

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2017 03:57 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: LUDLOW INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS (U351C170059)

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	23
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	4
Total	105	95

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: LUDLOW INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS (U351C170059)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant's proposed target area focuses on serving and/or addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals, which includes twenty (20) interdisciplinary teams from 37 Northern Kentucky schools. Teams will be identified from among the 37 schools that serve 50% or more students who qualify for the Free and Reduced Lunch program, an indicator of low-income as described in Title I (pg. e19).

The applicant identified specific gaps or weaknesses in services. The gaps include 2% of respondents noting that their school has teachers with specialty in dance and only 17% reported having theatre teachers at their schools. Dance is not taught specifically by anyone in 26% of the schools, and theatre is not taught specifically by anyone in 29% of schools. The various forms of the arts are not integrated, and there is little to no integration with other content areas. This coupled with the lack of confidence is perhaps not surprising given the minimal professional development teachers report having had in the arts areas (41% of arts teachers had no professional development in the last year in arts (pg. e23).

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:

The applicant's proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice, by citing Ludlow Independent Schools (LIS) Arts Education for America's Students: A Shared Endeavor (2013), in which 12 national arts organizations outlined the importance of high quality arts education, including arts integration (pg. e26).

The identified participants will likely be impacted by the project services, where improvement in teacher capacity to implement innovative, dynamic arts-integrated lessons will occur. Teacher capacity will also be built as school, district, and regional leaders ensure that the effects of the professional development will be intensive and sustained over time.

Weaknesses:

The amount of time the project will require of participating teachers is minimal and is not enough to be either sustainable and/or intensive (30 hours, five-day summer intensive workshop annually; 12 hours, quarterly in-person meetings; eight one-hour monthly online sessions, total, 50 hours available, plus teachers' chosen open education resources) (pg. e27). Additionally, community resources are vague and not explicitly stated.

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:

The applicant has identified key project personnel, outlining qualifications, relevant training and experience (pg. e39). The project staff will include a Project Director, Arts Integration Manager, and Arts Integration Assistant. The Project Director has extensive experience working in the Northern Kentucky school district and working on grant-funded project implementation. All position requirements have been detailed and a search committee will be identified for future appointments. A search committee will consist of: the Superintendent of Ludlow Schools and the Executive Director of NKCES (or their designees); an arts teacher and a teacher of other content; a representative of at least one community partner; and the Project Director to hire staff with appropriate expertise to hold the positions of Arts Integration Manager and Arts Integration Assistant. (Pg. e39-40).

Likewise, a cadre of consultants with the qualifications, relevant training and experience, have been identified for the project and bring a wealth of experience in the field of music, arts education and teacher development. Key consultants consist of: an Arts Integration Coach, Project Evaluator, Northern Kentucky Cooperative for Educational Services (NKCES) a financial and operational management service, and The Carnegie, the largest and only multidisciplinary arts venue in Northern Kentucky (Pg. e41-45).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

The applicant presents a detailed and well thoughtout management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The plan documents curriculum integration in such core subjects as language arts, social studies, physical education and health throughout the life of the grant (pg. e47-48).

The applicant offers multiple opportunities for implementing procedures for feedback and continuous improvement. The applicant will utilize the following examples of procedures to inform continuous improvement including: pre-post surveys, teacher self-assessments, peer assessments, surveys and oral feedback and an analysis of school team application (pg. e48-49).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not offer a clear sequence of activities for subsequent years of the project. Likewise, the applicant indicates one (1) hour of coaching support for participant teachers, which seems to be insufficient. Additionally the proposed project describes the Arts Integration Assistant's responsibilities as maintaining required records for project services, activities, and expenditures; and supporting communication with partners regarding meetings, trainings, and other Project related activities. The amount of time allotted (.5 FTE) seems to be inadequate due to the size and scope of the proposed project.

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:

The proposed project will provide performance feedback and periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes by use of surveys. Teacher feedback will also include information on effectiveness of the PD received and areas for improvement in the intervention (pg. e55-60).

Weaknesses:

The ultimate goal of the proposed project is to implement a high-quality model professional development program for arts educators and other instructional staff that enriches the academic experience, and to deliver professional development supports that increase the capacity of arts teachers to serve as interdisciplinary education leaders. To that end, process and outcome evaluations should be aligned to the project's activities, expected outputs, and outcomes but is not clearly supported. Evaluative disconnects such as team teaching activities being evaluated individually, will make it difficult to evaluate (pg. e55-59).

