

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** Stanislaus County Office of Education (U351C170013)

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

	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	22
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>101</b>

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Stanislaus County Office of Education (U351C170013)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

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

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

#### Strengths:

1. The proposal provides clear and detailed data describing the poverty levels (e21, 24), low academic achievement (e23), previous substandard educational leadership (e23), and low participation of students in the visual, performing, and fine arts. The proposal provides data from previous arts education research (e19) that relates directly to preparing content teachers to successfully integrate the arts within their curricula (e19).
2. The proposal provides a concise and focused summary of the past educational climate of the district, as well as the positive changes made over the last several years by the current superintendent (e23). Relevant information is provided about the superintendent's hands-on approach to building a positive environment and consensus among teachers and parents, specifically in regards to increasing arts education within the focal schools. Information about the previous high turnover of principals within Chrysler Elementary, and the re-staffing of the school provides a clear portrait of past gaps in service to the students within the school (e23). Information related to the potential impact of the grant is placed in context with current efforts to support arts-integration in the focal schools (e25).

#### Weaknesses:

1. No weaknesses noted.
2. 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 rationale and approach of the project are supported by statistically significant research and programming related to a prior PDAE grant. This grant yielded significant results in the areas of professional development as well as assessment of student work (e27).
2. Gains in writing scores are likely based on previous implementations of the model in another district (e30). Gains in teacher knowledge and expertise in assessing students' work are also likely given the previously implemented project (e29-30).
3. The proposed project outlines professional development of a very significant duration (80 hours) (e31). The duration and intensity of the professional development is supported by school leaders and teachers at the focal schools (e32). The quality of the professional development is demonstrated through the involvement of the lead author of the new national standards in the area (e33), and support for the online components via MONDRIAN (e37). The combination of flipped, online instruction, paired with a minimum of 40 additional hours of classroom implementation, documentation and support demonstrates a highly detailed and comprehensive approach to the professional development that is proposed (e38).

**Weaknesses:**

1. No weaknesses noted.
2. The percentage of students who speak English as a second language is significant; however, beyond mention of teachers being sought who speak English as a second language, little attention is directed to providing services in this area (e23). The ability of the project to meet the needs of students who have disabilities is considered only briefly; this is not well-integrated within the remainder of the proposal (e13, e22-23).
3. No weaknesses noted.

**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 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. Project personnel are highly qualified, given the involvement of the team that created iACCESS and the Mobile Arts Assessment Tool; a project director with eleven years of arts education experience, several grants, and multiple state-level awards, her teaching expertise (e44); and a curriculum/professional development team recognized for their respective areas of practice-based knowledge and research (e44-45). The project is supported by a principal investigator with over two decades of program evaluation experience (e46).
2. The online learning specialist is a highly qualified instructor and researcher (e47), and the website/app developer has previous experience in designing assessment tools in the K-12 educational context (e48).

**Weaknesses:**

1. No weaknesses noted.
2. 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 management plan is detailed, specific and reasonable, given the overall goals of the project to increase teacher capacity, sustain the project, and disseminate results in other schools within the county (e50). Given the combination of professional development with implementation of actual lessons, the timeline during year two is logical and appropriate (e52). There is evidence of closing the loop through conversations and sharing of information (e55, e63).
2. The continuous improvement plan provides a basic structure for ensuring that feedback is provided in a regular and ongoing manner (e55).
3. The time commitments of the project director, principal investigator, and key project personnel are reasonable, and the extensive amount of total time allocated for the project demonstrates a deep commitment to rigorously executing the project plan (e56).

