing research (Pink, 2009; Burnaford and Scripp, 2012) that supports the type of pedagogy that will be used with teachers and (Greene, 2001; Smith, Drescher, and Taylor, 2017) effective arts education (e28-29).

(2) The applicant thoroughly describes ways that services will have a great impact on the intended recipients (art educators and their students) by providing high quality professional development “in arts education that is situated in aesthetic inquiry and that follows exemplary practices” that are consistent with research and the Annenberg Institute for School Reform. The 72 hours of professional development will have a positive impact on teacher practice by increasing the skills of 60 art educators in using digital design and fabrication tools to enable them to utilize the Maker Spaces in their schools (e32).

(3) The applicant provides a detailed description of how the training/professional development services provided by the project are of high in quality, intensity and duration to lead to significant improvements in practice among recipients by:

- Providing up to 72 hours of training in each of two years with training provided both in the summer and during the school year both on site and through online PLC's. This training will “meld design, technology and aesthetic inquiry in a sustained and intensive production-focused program” (e33).
- Providing an opportunity for both students and teachers to participate in an annual juried exhibition. Artwork will be selected by professional artists and the event will be held at the Da Vinci Science center (e34-35).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified in this section.

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 describes that the district encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented. They have done so by referring to their foundational commitment to inclusivity and citing specifically that teacher recruitment and participation will be open to all and accommodations will be made for those with disabilities (e21, e26-27, e35).

(1) The applicant thoroughly describes how key personnel are highly qualified with relevant training and experience in that the Curriculum, Instruction & Educational Technologies team at Carbon Lehigh Intermediate Unit #21 (CLIU) will provide ongoing support at its state of the art training facility.

Additionally, the Director of Curriculum, Instruction and Educational Technologies at CLIU will serve as the overall project director. As Project Director, this position will jointly lead the Project Leadership Team with two employees of the Da Vinci Science Center. This group will also coordinate logistics of the workshops.

(2) The applicant provides a detailed description of how project consultants or subcontractors are highly qualified with

relevant training and experience. Examples include:

- The Senior Director of Science and Strategy at the Da Vinci Science Center who will lead the development of the PD curriculum and work with teaching artists and art educators over the course of the project (e37-38).
- The Da Vinci Science Center's Director of Education, will support faculty in developing the ability to teach using an inquiry approach (e39).
- A Professional Development Coordinator, TBD, responsible for curriculum development along with the teaching team (e40).
- A Distinguished Lecturer in Art from Hunter College (NYC) will lead content development for the workshops (e40-41)
- Senior Project Director at Research for Better Schools will oversee project evaluation (e41-42).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified in this section.

Reader's Score: 15

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 thoroughly describes ways that the management plan is clearly more than adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time by defining responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (e 42-48), and the project will be within budget as a financial breakdown of materials/activities and timeline are included (e76-78).

(2) The applicant completely defines how the procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the project are adequate in citing multiple sources for both. Examples include pre and post-test data from the summer workshop; teacher feedback on end-of-workshop surveys; daily feedback and assessments of artistic projects... (e48-49).

(3) The applicant provides a detailed description of the time commitments of the principal investigator and other key project personnel which are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project in stating that the Director of the Da Vinci Center and Leadership Team Member is providing 15-20% of his time and the Professional Development Coordinator will contribute 50% of their time(e49).

Weaknesses:

(1) The overall project director is only allotting 5% of her time to this project, which is a small amount of time to direct a project of this magnitude.

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) Although the exact instrument has not been developed, the applicant provides a complete description of the methods of evaluation that will include performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce both quantitative and qualitative data as those are stated criteria that the CLIU has outlined for the outside research group (e50-52).

(2) The applicant provides a detailed description of the methods of evaluation that will permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes as referenced in the chart such as: Variable – Teacher’s level of participation...; Method – Survey, interview...; Data Source – Teachers...; Frequency – Once or annually...; Party Responsible – External evaluators... (e53-55) and performance feedback, as outlined in the (2) narrative such as: quarterly leadership meetings, regular and repeated workshop planning meetings... (e55).

(3) The applicant methodically describes how the proposed project is supported by strong theory as evidenced in the logic model included in the attachments (e74) as well multiple sources cited throughout the document.

Weaknesses:

This reviewer found no weaknesses 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 project will support the development of high quality, accessible online learning communities where educators will earn up to 16 additional professional development hours.

Weaknesses:

This reviewer saw no weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/25/2017 12:25 PM