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

Weaknesses:

The applicant proposes the use of technological devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly open educational resources. This undoubtedly will necessitate the use of high-speed Internet access (pg. e30). However, the applicant did not fully develop the use of implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations. For instance, 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.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/02/2017 03:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2017 05:31 PM

Technical Review

Applicant: LUDLOW INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS (U351C170059)

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	23
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	4
Total	105	94

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: LUDLOW INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS (U351C170059)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides a thorough plan for serving disadvantaged individuals. For example, The applicant indicates that it will identify 20 disciplinary from among the 37 schools in Northern Kentucky that serve 50% or more students who qualify for the Free and Reduced Lunch program, which is an indicator of low-income population. The applicant provides a table that indicates that that there are 15 schools that have 100% in Free and Reduced Lunch program (FRL), with seven over 90% FRL, and five over 80% FRL. The applicant provides a table that indicates the percentage of students scoring proficient or above. (p. e21)

2. The applicant thoroughly addresses and identifies several key gaps as evidenced by research-based data and survey results. For example, the gaps identified include lack of professional development for arts integration, there is a lack of consistent, sequential, high-quality professional development in arts integration for practicing arts teachers certified in Pennsylvania to teach art and music. There is also unmet student need and demand for innovative educational approaches that demonstrate success in academic areas (ELA, mathematics, and science), and data reveal gaps in learning. (pgs. e24-e27)

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

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

Strengths:

1. The applicant provided extensive evidence that the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. For example, the applicant provides results from research findings with the most recent dated 2013 (p. e28), and others dated from 2004 to 2011 that supports the integration of the arts and their proven effectiveness while promoting academic success. The applicant documents that research has also found that arts engagement promotes emotional well-being and pro-social behavior, demonstrates that teaching through an arts integration methodology augments collaboration and teamwork, improves morale, and increases the range of instructional strategies employed (p. e29). The applicant provides a detailed table providing the rational key services and the rationale for each. (pgs. e27-e13)

2. The applicant provides a brief overview of a plan for professional development which will include an intense five-day summer NKIAE workshop with emphasis on models arts integration with academic content area, ongoing school team's professional learning network meetings, monthly coaching support, observation, and feedback, and leadership expansion opportunities for teachers after year one. The applicant provides a detailed table showing the key services and rationale for each. (pgs. 27-e29, e31)

3. The applicant proposes to provide training or professional development that is of high quality, and intense for the proposed program. For example, the applicant states that it will provide a five-day intensive summer NKIAE workshop designed with intent to model arts integration with another content area (varies each year). for teachers of arts and that content area. Time outside the school year will be used to design units during the summer workshop, supported by coaching and observation to encourage implementation, school teams' professional learning communities (ongoing), coaching support, observation, and feedback on a monthly basis. In addition, NKIAE will provide opportunities for teachers to move into leadership roles at the conclusion of first year of proposed program. (p. e31)

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not exceed the minimum number of hours required for professional development to ensure that is it of sufficient quality, intensity to lead to the expected outcomes for the proposed program. (p. e31)

The applicant did not demonstrate how the variation in content areas for arts integration on a yearly basis will be implemented. (p. e31)

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

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

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

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

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides evidence that the experience and training of key staff is relevant for the proposed project. For example, The project director has more than 17 years' experience in grant project implementation and management for schools, including grants that have funded professional development for teachers. The applicant indicates that an Arts Integration Manager will serve at 1 FTE (to be hired) with required with extensive experience in leadership roles, in arts education or a related field, and with strength in working with state and national arts education standards in professional development, arts integration, and school arts programming. (p. e40)

2. The applicant provides evidence that project consultants or subcontractors are experts in the areas of specialization that includes arts-in-education program initiatives. For example, the project evaluator has over 20 years of experience that in the area of the arts, is currently involved with a major Arts consultant, and holds an MA in Arts Administration, and other key consultants and subcontractors have significant experiences in the area of Arts. The applicant provides evidence of hiring key staff from underrepresented group. (pgs. e43)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 provides a detailed management plan that will meet proposed objectives on time and within budget, and includes clearly defined responsibilities and timelines for year one of the proposed project. The applicant documents that the plan will include activities/outputs, the person responsible and partners involved, a timeline, and milestones. Activities/outputs include adapting existing evaluation design and instruments, providing 30 hours of professional development through a five-day intensive summer workshop, and school teams to design and implement standards-based units. (pgs. e45, e46)