**Weaknesses:**

1. Given the detailed, multilayered evaluation and assessment data that will be collected in years one through three of the project, the management plan could be improved by detailing ways and/or points in time that this data would be collected and used to inform the strategic plan (e54-56).
2. The project management plan could be enhanced by describing how the evaluation will be more deeply embedded in the overall structure of the project (e55).
3. No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**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 proposed evaluation plan features the inclusion of guiding questions designed to determine the extent to which the project has met its goals. These guiding questions are appropriately framed to allow for describing project activities on a continuum (e59-61). The evaluation plan also focuses on impact and outcomes for both teachers and students (e61-64). These outcomes are clearly mapped onto the goals of the project and a quasi-experimental matched-design consistent with What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards is a strength of the program evaluation (e62).
2. Meetings and weekly conference calls (year 1) and bimonthly conference calls (years 2-4) are scheduled at appropriate intervals for a high quality program evaluation process. The division of the evaluation into areas focused on program efficacy, design and fidelity, and program sustainability (e64) provide appropriate structure for both formative and summative evaluation activities. The use of 4-point, non-median Likert scales for surveys is a strength (e68).
3. The proposed project is supported by strong theory, as represented in the logic model (e377). This logic model clearly delineates short, medium and long term outcomes that are consistent with the overarching goals of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

1. No weaknesses noted.
2. No weaknesses noted.
3. No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

- a. The proposed project builds on previous work in iACCESS, in creating apps related to developing teachers' expertise in arts-integration and the assessment of students' work (e34). A further strength relates to plans to structure both Android and IOS apps for teacher assessment work (e35).
- b. Online professional development curriculum development is a prominent strength of the proposed project (e32).

**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 11:01 AM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** Stanislaus County Office of Education (U351C170013)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	22
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Total</b>	105	101

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Stanislaus County Office of Education (U351C170013)

## 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 proposed project will focus on addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals. The iMEDIA Program is an innovative approach to provide sustainable professional development in arts integration and assessment technology to enhance student achievement. Participating schools are identified to have been selected from an open invitation to all schools in their Stanislaus County. Page e 19, 21, 22

The needs of the target area to be served are noted. For example 67% of students are considered economically disadvantaged, as compared to the state average of 59%. Generational poverty is identified and noted that 40% of incoming kindergarten students in one of the elementary school are lacking in readiness skills. Page e 22

It is noted that school leadership has experienced a revolving door, which is being addressed by a new superintendent who expresses a vision and commitment to arts integration. The new school superintendent asserts his commitment in noting that school reform is tied to arts education. This statement clearly supports the proposed initiative Pages e 23, 24

In addition, it is identified that 25% of students in the County are classified as English Language learners. It is noted that the program will especially benefit and advanced student's achievement through arts integrated instruction and learning. This is evidenced in describing proposed strategies emphasizing its value in communications skills and motivation. Page e 25

2. The applicant referenced research to support the proposed initiative. For example a 2016 study by the California Arts education Data Project details that high poverty students are more at risk for receiving poor or nonexistence arts education. This study supports the program since currently the only requirement for arts education in the K-12 district is in grades 7 -12. To address the need, the proposed project will serve two elementary school identified as high poverty with 85% of student living below the poverty level. Page e 26

It is noted that program strategies are aligned to address needs. This is evidenced in strategies include the "Flipped Classroom" model and rigorous standards based learning to enable designing and implementing two four-to-six week Visual art and English language Arts standards based units. It is noteworthy that the teacher's use of a mobile device will enable the uploading of student works for assessment of student's ability to transfer arts learning to a new context. Page e 19

A well-developed chart outlines the lack of arts education in high poverty communities. For example, in California 86 % of students lack access and only 35% participate in the arts. Page e 24.

