

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2010 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.351D **Schedule No** 1 **Tier No.** 1
Panel Name Panel - 5 **Panel Monitor Name** Lee, Carolyn **Panel Monitor Phone No.** 202-245-7817
Competition Manager Name(s) Austin, Diane C.(2022601280); Kress, Richard I.(2022601408)

Applicant Name The Center for Arts Education -- , **PR/Award No** U351D100039
Reviewer Name

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	15
Significance	10	10
Project Design	25	23
Project Personnel	10	9
Management Plan	20	18
Project Evaluation	20	19
TOTAL	100	94

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name The Center for Arts Education -- , **PR/Award No** U351D100039
Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

- Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:**
 - (a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.**

(b) 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-

Student data including risk factors were included in the proposal. (Appendix Page 3)

The proposal addresses current programs and the gaps with the programs such as Parents as Arts Partners. (page 5)

Gaps are identified through State data focused in the arts including staffing and supplies. (Page 5-6)

Selection of schools was clearly outlined with criteria listed. (Page 8)

Weaknesses-

The proposal talks about cuts in arts programs in favor of test prep without data to see the impact or breadth of the cuts. (page 7-8) (noted but points not deducted)

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- (1) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**
- 2.**

Strengths-

Inclusion of curriculum models and evaluation plans for replication to a broader audience. (Page 13)

Has partners listed for collaboration and scaling up of project. (Page 14)

Weaknesses-

The resources that urban areas have in the new program SASI 2 are not clear.
(Page 11)
(noted but points not deducted)

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- (1) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**

Strengths-

Organization has a history of programming in public schools. (page 18)
Essential elements of the program are provided. (Page 19)
Clearly stated goals, objectives and outcomes (Page 20-27)
Logic Model was provided that aligns goals, objectives, and outcomes and impacts with program activities. (Page 27, Appendix page 87)
Sustainability was addressed and professional development is to be provided to assist in further funding for the program. Additionally, the organization has a history of sustainable programming for model programs. (page 28)

Weaknesses-

Lessons learned were stated without research and programmatic information to back up the statements. (Page 18)
Unclear if the SASI program is significantly different from the SASI2 program and how the approaches and strategies differ from existing practices.
Unsure of the impact bullet on page 22-23 talking about influencing legislation and policy and the impact that will have on the Federal Funding status of the

application.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- Your comments and scores should address the following criterion:**
- 4. (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.**
 - (2) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor: The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths-

Staff, team, and consultants listed with qualifications relevant to the program.

(Page 29-31)

Inclusion of an Advisory Council for the program is listed. (Page 31)

Resumes for key personnel are provided. (appendix)

Position Descriptions were included. (appendix)

Weaknesses-

Only states that they are an equal opportunity employer but does not give strategies on promotion of the policy. (page 28)

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 5. Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:**
 - (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 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.

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

Strengths-

Project staff time commitments are outlined.

The time reflects adequate amounts based on the pilot program SASI (page 37)

Weaknesses-

Time line does not provide information on who will perform each task.

(Appendix 93-94)

Internal Management Staff describes Executive Director as devoting 10-15% of time to SASI but none to SASI 2. (Page 33)

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

6.

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

Strengths-

Qualifications of the evaluation team are provided. (Appendix)

Evaluation team has a history of evaluation for the pilot program. (Page 38)

Evaluation tied to logic model. (Page 41-42)

Performance measures related to the outcomes of the project are provided.
(Page 41-42)

Weaknesses-
Evaluation tools and results for the pilot program were not provided.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 19

[< Previous](#)

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2010 **CFDA/Subprogram** 84.351D Schedule No 1 Tier No. 1

Panel Name Panel - 5

Applicant Name Ther Center for Arts Education -- , **PR/Award No** U351D100039

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	15
Significance	10	10
Project Design	25	25
Project Personnel	10	10
Management Plan	20	20
Project Evaluation	20	20
TOTAL	100	100

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Ther Center for Arts Education -- , **PR/Award No** U351D100039

Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

- Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:**
- (a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.**
 - (b) 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:

There is a clearly substantiated need, as well as identified gaps and weaknesses. They have identified specific strategies in their logic model and and goals attachments to address these.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses in response to this criteria.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- 2. (1) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

Strengths:

The evaluation and goals attachments support the project significance and identify materials, processes and techniques to be used.

There are multiple plans for dissemination of results.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- (1) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.**
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**

Strengths:

This is a well-thought out, comprehensive proposal based upon ongoing research that clearly outlines essential elements, goals, objectives and outcomes.

They have identified outcomes for multiple participants: principals, teachers, artists, students and others.

