

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/13/2021 07:25 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Young Audiences of Maryland, Inc. (S411C210097)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
1. CPP1	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>CPP2</b>		
<b>CPP2</b>		
1. CPP2	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>CPP3</b>		
<b>CPP3</b>		
1. CPP3	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>18</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - EIR Early Phase - 14: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Young Audiences of Maryland, Inc. (S411C210097)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

2. The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

- 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 2. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 3. The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

#### **Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan**

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

- 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.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 3. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 4. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

**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:**

Sub

1. (1) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes a Randomized Control Trial (RCT) to evaluate the impact of the proposed Start With the Art program on student achievement and socioemotional outcomes (e39-e40). Specifically, the applicant proposes to assign teachers (classrooms) to treatment versus control groups, after stratification by school and the grade levels of the students they teach (e39-40). The proposed evaluation design (pages e39-e44), if well implemented, should produce reliable empirical evidence about program effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations (if there were no differential attrition) or with reservations (if there is differential attrition).

In line with WWC guidelines, the applicant demonstrates that the proposed stratified randomization approach (with delayed implementation for teachers in control groups) is feasible and equitable (e39-e40). This proposed design will ensure that all interested teachers have the opportunity to participate in training and deliver the intervention at some point during the project period, which will in turn increase the number of students receiving the intervention (e39-40).

The application demonstrates that the evaluation team has the requisite skills and experience to successfully implement the planned RCT and disseminate the findings (e37, e63-e78 and e88-e103). The evaluation team is external to the project implementation team (e36-e37)—which is important for objectivity in the implementation of the proposed fidelity and impact evaluation studies.

Given the nested nature of the data (e.g., classrooms/teachers nested within schools), the proposed analytical strategies (i.e., series of hierarchical linear models) are appropriate for examining the impact of the program on students and teachers (pages e45-e46). The applicant proposes logical strategies for ensuring the reliability of the observational protocols and proposes to administer data collection tools (e.g., Woodcock-Johnson IV) with established reliability indices (e43-e45).

**Weaknesses:**

The proposed evaluation plan does not include a power analysis (e39-e46). Although the applicant notes on page e46 that an “effect size of 0.25 or greater will be used as the threshold for a program of practical significance,” the applicant does not provide statistical power calculations to demonstrate that the expected sample size of 400 (page e42) is adequate for eliciting the minimum detectable effect size for this type of intervention.

The applicant does not discuss potential strategies for addressing teacher and student attrition and issues of nonresponse (e39-e46). Relatedly, the proposed evaluation plan assumes that 50% of students will have parental permission for the study (page e42), but does not discuss how this could constitute a confounding factor in the study. A potential threat is that the 50% expected parental permission might not reflect the population of students in the schools, as there may be significant differences between students with permission and those without permission. These differences could pose as confounding factors. As stated in WWC, confounding variables are significant threats to the internal validity of impact studies.

There are inconsistencies in the applicant's description of the sampling size for the classroom observations. On page e39, the applicant states “researchers will observe approximately 33% of all lessons co-taught by teachers and teaching artists who attended the 2022 Training Institute.” However, on page e40, the applicant states “the observational measure of key arts-integrated instructional strategies will be collected from 20% of all lessons co-taught by teachers and teaching artists in the treatment condition ... and control-condition classrooms.”

Sub

Reader's Score: 10

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

**Strengths:**

The proposed fidelity study (e38-e40) is logical and should enhance program performance and contribute to continuous quality improvement. For example, the applicant proposes to conduct classroom observations and focus groups to evaluate the extent to which arts-integrated lessons are implemented according to plan (e38-39). This approach is appropriate and has the potential to provide data to identify the factors and processes through which the intervention enhances student and teacher outcomes. In addition, the proposed frequencies of analysis and reporting of observations and focus group data are very realistic and should provide just-in-time feedback to support iterative refinement of program activities and continuous program improvement (e38 and e47).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not discuss plans for identifying and addressing barriers and challenges that may occur during intervention implementation (e38-e47).

Reader's Score: 4

3. (3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

**Strengths:**

The proposed Start With the Art program, if implemented as described in the proposal, has the potential to make significant contributions to research on how arts-integrated instruction fosters academic and socioemotional outcomes of elementary school students, especially those from limited-resource backgrounds.