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services**

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

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

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

**(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.**

**Strengths:**

(1) Page e 24 The iMEDIA (Model for Educator's Digitally Integrating Arts) that builds on the research and effective practices adopted from a successful 2014 PDAE grant Access Project in Fresno California. It is asserted that this program in California expanded learning with a focus on teacher assessment of discrete arts skills using mobile technology. That 2014 PDEA grant is cited to have created an innovative Mobile Arts Assessment tools which has been field tested by more than 100 teachers assessing 6,000 unique pieces of student's arts work in visual and performing arts. Page e 27

(2) The applicant proposes to serve 75 educators and over 3000 students, K-6 who are identified to gain knowledge in ELA. This is evidenced in identifying the iMEDIA model to impact students in grades k-6 in the target area in a "flipped classroom" experience engaging in two arts integrated units of study. The applicant asserts that the project will affect all teachers and students in the Stanislaus County in three significant ways. These are: developing an on line professional development curriculum and website with an be easily replicated; making resources available to school through the County and that the six Lead Teachers in the program and the 75 participating teachers will serve as a resource for program expansion. Pages e 32, 33

(3) The applicant identifies the professional development services to be provided by the proposed project in a well-developed two-year timeline. The timeline is built in quarters for each year and spans building and increasing background of Media Arts standards for the team to building an on line learning system and completely redesigning the MONDARIAN Tool for effectiveness and efficiency, Pages e 33, 34

In addition, an integrated system will be developed with the collaboration of county staff focused on grade K-2 arts education of arts standard and arts integration into academics. An orientation and training for participating teachers in the two elementary schools will be held during the first year. Page e 36.

It is well narrated that summer on line professional development modules are scheduled for the summer of year one. Coaching and capacity building for the Lead Teachers are scheduled for the summer of year two of the program. Pages e 39-42. Integrating visual arts with English Language Arts. In year four it is identified to recruit and meet with stakeholders to advanced program sustainability.

The endeavors of the County are well detailed noting the expansion of relevant programs to add seven professional develop workshops for elementary teachers in arts standards and arts integration across the curriculum. It is also noted the county hosts a website for K-12 arts educators and teachers in partnership with the Gallo Center for the arts and the

John F Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. It is asserted that the proposed program will bring together with a committee of educational agencies, The Stanislaus Union Elementary District and the Stanislaus County Office of education with nationally recognized project team to address the needs of disadvantaged student's theory high quality professional development in arts integration and the only. Pages e 26, 27

**Weaknesses:**

1. Adequate information is lacking to describe the MONDRIAN tool to be used and redesigned for classroom observation.
2. While the applicant identifies an open process to select schools serving K-6 grade elementary school grades it is not clear how grades k-2 were selected and the only integrated curriculum scheduled to be developed is for grades K-2.

Overall, the project lacks adequate information describing sufficient data detailing program strategies which will ensure 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.

The chart reflecting the California Arts Education Data Project is lacking a date to determine its relevance and current information. While the program is framed on a 2014 PDAE grant, very little current research is noted.

**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 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:**

Three effective strategies are well delineated to ensure equity in hiring practices. For example, the applicant networks with traditionally underrepresented groups in other County offices with large urban areas to broadcast job openings. Page e 42

Key personnel are identified to include the Director, an Arts Integration Specialist, an Online Learning Specialist, a Principal Investigator and a Mobile Applications and Web Design Team. It is noted that the team is the same team the created the original iACCESS project and the Mobile Arts Assessment Tool. The key staff will be supported in the operation of the project by the County Superintendent. Page e 43

The expertise and experience of the Project Director relevant as she currently serves as the Visual and Performing Arts and STEAM Coordinator for Stanislaus County. She has eleven years of experience in arts education and holds a M.A. T in Arts Education. Her responsibilities are well noted. Page e 44

Additional key staff are identified and their experience and expertise well described. For example, the Arts Integration Specialist is reference as a national leader in arts and arts integration, with a 25-year history as an arts specialist. He is

recognized as having published arts related works in the realm of K-12 Arts and core standards in English Language Arts.  
Page e 45

(2) The web design team is noted as having had experience in leading software teams in various projects including mobile consumer application to enterprise web application. His experience is noted as having consulted on several grants including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

