

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2017 05:52 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: Guilford County Schools (U351C170007)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	10	7
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	23
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	14
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	27
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Total	105	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 2: 84.351C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Guilford County Schools (U351C170007)

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. Links between SES, racial diversity and low achievement levels were discussed (e21, 24).
2. Statistics are provided that indicate alternatively licensed teachers are 135% more likely to score a rating of "does not meet expected student growth" than "meets expected student growth" (e20). Information is provided linking race and SES level of students to inequities in support for arts supplies and personnel (e22). Data is provided that links teacher effectiveness and low rates of art educator effectiveness on a state-based measure (e23).

Weaknesses:

1. The inclusion of specific data tables that provide examples of SES and race-based inequities in achievement would improve the proposal (e24). Data linking arts education and student achievement is unclear (e24). Schools have not been identified in which students are classified as disadvantaged based on income (e21).
2. Given that over eighty percent of students have access to arts education (e19) and that there is substantial involvement of the arts community in the district (e24), specific gaps in services were not clearly and specifically articulated.

Reader's Score: 7

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. Research related to cultural responsiveness is included within the plan for project services (e28-29). Research is cited that links an arts-integrated curriculum with the elimination of opportunity gaps (e35).
2. The impact of the proposed services are well-developed, as exemplified in the continuous improvement loop that involves arts educators, university faculty, peers, and principals (e27). The intensity of project services is further supported by coursework for principals that will support their evaluations and observations of arts educators (e27). Coaching provided by teaching artists from community organizations contribute to the potential impact of the project (e31).
3. The participation of arts educators in the GCS Arts Integration Academy, led by faculty at the University of North Carolina Greensboro, and involving extended mentoring and support is a clear indication of the quality and intensity of the proposed project services (e26).

Weaknesses:

1. Cultural responsiveness research that is cited is not supported by other research studies and is over a decade old (e28-29).
2. No weaknesses noted.
3. The proposal could be strengthened by clear representation of the duration of professional development in the form of a table. Based only on the narrative description, it is difficult to determine how many hours of professional development each educator will complete.

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 Evaluation Group has over 25 years of experience in evaluating large grants (e41). Clear responsibilities and timelines for hiring of the project directors is included within the management plan (e43, 45).
2. The Grant Advisory Committee is comprised of diverse and highly-educated arts educators (e36). The proposed project is clearly attentive to issues of diversity within this committee, including diversity within schools represented (e37-38). The inclusion of the Arts Booster Council as a "think tank" for sustaining project work is a noted strength (e42). The Arts Education coordinator is highly qualified, given a K-12 music certification, principal certification and superintendent certification, as well as a doctorate in educational leadership in progress (e42). The Executive Director of Secondary Curriculum is highly qualified, with experience at multiple levels, including principal and superintendent certification and practical experience as a middle and high school principal (e42).

Weaknesses:

1. Given that the project directors have not been identified, a timeline and specific process and date by which these individuals will be on board weakens the proposed project (e43).
2. No weaknesses noted.

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. Monthly project deliverables, bi-monthly project status reports and budget reports, and weekly status updates from project directors (e49) contribute to a regular and ongoing process for managing timelines and tasks (e46). As an integral part of the management of the proposed project, the creation and uploading of a project deployment plan will contribute to the successful management of the proposed project (e47).
2. No strengths noted.
3. Given the level of support provided by university and community support personnel, it appears that the time commitments of key personnel and support personnel are adequate for the execution of the project.

Weaknesses:

1. Much of the management plan is dependent on project directors who have not been hired. Given that the management plan is heavily dependent on the hiring of project directors who will then immediately complete a deployment plan, the fact that project directors are not in place is a significant issue (e45).
2. A clear means by which feedback will be gathered and fed back into the project plan is not provided (e45-46).
3. No weaknesses noted.

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. Clear goals and objectives are provided for each project outcome (e50-54). The academic achievement goals will be researched using What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards (e54). A rigorous student of the impact of the Arts Integration Academy on student math and ELA achievement will be completed (e55).
2. No strengths noted.
3. The proposed project is supported by strong theory; goals related to the development of culturally responsive curriculum and the implementation of an arts-integrated curriculum are connected to outputs and outcomes, which include academic outcomes for students in math and English Language Arts (e62-65).

Weaknesses:

1. Parent engagement is included within the evaluation plan but is not mentioned within the overall outcomes of the proposed project (e50). It is unclear how the establishment of a culturally responsive school-wide integrated arts curriculum will be measured (e51). While the measurement of student achievement outcomes is well-developed, the measurement of outcomes related to teachers' professional development is not similarly well-developed.
2. It is unclear how the proposed evaluation will allow for the assessment of the quality, duration and intensity of professional development.
3. No weaknesses noted.