The applicant proposes to disseminate the intervention conceptual framework and evaluation findings to appropriate stakeholders; including families, educators, policymakers, and researchers (page e24). The proposed dissemination strategies (e.g., public events, conference presentations, publications, websites; page e25) have the potential to reach a wide array of audiences. In addition, the application demonstrates that the project team has the experience, expertise, and network to facilitate the dissemination and distribution of the program. As shown in the resumes, members of the project and evaluation teams have published numerous research articles (pages e63-e103).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not discuss how the proposed Start With the Art program will alleviate the gaps identified in the proposal (e47-e48).

Reader's Score: 4

**Priority Questions**

**CPP1 - CPP1**

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**  
Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for

traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

#### **CPP2 - CPP2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**

Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through...[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

#### **CPP3 - CPP3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**

Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following...[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 10/13/2021 07:25 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/14/2021 03:48 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Young Audiences of Maryland, Inc. (S411C210097)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	29
<b>Sub Total</b>	50	49
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	22
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	22
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	0
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
1. CPP1	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>CPP2</b>		
<b>CPP2</b>		
1. CPP2	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	4
<b>CPP3</b>		
<b>CPP3</b>		
1. CPP3	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	115	80

# Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - EIR Early Phase - 14: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Young Audiences of Maryland, Inc. (S411C210097)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 20

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The Start with Art program builds on the success of a summer arts-integration camp (SALA), which pairs teachers with community artists to develop arts-integrated lessons (pp. e22-e23). The Start with Art program uniquely pairs community artists across four art domains with elementary school teachers in high needs (based on socioeconomic status) schools to co-develop and deliver arts-integrated instruction.

#### Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

#### Strengths:

The dissemination plan is thorough and includes sharing of progress and findings to academic, family, policy, and practitioner audiences both in person and via electronic and social media (p. e24).

#### Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 5

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

**Reader's Score: 29**

**Sub**

- 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

The theoretical framework emphasizes the impact of arts-integrated instruction on three constructs: diversifying teaching to meet differential learning needs; increasing retention of academic learning through arts as a familiar pathway and increased emotional connection to academics; and offering opportunities to experience and express emotions in ways that foster social-emotional growth (pp. 27-e33). The theoretical framework is embedded in the project's logic model (p. e32, p. e110) and is well-informed by the most current literature on arts-integrated instruction.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 2. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

The project goals, objectives, and outcomes are well-described with identified targets and measures (pp. e31-e33). Focus groups after training and after implementation are important to informing the ongoing development of the training and support of the teacher and artist pairs (p. e39). The Lab-TAB test is a particularly well-selected measure of perseverance (p. e44-e45).

**Weaknesses:**

An observational instrument will be used to measure and evaluate the quality of the arts-integrated lessons. This instrument has yet to be developed and has not yet been subject to measurement validation (p. e43).

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 3. The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Strengths:**

The project is well-designed to meet the learning and social-emotional needs of students in school that serve a high percentage of socioeconomically disadvantaged families (pp. e21-e27).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan**

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

Reader's Score: 22

Sub

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.

**Strengths:**

The management plan includes clear timelines, milestones, and actionable goals. For example, Phase I between January and July 2022 is dedicated to developing the program and recruiting schools and coaches (p. e52). The school district is supportive of the project and training will be delivered within an existing arts training institute popular with district teachers (pp. e25-e26). The training is intensive – two days – and is followed-up with ongoing consultation and coaching, which is adequately budgeted (pp. e25-e26; e115-e144).

**Weaknesses:**

The two Co-Principal Investigators (PI) serve as the project evaluators with some assistance from key personnel from the Young Audiences of Maryland (p. e37-e38). How the Co-PIs may be involved in the ongoing development and implementation of the training is not clearly delineated.

Reader's Score: 9

2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

**Strengths:**

The project personnel clearly have the background, training, and expertise to carry-out the project (pp. e36-e37; e62-e102). Co-Principal Investigators Holochwost and Brown have experience and expertise in research, arts education, and child development, particularly for students placed at risk by poverty (p. e37). Key personnel from Young Audiences of Maryland and Prince George's County Public Schools have experience successfully developing, offering, and fostering arts-integration in classrooms (p. e22-e23; e36-e37).