2. The applicant provides detailed procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. For example, the procedure for feedback and continuous improvement include surveys and oral feedback from community providers, project evaluation reports, video evidence, contact logs, input from staff (teacher participation), ratings (coaches and students), and analysis that will be shared for advisement regarding value of project during the project period. Feedback from workshop to ensure improvements with the teams' practice will also be shared. (p. e49)

3. The applicant indicates that the Arts Integration Manager will commit 1.0 FTE to the project. The time commitment for the Arts Integration Assistant was unclear (.5 or 1.0 FTE), and the Arts Integration Assistant will commit .5 FTE (p. e51). In addition, the Arts Integration Coach will provide a minimum of 125 hours each year to the project. (pgs. e50, e51)

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant did not provide specific timelines, responsibilities, and milestones for year two (Language Arts), and year three (Social Studies integration) for the proposed project. (pgs. e47, e48)
3. The applicant did not provide evidence that the project would have sufficient time commitments from key staff to ensure the success of the proposed project. For example, only one key person will commit 1.0 FTE to the project. The time commitment for the Arts Integration Assistant was unclear (.5 or 1.0 FTE). (pgs. e50, e51)

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (1) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**
 - (2) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
 - (3) **The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in this notice).**

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides an evaluation plan that includes the use of objective measures that will clearly relate to intended outcomes for the proposed project, and provides evidence to ensure the provision of qualitative and quantitative data by the end of performance period. The applicant provides performance measures used to assess the outcome of Objective 1.1, (80% of 120 participants on 20 interdisciplinary teacher teams will participate in sustained and intensive arts integration professional development), and there are participation records that account for 40 hours of direct training gained over one year. The applicant indicates that sign-in sheets and teacher professional development logs will provide quantitative data. (pgs. e58-e62)
2. The applicant clearly demonstrated how the project will ensure that methods of evaluation will provide feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the applicant indicates that performance feedback will come from attendance records at project events; teachers' professional development logs; the Arts Foundations – (PRE –Institute Survey) and Arts Infusion (POST-Institute Survey), as amended during Year One to include all arts forms from Kentucky Academic Standards. In addition, other sources of feedback will include video or photographic evidence of units; coaching observations and feedback of unit implementation, records of teachers' new leadership positions (e.g. meeting minutes, certificates, and letters from principals, superintendents, or community arts provider managers). (e55, e56)
3. The applicant provides evidence of using a strong theory approach for the proposed project. For example, the applicant provides a research-based theory that provides evidence in the areas of arts integration to improve teaching and learning across the curriculum, inclusion of community organizations, multi-level professional development, and professional learning communities, and coaching. (p. e60)

Weaknesses:

1. The applicant did not clearly indicate if the indicator for evaluation of teachers would be from a team or individual perspective. (p. e54)
- 2) The applicant failed to provide clear evidence of partner commitments for community arts partners. (e35, e42, e45)
- 3) The applicant will not offer more than the minimum required professional development to ensure that it leads to

improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. (pgs. e31-39)

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:

a. The applicant indicates a plan for the use of technology and Internet access to increase students' and educators' access to digital tools, assessments, materials, and open educational resources. For example, the applicant proposes to implement high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations that include the introduction of online learning during preparation work for the five-day summer workshop (e.g., required access of open education resources and TED talks). In addition, the applicant indicates that it will continue to use technology resources throughout the five-day workshop in an effort to promote interest of teachers, to break down barriers, and to increase familiarity with the range of resources available. The activities will include opportunities to share lessons, units and other arts integration tools among the teams, video-recorded lesson implementations with opportunities to provide feedback. (pgs. e74)

b) The applicant proposes to leverage technology to support instructional practice and professional development projects through infusion throughout the project that includes a requirement to use technology in preparation for and during the summer workshop. In addition, teachers will use technology throughout the year to support their arts integration work; to participate in online professional learning communities; to obtain online professional development monthly through the project's professional learning network; and to post units on the project's online sharing platform. (p. e16)