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:

- a. Swivl technology will be used to create an online repository (e26).
- b. Online coursework is a key component within the proposed project and will involve arts educators, non-arts educators, and administrators (e28-30). Micro-credentials related to completion of online coursework demonstrate a comprehensive approach to the competitive preference priority (e31).

Weaknesses:

- a. No weaknesses noted.
- b. No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/01/2017 05:52 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2017 10:53 AM

Technical Review

Applicant: Guilford County Schools (U351C170007)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	10	7
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	22
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	11
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	14
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	24
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Total	105	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 2: 84.351C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Guilford County Schools (U351C170007)

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 addresses serving the needs of disadvantaged individuals. This is shown through a program goal focused to provide children with effective teachers who are supported with opportunities for professional growth, specifically promoting academic success through robust arts education. Some of the needs of the target population are delineated. They include the fact that the district serves 73,306 students in a culturally diverse high poverty area. It is noted that as of this year, 83.1% of their students are involved in some form of arts education. The applicant proposes a stand-alone arts instruction program which is strong and will be integrated with authentic arts integration in non-arts classrooms as a key to students' academic achievement. Page e 19

The teaching staff is culturally diverse and connected to the community.

The applicant identifies their under-served schools and is focused to ensure effective culturally responsive teachers and to advance arts standards in arts integration across the curriculum. Four program goals are articulated to detail how the proposed project will serve the needs of disadvantage students. One goal is to provide professional development and to advance teachers' arts learning content knowledge and pedagogy. This is noted to specifically serve to train alternatively licensed teachers in the arts to increase their knowledge of arts standards and pedagogy skills. It is noted that student progress in classes taught by alternate certification teachers are less than results demonstrated by students in classes taught by teachers who are trained in the arts. Therefore, content specific professional development in arts education is scheduled to be provided to alternate certificated staff. Pages e 20-22

It is clearly described that the programs focus is to provide teachers professional development focused in increasing arts learning opportunities for students (goal three) In addition, it is noted that the district schools' benefits from substantial involvement from arts- community organization involvement Letters of support are included in the appendix from the Guilford County Schools Arts Education partners and from government representatives to advance to program and its goals. One end goal of the program is to serve their students and to serve other in developing a replicable model to benefit other educators and students, Pages e 23-26

(2) The applicant references research studies which identify specific gaps in services, infrastructure, and opportunities among minority -majority and low-income communities. It is noted that in Guilford County teachers in minority majority and poor school demonstrate a lower attendance rated in arts professional development than others. Pages e 19, 20

It is clearly noted that district specific information indicates the effectiveness rating for arts educators with alternate education licenses are likely to be less than those of traditional arts certified educators as measured by North Carolina Analysis of Student Work. Page e 21

The applicant references data from the district information which the fact that their school district delineates that white students have more effective arts programming than other districts in the County, and that school scoring higher in the North Carolina End of Grade and End of courses have more dedicated funds for arts supplies and personnel. Page e 22

Weaknesses:

1. Adequate research is lacking to substantiate that arts education is directly linked to higher student growth in the content areas. Page e 24

Some data is presented in a general manner and lack specificity. For example, it is asserted that the schools in the state who demonstrate are higher level of student academic achievement have more dedicated funds for art, and that schools in which the principal supports arts education demonstrate a higher effectiveness rating. Pages e 21, 22 For example, research or statistical evidence and factual data is lacking.

Adequate demographic data or school data is lacking to substantiate or determine the magnitude of the need for the program. Adequate school academic data and community risk factors are lacking and not comprehensively articulated. Page e 24

Reader's Score: 7

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 applicant addresses the criteria in articulating a program encompassing services which reflect some up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. The applicant references some research to support their proposed program, particularly noting a document on multiculturalism and cultural responsiveness Page e 28 In addition, the applicant reference research to support creating micro-credentials as an Arts Integration Prodigy. Page e 31

It is noteworthy that the applicant aligns their proposed program to advance literacy. It is specified that in the final year of the program the project schools will launch a research study designed to test connectivity of cognitive processes for literacy learning with music reading, spatial reason in visual and theater arts and kinesthetic comprehension dance education. Page e 31

2. The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services is focused on research exploring how integrating the arts into non-arts area of the curriculum can enhance the relevancy of the curriculum in which arts are influence. It is asserted that schools which arts education is supported that a higher academic performance is noted, as measured by the North Carolina Analysis of Students Work process and the Educator Value-Added Assessment System teacher effectiveness rating. Pages e 43, 44

An additional research study is referenced to support their program describing a 2009 study that outlines the advancement of an authentic art integrated curriculum which specifies the impact of arts integration. Three major areas are noted in the research and will be reflected by the program services focused on; enhancing students' self-esteem and confidence and providing unique models of knowledge and comprehension to foster an understanding the interconnectedness of all curriculum and enhance collaboration . Page e 36