There is excellent potential for building capacity and they have a documented track record.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- Your comments and scores should address the following criterion:**
- 4. (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.**
 - (2) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor: The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

The personnel involved with this project are well qualified to see it to successful completion.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses.

Special note: The grant would have been even stronger with a museum or other community visual art organization as one of your community partners.

Consider expanding beyond the one visual art education individual to mirror the participation of organizations evident for the other arts areas.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- (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.**
- 5. (2) 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.**
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

There are clearly defined responsibilities for all participants, clear timelines, and appropriate time commitments. Additionally, there are thoughtful procedures for ensuring feedback and support.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**
- 6. (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

There are clear and objective measures related to intended outcomes, including both quantitative and qualitative data. The evaluation is purposeful and designed to inform future iterations of the project.

Weaknesses: No weaknesses.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

[< Previous](#)

ARTS IN EDUCATION MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION TECHNICAL REVIEW FORM

REVIEWER'S NAME (PRINT):



DATE:

SIGNATURE:

PR #: U351D100039

THE CENTER FOR ARTS EDUCATION

<u>SELECTION CRITERIA</u>	<u>MAXIMUM PTS</u>	<u>ASSIGNED PTS</u>
1. Need for Project	15	15
2. Significance	10	10
3. Quality of Project Design	25	25
4. Quality of Project Personnel	10	10
5. Quality of the Management Plan	20	20
6. Quality of Project Evaluation	20	20
Subtotal	100	100
TOTAL		

General Comments:

PR #: U351D100039

(1) NEED FOR PROJECT (15 points)

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

(a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

(b) 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:

CAE makes sure all six schools participating in SASI 2 are barrier free with regard to gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age and insures that Special Education and ELL students have equal access to all program components. The approval letter from the NYC DOE's Proposal Review Committee of the IRB is important. The focus on six "arts poor" middle schools reflects the need. Includes traditional SES data in defining the need and documents the precipitous decline in spending on arts supplies, instruments, instruction, and service by NYC's arts and cultural organizations.

Weaknesses:

None.

For Need the maximum score is 15 points. Use the following guidelines:

Score 15

PR #: U351D100039

(2) SIGNIFICANCE (10 points)

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- (1) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project,

1

including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

CAE's record as competent service provider and broker of quality arts education bodes well for its potential to utilize its network and capacity for the dissemination of project findings to local and national conferences. SASI 2 supports parental engagement, promotes school arts teams, and a school-centered approach to PD. SASI 2 findings will also be presented to city council and assembly members, and senators as CAE continues to work towards policy change education reform in support of arts education.

Weaknesses:

None.

None.

For Significance the maximum score is 10 points.

Score 10

PR #: U351D100039

(3) QUALITY OF PROJECT DESIGN (25 points)

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- (1) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
- ¹ (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

Strengths:

SASI 2 builds upon the research from sources summarized on pages e17 and e18. The essential elements of project design outlined in the proposal will facilitate the realization of project goals and rational objectives in order to reach anticipated outcomes. The project will take outside funding while maintaining a vigorous arts program and equip various community partners with the "know how" and desire to obtain and maintain outside funding.

Weaknesses:

None.

For the project design the maximum score is 25 points.

Score 25

PR #: U351D100039

4) Quality of project personnel (10 points)

Your comments and scores should address the following criterion:

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 factor:

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

Strengths:

Proposed project staff has local and national reputations as arts education leaders. The professional staff is complemented by and Advisory Council, school-based personnel, consultants, and community arts partners.

Weaknesses:

None.

For project personnel the maximum score is 10 points.

Score 10

PR #: U351D100039

(4) QUALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN (20 points)

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- (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
1 accomplishing project tasks.
- (2) 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.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Roles and responsibilities of the management team, consultants, school-based personnel and partners, community arts partners are clearly identified. A narrative timeline is also presented that explains how staff will work together to achieve project goals and objectives.

Weaknesses:

Though there was not one person devoted to the project 100% time, no points were deducted because of the CAE team's previous success in managing AEMDD projects and producing results.

For the management plan the maximum score is 20 points.

Score 20

PR #: U351D100039

PROJECT EVALUATION (20 points)

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough,
feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
- (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 evaluation team has worked together since the first SASI project and has developed a comprehensive evaluation plan that addresses important questions regarding the schools' implementation of the SASI program; measures the impact of SASI 2 on student learning processes as well as performance in the arts, tract parent involvement, etc. The qualitative and quantitative quasi-experimental design will use matched comparison groups for the analysis. A variety of methods will be used to collect data including observations, surveys, structured interviews, standardized test scores, and school records of attendance and grades.

Weaknesses:

None.

For Evaluation the maximum score is 20 points.

Score 20