**Weaknesses:**

None.

Reader's Score: 5

3. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

The costs for this project are very detailed and provided in the Budget Narrative (p. e38, pp. e115-e152).

**Weaknesses:**

The rationale for the costs, including a cost analysis, is not provided for all areas of the budget (p. e38, pp. e115-e152).

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

**4. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The process for gathering data to inform the ongoing development of the project is well-described. The data collected will provide both important subjective and objective information about the training and implementation of the arts-integrated teaching that should be helpful to key personnel as they provide ongoing support and trainings subsequent to the first year (p. e38, also evaluation methods pp. e39-e47).

**Weaknesses:**

How focus group and observation data will be shared and processed to inform continuous improvement is unclear beyond that it will be shared soon after the data is collected (pp. e46-e47). How the key personnel plan to engage this data to inform possible improvements to the program is unclear, particularly given the short timeframe between collection of data and reporting of findings. Conducting focus groups in August and sharing findings in September is an ambitious turn-around (p. e47).

Reader's Score: 4

**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:**

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

**1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

Reader's Score:

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

**Strengths:**

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

3. (3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

### Priority Questions

#### CPP1 - CPP1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

#### CPP2 - CPP2

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**

Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through...[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

**Strengths:**

Applicants provide national level data that demonstrates the negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on kindergarten student enrollment and particularly for students living in poverty (p. e34-e35). The intervention itself fosters collaboration between teachers and artists to deliver arts-integrated lessons that should foster learning, engagement, and socioemotional growth for students most impacted by the pandemic (p. e24).

**Weaknesses:**

District level data is not provided to contextualize the impact of COVID-19 on student engagement and learning (p. e33-e35).

**Reader's Score:** 4

**CPP3 - CPP3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**

**Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following...[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]**

**Strengths:**

The project is well designed to redress educational disparities associated with socioeconomic disadvantage exacerbated by COVID-19 (pp. e33-e35) by increasing access to effective art-integration teachers and by providing PD in arts-integration to teachers that elevates student engagement via a more robust, creative, and playful medium.

**Weaknesses:**

None.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/14/2021 03:48 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/15/2021 05:48 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Young Audiences of Maryland, Inc. (S411C210097)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	24
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
1. CPP1	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>CPP2</b>		
<b>CPP2</b>		
1. CPP2	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CPP3</b>		
<b>CPP3</b>		
1. CPP3	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>83</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - EIR Early Phase - 14: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Young Audiences of Maryland, Inc. (S411C210097)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 20

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

#### Strengths:

The applicant clearly identified the proposed project's idea of building on existing strategies of developing an evidence-based, field-initiated program of arts integrated with instruction, that is designed to improve the academic performance of at-risk students, develop students' emotion regulation, and teach them to build positive relationships with peers (e 24). The program will incorporate four existing arts-integrated instructional strategies (e 23). To foster students' engagement, the applicant proposes using art activities, modalities, and examples (e 23). To provide students with opportunities to exercise a capacity for emotion regulation, the applicant proposes using art experiences (e 23). Collaborative work will be used to foster students' positive peer relationships (e 23).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

#### Strengths:

The applicant identified many ways the project's findings will be disseminated. For example, the four audiences to be recipients of the project's results: families, educators, policymakers, and researchers (e 24). The applicant also clearly noted that key personnel will present at meetings of educators and policymakers, including The Arts Education Partnership (AEP) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) (e 24). Presentations and publications will be announced on the websites and social media accounts (e 25). Emerging findings will be presented at annual meetings of YAMD and PGCPs, and will feature presentations of students, teachers, teaching artists (e 25).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 30**