**Weaknesses:**

None are 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 describes a management plan structured to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The Stanislaus County Office of Education Visual and Performing Arts Department are responsible to implement the designed collaborate management plan to manage a program encompassing professional development for teachers aligned to rigorous academic standards. An overview of their history in successfully operating professional development programs since 2009 is noted. Pages e 48, 49

A general comment is asserted noting that the Stanislaus County Educational team will lead the management of the iACCESS project and serve as responsible for the coordination of all activities, hiring of staff and communications and logistics. It is designated that the StanUnion superintendent will also serve in the responsibility to ensure teachers have adequate time to engage in various professional development offerings, and to ensure its content is integrated within the school reform effort. Page e 49, 50

The applicant presents a well-developed timeline which structures the four years of the program identifying major activities and aligning each to the persons responsible. For example, in year one staff will be hired and the website designed and field testing initiated. The MONDRIAN tool will also be created in year one under the responsibility of the Website Designer, the Project Director and Principal Investigator. Each major activity is aligned to a program objective. Pages e 51-53

(2) The applicant presents a plan which delineates some adequate procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. This is evidenced in identifying the Education Design to guide progress with bi-monthly staff meetings led by the Project Director. A chain for feedback is specified with the Lead Teacher bringing information back from the participating teachers in the Support Plan meetings.

(3) The applicant responds to the criteria providing a chart which identifies the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel. For example, The Project Director is denied working 90 days in each year of the project and the Lead Teachers and participating teachers to work ten days a year in the project each

**Weaknesses:**

1. The applicant fails to designate a person responsible to ensure that program activities area accomplished within budget. In addition, financial responsibilities are not noted in the timeline. Pages e 50 54. Information is lacking to identify the specific persons and the title, or professional expertise of those who are serving on the Stanislaus County Educational Team and who are designated to oversee the program implementation.

The timeline scheduling specific major activities, lack specification of alignment with major milestones.

2. Information is lacking designating the person or persons responsible for analyzing data. The applicant mentions the Continuous Improvement Plan Process but fails to describe it. While information from the participating teachers is noted to be collected by the Lead Teacher, additional information describing data collection from any other group such as the school administrators or from a person responsible to review of student progress is needed.

2.The training of the Web Design consultant is not referenced in the narrative.

3. Adequate information is lacking to discuss or substantiate that the time allotment for key staff are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. For example, it is identified for the Lead Teacher and the participating teachers to commit ten days a year to the program. Information is lacking to describe what duties encompass the ten days and if they are for professional development activities only.

**Reader's Score: 19**

**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 responds to the criteria discussing methods of evaluation which include objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data. The evaluation will be conducted by Education Design and the program's Principal Investigator for two separate efforts of assessment. An outcome based research study or impact evaluation will focus on the impact of the program through various measurement protocols and tools. A Program evaluation or a process evaluation will be conducted focused on fidelity of implementation, efficacy, sustainability and transferability of the model. In addition, data collection from teachers is noted to include evidence of transfer in students work and changes in understanding. Pages e 57-59

Qualitative data will be collected from assessment strategies aligned to each of the three goals. Questions are well articulated to secure meaningful qualitative data to gather data on how well the MONDRIAN provided useful feedback to students. Qualitative data will also be collected in the extent teachers are trained (train -the-trainer model) to support integrated arts learning using the iMEDIA curriculum. Page e 60-62

The program will conduct a quasi-experimental study using matched student control. The study is aligned to What Works Clearinghouse. In addition, student data will be reviewed from the district's benchmark tests in English Language Arts. Pages e 62, 63

Quantitative data will be collected by the Assessment Office at the County office who has committed to providing data in numerically identified (anonymous to district outsiders) Scores from the MONDRIAN performance assessment is noted to be compared between a random sample of treatment and control students to generate reliable predictions. Page e 64

2 . Performance feedback is clearly referenced to be collected on an annual basis related to pre-and post-assessment (September and May.) Teacher interviews are specified to occur in mid fall and late spring annually. Formative reporting is scheduled to occur quarterly and informally during conferences. The summative report will be delivered at the end of each year, Page e 69