(3) The applicant addresses the criteria effectively detailing professional development services to be provided by the proposed project which are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. This is evidenced in identifying the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to design three graduate level courses focused to improve arts and non-arts teachers' skills in the integration of arts standards across the curriculum. A two-week summer County Arts Integration Academy is proposed to include university faculty working with K-8 elementary school staff for two years following the course completion. Page e 26 Page e27

A cyclical pattern of continuous improvement is articulated a visually charted. It includes professional development, formative feedback from principals, ongoing coaching from the university staff, peer coaching and collaborative partnering. On line platforms are identified encompasses in the endeavor. Page e 27
In addition, the applicant references the Arts Education Partnership to engage evaluative personnel without an arts background of discipline to obtain related feedback Page e 27

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant fails to articulate research aligned to supporting the state and federal guidelines and arts standards. In addition, research is lacking to effectively support the pedagogy of arts integration to advance academic achievement for elementary students.

Research documentation is lacking to substantiate the cultural response components of the proposed program focused on advancing student achievement.

Adequate information is lacking to identify and describe the duration of the program's professional development, noting the amount of hours and days annually scheduled for relevant training.

Reader's Score: 22

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

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 addresses the criteria in an articulation of various committees engaged in the design, implementation and evaluation of the program. This is evidenced in identifying and describing three committees. The Advisory Committee as comprised of educators in district . Their overall experience and expertise are noted in a general statement and notes representing women in leadership, minority leadership and their excellent educational experience in minority-majority schools. The committee members are named and the position in the district identified. Pages e 33, 34 , 43

The applicant identifies the project planning committee as consisting of key Guilford County School staff, staff from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and the Evaluation Group (TEG.) the names and positions of the three members are noted. It is specified that organizational support will be provided to the project. These are noted to include that of the Executive Director of Secondary Curriculum who oversee the budge for all arts education programs and will oversee expenditures the Arts Education Coordinator. A brief overview of her qualification include serving as a middle and high school principal and middle school and high school curriculum officer. Page e 42

A Project Director is identified to be hired and required to be a licensed arts educator with at least ten years of experience. The duties of the position are noted to include logistical oversight and managing micro-credentialing and facilitating Advisory Committee meeting and to provide reports to the Arts Education Coordinator and liaise with the University partner. Page e 43

(2) The qualifications of one project consultant is noted in specifying the UNCG Project Director and providing a job description for the person to be hired for the project. A person is noted who will provide logistical oversight. Page e 43

Weaknesses:

Note: Adequate information is lacking in addressing the criteria related to how the project and 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.

1. The applicant names each member of the advisory committee and notes their position in the district, but fails to specifically describe the qualifications and relevant training of any key program personnel. Pages e 34, 35 In addition, the applicant names the three people on the Planning Committee and not their professional position, but fails to describe their qualification noted as any experience and training. For example, the person on the Planning Committee from the Evaluation Groups is identified as the Director of Evaluation, however his credentials are not narrated.

Information is lacking to clearly identify the Project Director and their qualifications.

The Management Team is also noted in only listing the titles of positions lacking any information describing their qualification. Page e 41

A project timeline is not provided.

2. The relevant training of the contractor from the University is specified but lacks an adequate description of their experience and required qualifications.

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 narrates some components of a management plan structured to achieve the implementation of some major program activities and to designate their responsibility to a program staff and to note the dates for activity completion. This is evidenced in narrating a Guilford County Schools Arts Integration Academy Project Management Schedule. It clearly delineated that the deliverables of the project and aligns each to the person or persons responsible and specified a proposed date for completion. Major management activities encompass in the first year of the project. These encompass to: hire staff and complete a full deployment plan; select six project schools for each year of the program; develop a calendar of professional development; convene committees; submit purchase orders and initiate weekly updates. Pages e 45, 46 In addition, components of the Deployment Plan will be developed. This plan is specified to provide supervisory person, participating staff and the public each an overview of the project a focus on deliverable, staffing needs and budget needs. Page e 46, 47

It is adequately specified that a risk-analysis will be developed and implemented as a managerial tool to determine potential threats to the participating organization or the project itself or to the staff. The tools will also indicate the probability of a threat occurring and impacting security levels, mitigation and contingency.

(2) The applicant clearly identifies procedures for ensuring feedback for continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. This is evidenced in designating the Project Director to provide weekly updates to the Arts Education Coordinator with update of status. The report is indicated to assist in working together with the advisory committee focused on significant results.

Weaknesses:

1. Overall the management plan is not comprehensive and lacks identification and articulation of program objectives which are clearly aligned to a time frame, responsible person and to specify responsible for activities to be accomplished within budget. The deployment of the Project Director is not clearly identified.

2. Strategies to ensure feedback are general and brief. The Director's weekly report is noted but is not well developed in structures or forums in which to deliver the report to adequately inform and to evoke feedback is lacking. no discussion of budget on time.