Sub

- 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

A detailed plan is used to demonstrate a program year. After recruitment of teachers and teaching artists, they will participate in a Training Institute offering instruction in collaboration lesson planning, co-teaching techniques, and arts-integrated instructional strategies (e 26). It was also noted that the arts-instructional strategies demonstrate the domains of socioemotional development (e 26). The applicant specified that these strategies produce outcomes of emotion regulation, perseverance, and positive relationships with their peers (e 26). The applicant also clearly specified the rotation of teachers for subsequent years (e 26-27).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 2. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant noted clearly specified goals to include developing an evidence-based field-initiated program, establishing a two-way collaboration between classroom teachers and YAMD teaching artists, and expanding access to arts-integrated instructional strategies (e 32). Objectives consisted of developing an evidence-based field-initiated program, implementing and iteratively refining the program, and rigorously evaluating the effects of the program (e 33). Outcomes included fostering students' academic performance, emotion regulation, perseverance, and positive relationships with their peers (e 33).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 3. The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant identified that the targeted population consisted of reaching at-risk students in K-3rd grade (e 34). It was noted that the implemented program of arts-integrated instruction presents a diverse learning opportunity for students and enhances retention of academic content (e 34). By providing expanding access to arts experiences through the provision of arts-integrated instruction, the applicant hopes to meet the needs of the targeted population by providing experiences that promote socio-emotional development (e 34).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan**

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 24**

Sub

- 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.**

**Strengths:**

The presented information strongly suggests that the objectives of the proposed project will be completed on time and within budget (e 35-36). For example, the applicant presented a management plan that has clear timelines and milestones for accomplishing tasks (e 35-36). It was noted that in August of 2022, the applicant will begin Phase II and begin the first Training Institute (e 35). It was noted the names of key personnel and their specific roles for the collection of data from classroom teachers, teaching artists, and instructional coaches with the results of the analyses of the data to be shared by the lead researcher and key personnel (e 35- 37).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant successfully identified the qualifications of the grant leadership including relevant training and experience of key personnel. For example, the applicant identified the Chief Program Officer at YAMD as the Project Director who will manage the daily aspects of the project which entails booking and scheduling of teaching artists (e 37). Another key personnel's relevant experience was identified as the Chief of Innovation and Strategic Initiatives at YAMD and will manage the budget and work with the Co-Principal Investigators and research team (e 37). The identified co-Principal Investigators have extensive experience and have collaborated before on previous projects concerning at-risk students (e 37).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**3. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

To prove costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of data, the applicant clearly noted an in-kind contribution valuing \$440,237.01 for the proposed project's salaries for key staff wages (e 112). The applicant included a breakdown of all personnel (e 118). For example, it was noted that the Chief Program Officer's hourly rate be \$60.17, and the Education Directors' salary to be \$49.26 hourly (e 118). The provided salaries and wages appear adequate.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not propose providing a cost analysis for the project to determine the true costs of the program (e 38).

**Reader's Score: 4**

**4. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proved the adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement. For example, the applicant identified that observational data of arts-integrated lessons will be collected each year and shared bi-annually, in January and June of each academic year (e 38). The applicant detailed that the results of the analyses collected using the observational measure from their lessons observed in September through December of 2022 will be shared in January 2023 (e 47). The applicant noted the adequacy of ensuring feedback included

**Sub**

identifying that in the first, pilot year of the program, implementation will occur in Fall Year 1 - Spring Year 2, with the observational data to be supplemented by the results of focus groups using educators (e 38).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**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:**

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

3. **(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.**

Sub

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

### Priority Questions

#### CPP1 - CPP1

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

#### CPP2 - CPP2

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**

Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through...[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly noted that arts-integrated instruction can also yield benefits to aspects of socioemotional development that may have been adversely impacted by COVID-19 (e 35). For example, it was noted that the implementation of arts-integrated instruction can help with prosocial behaviors (e 35). Therefore, the applicant identified that the proposed project addresses the needs of children and families disproportionately impacted by COVID-19 (e 35).

**Weaknesses:**

More district-level data was needed to determine the specific needs of the targeted population (e 35).