A chart is presented which adeptly outlines each of the three program goals aligned to measurable objectives and a data collection timeline. For example, data will be collected each year of the project through the years on teacher leaders training from workshop logs and observation. Page e 70

3 The applicant precisely details the proposed project as supported by strong theory. This is evidenced in specifying that the evaluation will be guided by the Five Critical Levels of Professional Development Evaluation Model. The model components are identified to include; the reaction, learning, organizational support, the use of new knowledge a skills and student learning outcomes. Ultimately these five skills are focused to advance students' outcomes. Page e 57.

The applicant also specifies using the PDSA -Plan, do, Study, Act cycle which is described as a scientific method e for iterative testing of change in a complex system, such as a school system. This approach is referenced as promote by the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement in Teaching. Page e 58

A precise Logic Model provides a visual articulation of program operation. The four inputs are charted and aligned and cross referenced with the anticipated outcomes. For example, the online learning and assessment tools will serve to produce a replicable model of arts integration.

#### **Weaknesses:**

None are noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

#### **Priority Questions**

##### **Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

A. The applicant will use an internet based Model for Education with Deeply Integrated Arts (iMEDIA) to enable staff in the target area to receive high quality and sustainable professional development in arts integration and assessment technology. These are positioned to advance student achievement and cognitive gain. It is a unique model that fosters blended learning with a focus on teacher assessment of discrete art skills using mobile technology.

B. The proposed program is well described noting implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, for educators could earn professional development. This is specified to occur in a “flipped classroom” model with two days of on line professional development in the foundation of art skills and in experimental workshops encompassing knowledge applied in face- to- face experimental workshops. sessions. Page e 19

**Weaknesses:**

None are noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/02/2017 11:01 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/31/2017 12:16 PM

## Technical Review

**Applicant:** Stanislaus County Office of Education (U351C170013)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Services</b>		
1. Project Services	25	22
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	19
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	30	30
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Leveraging Technology</b>		
1. CPP 1	5	5
<b>Total</b>	105	101

# Technical Review Form

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

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

Applicant: Stanislaus County Office of Education (U351C170013)

## 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)

Planned for high poverty, racially diverse elementary schools and district, with an approach that uniquely serves this population. (e21)

Strong administrative support at the County, District and School levels, after many years of neglect for arts learning and arts integration. (e22-23)

New policies, processes, and programs are in place to support children's growth and learning in and through the arts. (e23)

(2)

The proposal builds on an already successful model, applying what was learned in the last go around. (e6)

The proposal adds Media Arts, which has just been included in the Arts Standards. (e6)

Two elementary schools are involved. They are large schools, and are being used to develop an approach that will be replicated after this research is done. The project will reach 3,000 students (some in the control group) and 75 teachers.

#### 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:**

(1)  
The proposal builds on recent research that suggests positive impact on those receiving the services. (e27)  
The proposal expands and improves the innovative Mobile Arts Assessment Tool. (e27)

(2)  
The project aims to reach 75 teachers with over 80 hours of services per year with highly trained integrated arts specialists to deliver integrated arts units, and 3,000 students to achieve significant gains in arts knowledge integrated with ELA. (e12)

(3)  
There is sufficient PD and contact time, some in person and some online. (e28-29)  
Powerful use of technology, both as a tool for assessment and visual discrimination and as a delivery modality for PD, will drive the project. (e30)

The project will provide district-wide technology services for teachers; WiFi access in all schools. (e31)  
Exploration of media arts is cutting edge, and will be led by an expert in the field. (e30-31)  
Detailed plans prepare teachers, develop a new (revised) technology platform, improve evaluation tools, develop integrated units by grade level, implement and assess. (e33-42)