Strategies or protocols to ensure feedback from staff and the school participating in the project is lacking. In addition, a structure for feedback from the university partner is not described.

The applicant identifies a bi-monthly project statement report to be disseminated to provide insight into the program and to provide update an expectations and program data related to accomplishment. However, it is not specified who will develop this report and where and how information will be gleaned and the person or person responsible for data driven decision making.

3. In the narrative, the applicant fails to identify the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel and to describe the specified times as appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

While the management chart specifies six schools to participate each year, it is unclear how the teachers will be engaged each year. A clear selection process is lacking.

Reader's Score: 14

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 addresses the criteria delineating some methods of evaluation which will include the use of objective performance measures that are related to a few of the intended project outcomes and will produce quantitative and qualitative data. This is evidenced in structuring four program questions to guide qualitative feedback and information. The four evaluation questions are aligned to the four goals and related objective of the program. The questions are well stated and the objectives noted by their corresponding number. Page e 50 The applicant articulates a well developed table of Academic Goals and Objectives. Each four goals is specified and objectives aligned. The tool for assessment is noted for each and a timeline. For example, the first goal of the program is focused to improve teacher arts-learning, content knowledge and pedagogy. An objective is to enroll and engage thirty teachers each year in the summer institute. Attendance will be reviewed to track and pre-and post-assessment are noted. Pages e 49-52

It is well developed for the program evaluation components to consist of a quasi- experimental design and mixed methods. For example, it is noted or the evaluations today to test the effectiveness of the program model focused on increasing student outcomes. A research question is comprehensive to evoke feedback notes to inquire: what the impact of the program has on English Language Arts Standards scores for students in the program for two years. A longitudinal study is specified to be implemented and noted that it meets What Works Clearinghouse standards. Page e 54

Data Parameters for the impact study are clearly charted. Each parameter is identified and aligned to the area of study. For example, a sample size is noted as 60 schools (12 treatments and 48 comparisons and 300 teachers and 60 treatments and 240 comparisons). Pages e 53-55

A Fidelity Index is aptly noted to assess the degree to which the program is implemented as designed and proposed.

2. The applicant clearly narrates methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic

assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Quantitative data will be collected and analyzed from feedback at professional development engagements including the summer programs and various committee meeting. Feedback will be obtained and qualitative data is clearly identified to be collected include information and feedback from; key stakeholders, open ended survey question and minutes from meetings. Page e 56

3. The applicant details some information that the proposed project is supported by strong theory. This is well articulated in assessing the vision of the program is focused on all students to be able to have the opportunity to succeed academically through a high-quality education in the arts and through arts integrated in the curriculum and in an environment characterized by diverse social, economic, ethnic and racial backgrounds. The foundational framework for the program is clearly specified as building on four framework components. These are delineated to encompass; improving teachers in arts learning content knowledge and pedagogy; expanding arts learning opportunities for teachers; increasing arts learning for all students and increasing partner and community involvement in arts learning. Page e 60

The rational or strong theory is articulated stating that “of stents have access to a scope of learning and tools, then change will lead to improved student academic achievement and sustainability integrated arts programs. This is built on student access to; effective educators through high quality integrated arts; integrated arts project based instruction; increase parent and community support. Page e 60

A well-developed Logic Model identifies each program goal and activities , outputs, and outcomes and the program impact. . The Logic Model specifies the input of hybrid arts integration courses to increase staff abilities resulting in closing the opportunities gap. Pages e 62 - e 64

Weaknesses:

1.Information is lacking to indicate any parental engagement. Page e 50

2. Information is lacking to describe how the program components of a culturally responsive school will be measured.

2 Information is lacking to details the research which supports a clear link between professional development and student outcomes

Adequate information is lacking to detail current strategies and their efficacy on how to asses teacher professional development and the link to student growth. For example, it is proposed tor goal 1, for 80% of students to demonstrate progress in year one, and strategies are lacking to describe the tools teachers will use to demonstrate growth.

Reader's Score: 24

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,

traditional time-based metrics.

Strengths:

(a) The applicant effectively describes a program which incorporates 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.

The applicant supports their program in referencing the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation lessons observation in Swivel to provide opportunities for other project participants to observe partner classrooms . In addition, The Collaboratory is identified and described to provide students with additional after school arts learning opportunities. Page e 32

(b) The proposed program effectively implements 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. This is specified to be developed in collaboration with the University. In addition the collaboration will develop micro-credentials and as a research based Art Integration Prodigy, Page e 32, 33

Weaknesses:

None are noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/02/2017 10:53 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/31/2017 12:21 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: Guilford County Schools (U351C170007)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	10	8
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	24
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	14
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	28
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	5
Total	105	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Professional Development for Arts Educators - 2: 84.351C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Guilford County Schools (U351C170007)

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 district is large and diverse (67% minority, 105 languages, 43rd in size nationally). (e19)