Reader's Score: 4

CPP3 - CPP3

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**

Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following...[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]

**Strengths:**

The applicant presented a project design that promotes equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in grades K-3 (e 17). The applicant defined high-need students according to students' socioeconomic status, the likelihood of the targeted population's education being disrupted due to COVID-19, and to at-risk students' access to educational resources and opportunities (e 17). It was identified that over 66% of students in the applicant's identified area qualify for free and reduced-price lunch, and over 90% of those children are children of color (e 17).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/15/2021 05:48 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/14/2021 10:53 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Young Audiences of Maryland, Inc. (S411C210097)

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	20	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	50	0
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
<b>Resources &amp; Management Plan</b>		
1. Resources & Manag. Plan	25	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	25	13
<b>Sub Total</b>	25	13
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
<b>CPP1</b>		
1. CPP1	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>CPP2</b>		
<b>CPP2</b>		
1. CPP2	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>CPP3</b>		
<b>CPP3</b>		
1. CPP3	5	
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	
<b>Total</b>	115	13

# Technical Review Form

Panel #14 - EIR Early Phase - 14: 84.411C

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Young Audiences of Maryland, Inc. (S411C210097)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 0

#### Sub

1. The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

2. The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

- 1. The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 2. The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 3. The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

#### **Resources & Management Plan - Resources & Management Plan**

- 1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Sub**

- 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.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 2. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 3. The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

- 4. The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

**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:**

Reader's Score: 13

Sub

1. (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards with or without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in this notice).

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly describes a general data analysis plan utilizing hierarchical linear models that account for nesting of students and classes within schools (pages e45, e46).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant mentions assessing 5-6 domains and scales to measure educator practice but it is not clear how these will be developed or how they will be defined and validated. It is also not clear if both the classroom teacher and the co-teaching artists will be assessed by these measures (pages e43, e45).

The applicant describes the participation plan for each project cohort but it is not clear if the same teachers and students from cohort 1 will continue to be assessed throughout the end of the program. It is also not clear whether or not longitudinal data will be collected from cohorts 1 and 2 (pages e41, e42).

The applicant indicates that they will use three scales on engagement, peer sociability, and peer communications drawn from the Individualized Classroom Assessment Scoring System (inCLASS), but it is not evident that all or most of the arts-integrated lessons will include any or all of the three components. In particular, it is not indicated how many of the 16 lessons will include aspects of peer sociability and peer communication (page e43).

Most of the assessments and measures of the project are qualitative and observation-based and rely heavily on interrater reliability (coaches observing and assessing teachers, teachers observing and assessing students), and the project does not appear to include first-person measures such as individual student and teacher surveys (pages e43, e44).

Reader's Score: 6

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly describes plans to share data and results at the end of the semester for teacher and student observational measures or at the end of the school year for training institute focus groups (page e47).

**Weaknesses:**

There is no discussion of how the bi-annual and annual results will be reviewed and used to provide continuous improvement and improve ongoing project performance among instructional coaches and teachers. The application only mentions sharing results with key project and school district personnel (pages e46, e47).

Reader's Score: 4

3. (3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant highlights the foundational theoretical framework and theory of change for the project and states how the project will add to the research literature regarding the integration of arts education into math and English and Language Arts (ELA) lessons for early elementary school students (page e48).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not specifically discuss how each of the four types of project data to be collected and analyzed will contribute to the field and increase knowledge of arts-based co-teaching methodologies for high-needs students. Overall, there is not a discussion of the specific components of the project and how they will contribute to increased knowledge and understanding (page e48).

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Questions**

**CPP1 - CPP1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1: Computer Science (up to 5 points).**

**Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science (as defined in this notice). These projects must address the following priority area: Expanding access to and participation in rigorous computer science coursework for traditionally underrepresented students such as racial or ethnic minorities, women, students in communities served by rural local educational agencies (as defined in this notice), children or students with disabilities (as defined in this notice), or low-income individuals (as defined under section 312(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

**CPP2 - CPP2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Innovative Approaches to Addressing the Impact of COVID-19 on Underserved Students and Educators (up to 5 points).**

**Projects designed to address the needs of underserved students and educators most impacted by COVID-19 through...[refer to the NIA for the full list of potential projects]**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

**CPP3 - CPP3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Equity and Adequacy in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities (up to 5 points).**

**Projects designed to promote equity in access to critical resources for underserved students in prekindergarten through grade 12 through one or more of the following...[refer to the NIA for the full set of potential projects]**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/14/2021 10:53 PM