**Weaknesses:**

(2)  
Starting with the lower grades is a blessing and a curse. It's easier to start with younger children and their teachers, and as the program grows, the children come up with more skills. However, you run the risk of older children and their teachers forever thinking that the approach is "too young." It is a dilemma that the applicant should be aware of... (e37)  
ELL is mentioned, but is not developed as clearly as other needs—i.e., the impact is not clearly flushed out. (e32-33)

(3)  
Applicant says integrated curriculum units will be high quality, but provides no guidelines for the creation of the units. (e36)

**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 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) & (2)  
The experience and qualifications of the personnel are simply stellar throughout. This is a team of pros who know what they're doing, and how to work together. They are impressive and diverse. They have expertise in running and managing grants. (e42-48)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

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

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

#### Strengths:

(1)

The management plan begins with a very experienced and interconnected team of educators, administrators, technology experts, and evaluators who have clear roles and lots of grant experience. (e48-49)

Goals and objectives are clear and sequenced so that the project moves from training to implementation with opportunities for refinement, and then dissemination to a broader community. (e50-51)

The timeline is clear, with sufficient flexibility within each step. (e50-54)

(2)

There is formative assessment and opportunities for adjustment built into the timeline. (e55-56)

(3)

The time commitment of personnel seems a bit tight; however, the team seems to have expertise in making this work, and if they work efficiently, it should be manageable. (e56)

#### Weaknesses:

(1)

Consider plans for additional support and remediation for those teachers who are struggling with the training and implementation. It helps to have a policy in place for how and when to deal with challenging teachers as well as students. Information about training on technology is too general to understand what skills and understandings will be gained. (e51-53)

(2)

On page e55, the "strategies and modifications identified and utilized in upcoming teaching activities based on the data presented in collaborative discussions" means that there is no plan to return to modify those lessons in which flaws were found. The plan should include a revision process for the already-implemented K-2 plans before they are more widely disseminated.

"Continuous improvement" leans on teachers for data, but not school administrators. (e55)

(3)

Time commitments on page e56 will require the team to be very efficient with their time. These time allocations will work only if nothing goes awry. (e56)

### 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 impartiality of evaluators is an obvious and necessary strength. (e57)

The theoretical framework uses contemporary theories of professional development that allow for sufficient time and iterative successes to yield sustainable results (e58).

(2)

The data collection will be broad-ranging, and used formatively for adjustment throughout the project, as well as for summative reporting of successes and next steps. (e55)

There is understanding that arts integration requires knowledge acquisition in both domains, in this case visual art and ELA. (e57)

(3)

The scope of the evaluation includes the efficacy of the tool itself, teacher outcomes (which are stated as a central purpose of the project) that are rigorous and require substantial content and technology tool learning, student outcomes on arts integration projects (for which there is a control group quasi-experimental design) with a population size that has "statistical power for generate reliable predictions." (e61, 64)

The program evaluation is designed to inform the project throughout, allowing iterative changes. Sustainability is considered with specific research questions that will inform later years of the project, as well as plans once the grant cycle is completed. (e63)

The Data Collection section on e67 provides a roadmap for all involved in the project. It shows that the team knows what they are doing, and that the outcomes are driving the implementation in the best way possible, for formative and summative information to drive the initiative.

Data Analysis (e68) is clear and appropriate to the needs of the multiple goals. The connection to Scripp et. al scema is another example of piggybacking on already existing good research procedures. Scripp does research in arts integration that includes music, so opens the door to potential use of this project's evaluation on broader arts integration initiatives.

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted.

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Leveraging Technology**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

a) & (b)

Technology is used in several ways in this project, and is being creatively used to build teacher capacity to critically view student art, and thereby to assess student growth in visual art (e61). High quality digital coursework is applied in a flipped, blended design. The tool may become an Open Educational Resource (OER), and there are plans to disseminate it more widely. The proposal feels like an i3 development grant. There is sufficient expertise, and the team is well-connected to others nationwide as they work.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/31/2017 12:16 PM