Although the district is progressive, culturally responsive, and supports arts education, schools in geographically poor neighborhoods do not serve teachers, students, or the communities sufficiently. This mirrors findings in other similar communities. (e19-20)

In this section, and throughout the proposal, all needs and goals identify student learning and ameliorating learning gaps as the ultimate purpose. (e24)

The problem is succinctly stated (e25): "Current professional development opportunities for arts educators are not necessarily meeting the cultural and personalized needs of teachers serving in minority-majority, socio-economically disadvantaged schools. Furthermore, non-arts educators also serving these schools are receiving no arts integration professional development whatsoever." (e25)

(2)

Through a series of GCS data paired with broader research findings, the applicant identifies the needs of improving teacher arts learning, content knowledge, and pedagogy (e20), expanded arts-learning opportunities for teachers (e21-22); increased arts learning opportunities for teachers (e24); and increase partner and community involvement in District arts education (e24).

The magnitude of gaps and weaknesses is deftly described through pairing of local data and broader, more formal findings, to identify local potential for improvement (throughout section)

Weaknesses:

Inclusion of specific data on inequities would be helpful. (e24)

In the quote, logic would suggest "increases" rather than "decreases." This provides the main evidence for project goal 3. (e24, paragraph 1)

Evidence is not cited that "schools that dedicate more funds and better principals have higher achievement." (e22)

Reader's Score: 8

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:

This project design is lean, while at the same time being extremely rigorous and demanding. It does exactly what educational PD should do. The anticipation of issues is realistic. The team seems politically savvy, as indicated by the many letters of support from congressional representatives and local organizations.

(1)
The project's four goals will be addressed through a sequence of experiences in a cyclical pattern of continuous improvement, designed with the goals clearly in mind. (e26-27)

The project components reflect up-to-date research from a range of disciplines, and also draw on innovative strategies to engage and deepen participant learning. For example: the "micro-credential" approach (e31) is comparable to badges in gaming and speaks to today's young professionals; use of the Gates Foundation's research on what teachers want in PD, and references that indicate consideration across disciplines and areas of focus, particularly exploring literature on Opportunity Gap and examinations of the socio-cultural dimension of schooling (e69-70).

The Gates Foundation report provided guidance based on what teachers are asking of professional development, such as coaching and common planning, is referenced throughout this section. (e31-32)

Services include newly-designed courses (with online components) for arts and non-arts teachers and administrators; two years of follow-up support, peer to peer observations using technology. The principals will learn improved evaluative and observational skills for arts educators and also use the Swivl platform. A summer integration workshop will be held.

The University partnership is a great strength, with expert guidance in course creation and delivery, as well as on-going support in schools and classrooms, including community engagement.

(2)
University courses have online modules for non-arts participants, arts educators, and administrators, personalized by teaching level, to address the specific needs of the group, developing necessary skills and understandings to plan, implement, and evaluate. (e28-29)

Continued support over the following two years is designed to support and reward participants as they improve and gain new skills.

(3)
The project services directly address the objectives, and all are designed and interwoven to provide authentic arts integrated curriculum that impacts student achievement and self-esteem for underperforming children, through improving teacher collaboration, knowledge, and arts opportunities; and contact with families. These are the systems that impact a child's learning and provide a culturally responsive and personalized curriculum. (e35)

Of note is the inclusion of community and family involvement, particularly to inform them of the value of the arts to engage students, and increase student learning. The concept of "integral spheres of influence" in a child's life makes support from the community and family an important factor in student success. (e24)

Weaknesses:

(1)
One issue with the Gates Foundation data is that while it tells what teachers are asking for, it may not be what teachers actually need in order to improve and deepen their practice.

Alignment to state and federal guidelines is missing. (e28, 31)

Cultural responsiveness studies are over a decade old (e28).

(3)

The proposal would be strengthened by identification of duration of PD and number of hours recipients would receive. (e26-36)

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 Advisory Committee is listed first, and includes representation from across the spectrum of citizens. Highly successful arts educators are included, as determined by a state Analysis of Student Work process (again putting student growth at the center of decision making). (e36-38)

The Project Development Team is made up of institutions, groups and individuals, including the school district and university. The institutions, as well as the individuals within them, are highly qualified and offer breadth and depth of experience. (e39)

(2)

The Evaluation Group's role is clearly defined, including high quality program evaluations that inform decision making and promote effective practice, and leading use of grant resources effectively and efficiently. (e40)

Specific roles are described, which together are interwoven to create a robust picture of an efficient program. (e39-41)

There will be co-project managers at the district and university to assure that the partnership maintains fidelity to the plan. (e41)

An Organizational Chart provides a clear picture of relationships. (e41)

Definitions of positions for hire provide clear criteria for skills and experience that will be necessary. (e42-43)

The management plan has very clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Weaknesses:

Success would be enhanced by a few great hires for key positions.