Weaknesses:

b) The applicant did not show how educators would earn professional development credit or CE units through digital credentials. (pgs. e16, e74)

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/01/2017 05:31 PM

Status: Submitted

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

Technical Review

Applicant: LUDLOW INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS (U351C170059)

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	23
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	27
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Leveraging Technology		
1. CPP 1	5	4
Total	105	96

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: LUDLOW INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS (U351C170059)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The proposal makes a very strong case linking high poverty to both a lack of resources and arts experiences, as well as linking to low academic performance (pg. e20-22). The survey data from teachers to assess their specific needs for professional development (pg. e23) leads to four specific challenges that this proposal could address (pg. e25).

Weaknesses:

"This criterion was thoroughly discussed; no weakness were found."

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 chart on pgs e27-30 provided a clear understanding how each component of the project is grounded in research and best practice. The bulleted list of intended improvements in practice (pg. e31) shows a clear scope and sequence in the program design that could lead to these intended outcomes.

Weaknesses:

The number of total PD hours (50 hours, pg. e27) is the minimum number for effective PD in the literature on this topic (Darling-Hammond et al, 2009. State of the Professional, Journal of Staff Development). With such abundant resources (community partners, large federal grant), it seems that the applicant has the capacity to provide much more than the minimum.

Also, there is a vague reference to the inclusion of community arts partners providing residencies (pg. e35, 42, 45, and appendix), but this is not explicitly in the program design. Usually, teaching artists modeling lessons, co-teaching, and mentoring is part of a high-quality PD program, as evidenced by the Venn diagram on pg. e27.

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:

While the project manager and assistant have not yet been hired, there were clear job qualifications outlined and a statement about encouraging applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented (pg. e40-41).

Having the regional education agency involved as a community partner brings a weight and importance to the project (pg. e44) that situates it squarely inside the realm of education reform, instead of relegated to an outside "special" or "frivolous" piece of education (pg. e61).

Weaknesses:

"This criterion was thoroughly discussed; no weakness were found."

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:

There are lots of mechanisms for continuous feedback, such as evaluation reports, video evidence, and contact logs, (pg. e49).

Weaknesses:

The format of the management plan was not clear, especially when trying to assess if the linear timeline made sense for the sequence of activities (pg. e45-47). A table or spreadsheet would have helped make this clearer. This led to several questions about the intended activities, such as the pre-tests being a required piece of the application (pg. e46), even though schools might not be selected to be a part of the program, they would still take the pre-test.

Additionally, it was not clear if the teams would be teaching their units as a team or to their respective classes individually, especially because the coach is listed as only provided one hour of support to each team during implementation (pg. e47). Again, because of the format, it was not clear if in year four, the original cohort would still be taking part in all or some of the listed activities (quarterly regional learning network meetings, monthly PD sessions via the online learning network, etc.) (pg. e46).

There is a discrepancy between pg. e39 and pg. e41 on how much time the Arts Integration Assistant will spend on the project (1 FTE vs. 0.5 FTE).

Reader's Score: 17

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

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

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

Strengths:

The table format (pg. 57-59) provided a helpful overview of each goal, its method of measurement, and its intended outcome, which helped assess that the evaluation will indeed produce qualitative and quantitative data to measure the intended outcomes.

Weaknesses:

In some instances, the teachers are rated individually (pg. e55), but in the same performance measure, the indicator is for the participating team (pg. e54), which led to confusion about how teachers/teams are measured and if the teachers are implementing the units individually or team teaching.

Also, the pre-post survey will be used to contribute to project improvement, especially for planning the summer institute, but the summer institute will be addressing different disciplines each summer, which might make the instrument a less valuable tool for feedback (pg. e56).

And finally, the proposal states that the ultimate measure of success is whether or not arts integration will impact student achievement (pg. e59). While creating this measure will take time, it is not included in the logic model (pg. e61), nor is the evaluation (and program design) backward mapped from this ultimate goal. It will be hard to achieve this goal if the

program isn't designed with this end goal in mind.

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 idea of a virtual problem of practice tour is exciting and could provide excellent support for teachers--it's a great use of technology.

Weaknesses:

There are too few details about how the problems of practice tour and online professional learning communities will function, such as what digital platform would be used, who will lead or initiate the online conversations, webinars, or sharing (pg. e74).

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

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