The proposal named members of advisory committee, but didn't give their qualifications. The application didn't specify the qualifications of the director. (e34)

No timeline for individuals to be on board. (e43)

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 Overall Work Flow is outlined in a chart that has a rigorous, tight timeline describing the deliverable, who it is assigned to, and due dates. This timeline works because the proposal already has so much organization in place (e45-e47). This chart has replicable actions for each year, creating a pattern of responsible oversight throughout. (e47)

The district will use a Project Management tool (CANVAS) to record and organize all activities, and provide data for reports. (e44)

A full deployment plan is planned to be ready by August 20, with deliverables, responsibilities and completion dates, overall expected impacts, and budgeting and staffing. (e47)

(2)

Feedback is built into the plan through detailed status worksheets for directors, so every aspect of each component is tracked, including threats. This will assure constant communication across the project, and inform managers, committees, and then others. (e48)

The possibility of inhibiting factors is explicitly addressed, so problems that might affect the forward movement of the program will be addressed. (e48)

(3)

The expectations for communication, feedback, and problem-solving are very demanding. Detailed reporting will be frequent and timely. Weekly status updates by the Project Directors will inform the Arts Education Coordinator. There is an expectation of continuous collaboration across the entire team. (e42)

The Arts Education Coordinator has a lot of oversight, reporting, and scheduling, and advising responsibilities. (e42)

Weaknesses:

(1)

Much of management plan depends on project director who has not been hired. The entire proposal's final details hinge on directors who haven't been hired or met yet to determine important design issues. (e43)

There is no discussion of permissions that need to be arranged, either for the videotaping and sharing, or the use of student scores from outside the target schools. Also, there was a comment about approval from the University dean before created courses can be implemented.

(2)

There is need for a clear plan for ongoing feedback to be collected and fed back into the project. (e45-e47)

The proposal would be strengthened by a discussion of how to maintain budget, time, staying on scope. A timeframe is not articulated. Work with the University is important but HOW is not specified. There are bimonthly reports; however, it is not clear who's responsible, and who's disseminating the information. In general, there could be more detail on several parts of the plan.

(3)

The design and activities are rigorous. There may be some time commitment issues for the Project Directors, and perhaps even University personnel. It is helpful that trained personnel will be leaders in training, and can be increasingly tapped to help out on the ground.

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:

E-Reader Query

Top of Form

Form Materials

e-Application

Technical Review Comments

Show/Hide Subtotals

Show/Hide Names

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year

2017

CFDA/Subprogram

84.351C

Schedule No

2

Tier No.

1

Panel Name

Professional Development for Arts Educators - 2

Panel Monitor Name

[REDACTED]

Panel Monitor Phone No.

[REDACTED]

Competition Manager Name(s)

[REDACTED]

Applicant Name

Guilford County Schools

PR/Award No

U351C170007

Reviewer Name

[REDACTED]

Questions

Points Possible

Points Scored

1. Selection Criteria

Need for Project

10

8

Project Services

25

24

Project Personnel

15

14

Management Plan

20

17

Project Evaluation

30

29

TOTAL

100

92

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority

CPP 1

5

5

TOTAL

5

5

GRAND TOTAL

105

97

Technical Review Form
Applicant Name
Guilford County Schools
PR/Award No
U351C170007
Reviewer Name

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 district is large and diverse (67% minority, 105 languages, 43rd in size nationally). (e19)

Although the district is progressive, culturally responsive, and supports arts education, schools in geographically poor neighborhoods do not serve teachers, students, or the communities sufficiently. This mirrors findings in other similar communities. (e19-20)

In this section, and throughout the proposal, all needs and goals identify student learning and ameliorating learning gaps as the ultimate purpose. (e24)

The problem is succinctly stated (e25): "Current professional development opportunities for arts educators are not necessarily meeting the cultural and personalized needs of teachers serving in minority-majority, socio-economically disadvantaged schools. Furthermore, non-arts educators also serving these schools are receiving no arts integration professional development whatsoever." (e25)

(2)

Through a series of GCS data paired with broader research findings, the applicant identifies the needs of improving teacher arts learning, content knowledge, and pedagogy (e20), expanded arts-learning opportunities for teachers (e21-22); increased arts learning opportunities for teachers (e24); and increase partner and community involvement in District arts education (e24).

The magnitude of gaps and weaknesses is deftly described through pairing of local data and broader, more formal findings, to identify local potential for improvement (throughout section)

Weaknesses

Inclusion of specific data on inequities would be helpful. (e24)

In the quote, logic would suggest "increases" rather than "decreases." This provides the main evidence for project goal 3. (e24, paragraph 1)

Evidence is not cited that "schools that dedicate more funds and better principals have higher achievement." (e22)

Question Status:Completed

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

2.

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

This project design is lean, while at the same time being extremely rigorous and demanding. It does exactly what educational PD should do. The anticipation of issues is realistic. The team seems politically savvy, as indicated by the many letters of support from congressional representatives and local organizations.

(1)

The project's four goals will be addressed through a sequence of experiences in a cyclical pattern of continuous improvement, designed with the goals clearly in mind. (e26-27)

The project components reflect up-to-date research from a range of disciplines, and also draw on innovative strategies to engage and deepen participant learning. For example: the "micro-credential" approach (e31) is comparable to badges in gaming and speaks to today's young professionals; use of the Gates Foundation's research on what teachers want in PD, and references that indicate consideration across disciplines and areas of focus, particularly exploring literature on Opportunity Gap and examinations of the socio-cultural dimension of schooling (e69-70).

The Gates Foundation report provided guidance based on what teachers are asking of professional development, such as coaching and common planning, is referenced throughout this section. (e31-32)

Services include newly-designed courses (with online components) for arts and non-arts teachers and administrators; two years of follow-up support, peer to peer observations using technology. The principals will learn improved evaluative and observational skills for arts educators and also use the Swivl platform. A summer integration workshop will be held.

The University partnership is a great strength, with expert guidance in course creation and delivery, as well as on-going support in schools and classrooms, including community engagement.

(2)

University courses have online modules for non-arts participants, arts educators, and administrators, personalized by teaching level, to address the specific needs of the group, developing necessary skills and understandings to plan, implement, and evaluate. (e28-29)

Continued support over the following two years is designed to support and reward participants as they improve and gain new skills.

(3)

The project services directly address the objectives, and all are designed and interwoven to provide authentic arts

integrated curriculum that impacts student achievement and self-esteem for underperforming children, through improving teacher collaboration, knowledge, and arts opportunities; and contact with families. These are the systems that impact a child's learning and provide a culturally responsive and personalized curriculum. (e35)

Of note is the inclusion of community and family involvement, particularly to inform them of the value of the arts to engage students, and increase student learning. The concept of "integral spheres of influence" in a child's life makes support from the community and family an important factor in student success. (e24)

Weaknesses

If there's any concern, it would be that this project design is too tight. It is lean while at the same time being extremely rigorous and demanding. It does exactly what educational PD should do, including pushing out weak and ineffective individuals. The anticipation of issues is realistic, but also indicates that there might be some push-back somewhere along the line. The team seems politically savvy, as indicated by the many letters of support from congressional representatives and local organizations. The strength itself might become a weakness.

(1)

One issue with the Gates Foundation data is that while it tells what teachers are asking for, it may not be what teachers actually need in order to improve and deepen their practice.

Alignment to state and federal guidelines is missing. (e28, 31)

Cultural responsiveness studies are over a decade old (e28).

(3)

The proposal would be strengthened by identification of duration of PD and number of hours recipients would receive. (e26-36)

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

3.

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.

Weaknesses

Success would be enhanced by a few great hires for key positions.

The proposal named members of advisory committee, but didn't give their qualifications. The application didn't specify the qualifications of the director. (e34)

No timeline for individuals to be on board. (e43)

Strengths

(1)

The Advisory Committee is listed first, and includes representation from across the spectrum of citizens. Highly successful arts educators are included, as determined by a state Analysis of Student Work process (again putting student growth at the center of decision making). (e36-38)

The Project Development Team is made up of institutions, groups and individuals, including the school district and university. The institutions, as well as the individuals within them, are highly qualified and offer breadth and depth of experience. (e39)

(2)

The Evaluation Group's role is clearly defined, including high quality program evaluations that inform decision making and promote effective practice, and leading use of grant resources effectively and efficiently. (e40)

Specific roles are described, which together are interwoven to create a robust picture of an efficient program. (e39-41)

There will be co-project managers at the district and university to assure that the partnership maintains fidelity to the plan. (e41)

An Organizational Chart provides a clear picture of relationships. (e41)

Definitions of positions for hire provide clear criteria for skills and experience that will be necessary. (e42-43)

The management plan has very clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

4.

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 Overall Work Flow is outlined in a chart that has a rigorous, tight timeline describing the deliverable, who it is assigned to, and due dates. This timeline works because the proposal already has so much organization in place (e45-e47). This chart has replicable actions for each year, creating a pattern of responsible oversight throughout. (e47)

The district will use a Project Management tool (CANVAS) to record and organize all activities, and provide data for reports. (e44)

A full deployment plan is planned to be ready by August 20, with deliverables, responsibilities and completion dates, overall expected impacts, and budgeting and staffing. (e47)

(2)

Feedback is built into the plan through detailed status worksheets for directors, so every aspect of each component is tracked, including threats. This will assure constant communication across the project, and inform managers, committees, and then others. (e48)

The possibility of inhibiting factors is explicitly addressed, so problems that might affect the forward movement of the program will be addressed. (e48)

(3)

The expectations for communication, feedback, and problem-solving are very demanding. Detailed reporting will be frequent and timely. Weekly status updates by the Project Directors will inform the Arts Education Coordinator. There is an expectation of continuous collaboration across the entire team. (e42)

The Arts Education Coordinator has a lot of oversight, reporting, and scheduling, and advising responsibilities. (e42)

Weaknesses

(1)

Much of management plan depends on project director who has not been hired. The entire proposal's final details hinge on directors who haven't been hired or met yet to determine important design issues. (e43)

There is no discussion of permissions that need to be arranged, either for the videotaping and sharing, or the use of student scores from outside the target schools. Also, there was a comment about approval from the University dean before created courses can be implemented.

(2)

There is need for a clear plan for ongoing feedback to be collected and fed back into the project. (e45-e47)

The proposal would be strengthened by a discussion of how to maintain budget, time, staying on scope. A timeframe is not articulated. Work with the University is important but HOW is not specified. There are bimonthly reports; however, it is not clear who's responsible, and who's disseminating the information. In general, there could be more detail on several parts of the plan.

(3)

The design and activities are rigorous. There may be some time commitment issues for the Project Directors, and perhaps even University personnel. It is helpful that trained personnel will be leaders in training, and can be increasingly tapped to help out on the ground.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5.

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 Project Evaluation is directly related to the overarching question and stated objectives, completing a consistent thread throughout the proposal. (e50)

There are abundant measures and reporting tools for qualitative and quantitative findings, appropriate to each objective. (e50)

Formative and summative reporting are explicitly planned at various intervals throughout the project, with small reports on a frequent basis, and comprehensive reports and fidelity index annually. (e56)

The "Goals and Objectives" chart provides a detailed roadmap, using a SMART format (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timed) to maximize validity and reliability. Objectives are clear, measurements are specific, and a timeline is provided for each so there is no wiggle room, and should help keep everyone on track. (e50-53)

Of particular interest is the Measure in 1.2 – Integrated Arts Content Knowledge Pre-Post Test, which would be useful when and if disseminated more widely. (e51)

North Carolina's state tests in English and math, and Analyses of Student Work in the Arts provide vehicles for comparisons with other schools, and will be used for evaluation pre- and post-test comparisons. (e36)

The Impact Study described on e55, with a good chance of significant results because of the rigorous treatment, will be of interest to school leaders searching for ways to reduce the cultural achievement gap. The study is well designed, and takes many variables related to "disadvantaged schools."

A Data Collection, Reporting, Instrumentation and Analysis chart (e58-59) further delineates the variables of each goal, data collection and reporting schedules, the instrumentation, type of analysis, and the person responsible. There is no wiggle room in this plan, and that's a good thing.

(2)

"The evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes." The quasi-experimental, mixed-methods design takes into account statistical power, and meets the evidence criteria for the What Works Clearinghouse. This is of great importance because there are so few arts projects funded sufficiently, with important objectives, and an evaluation design that allows consideration for recognition and broader dissemination. This has the potential to elevate arts education and arts integration within the pre-service and in-service communities, and to change the status of arts educators and integrated arts models within elementary education, particularly in underserved schools. (e53-54)

(3)

The provided logic model (e62) is offered to help monitor efforts and avoid program drift, and to provide stakeholders with an understanding of components and the strong theory on which the program implementation rests (e60). From beginning to end, the project has internal consistency and a singular broad goal of closing opportunity gaps particularly in schools located in more socially disadvantaged areas. The case for arts education and arts integration to level the playing field is well-made, and the proposal's quality provides a best chance of success.

The entire project and evaluation design is planned with success and replication in mind. The evaluation team says, "Evaluation is something we do WITH our clients, not TO them" (e57). Expanding this thought, the highly interactive,

rigorous plan put forth in this proposal demonstrates how a well-crafted and implemented project can be something a team does WITH the broader educational community, not TO it.

Weaknesses:

- (1)
Current engagement is included in evaluation form but not in overall outcomes of the project. (e50)
- (2)
Teacher PD evaluation is not totally developed clearly—should be developed as much as students (e51).

Reader's Score: 28

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)
Data will be collected via eye tracking glasses, to align instruction with psychological processes of the student. This is a unique use of technology within this field, and should yield interesting results. (e34)
- (b)
The online learning community is designed to engage teachers in peer-to-peer observation and evaluation using Swivl technology and a web-based platform. (e26, 32-33)
Use of Swivl technology to practice improve school principals' evaluative and observational skills is unique. (e27)
University courses will be crafted with online modules for non-arts participants, arts educators, and administrators, personalized by teaching level, to address the specific needs of the group, and developing necessary skills and understandings to plan, implement, and evaluate. (e28-29)
A digital project management tool will serve to track progress in each component of the program, following from the Full Deployment Plan. (e48-49)
The technology is built into many components of this project, and is integral to its success.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/31/2017 12:21 PM