

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	Puget Sound Educational Service District -- Arts Impact, Teaching and Learning	PR/Award No	U351D100119
Reviewer Name			

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	14
Significance	10	10
Project Design	25	24
Project Personnel	10	10
Management Plan	20	20
Project Evaluation	20	20
TOTAL	100	98

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name	Puget Sound Educational Service District -- Arts Impact, Teaching and Learning	PR/Award No	U351D100119
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.**
1. **(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: Need is established through clear examples and statistics. Gaps are identified through a WSAC research initiative focusing on K-12 schools and their incorporation of arts based activities. The fact that principals and teachers identified the need for arts integrated learning (p. 8) strengthens the probability of meaningful participation. There are viable strategies for addressing gaps and weaknesses (pgs. 2, 4, 6, 9).

Weaknesses: It is mentioned that families will become more engaged in their students' learning through this program, without citing how this will occur (p.10).

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 14

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 pilot project demonstrates potential for applying the model in other settings. The self-assessment tools listed provide opportunities for future participants to evaluate their own motivations and readiness to undertake comprehensive arts education training. This ensures school ownership of the

process!

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: The project is based on current and ongoing research, and is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning. Clearly outlined processes and logic model demonstrate commitment to authentic learning and rigorous standards for students. Clearly defined strategies for professional development, mentoring, and learning communities build capacity.

Weaknesses: Sustainability beyond federal funding is not clearly addressed.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- Your comments and scores should address the following criterion:**
- 4. 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: Personnel are well suited to the proposed project. There is demonstrated experience with previous AEMDD grants.

No weaknesses.

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: Clear management plan which defines timeline, responsibilities, and milestones for each year of the project.

No weaknesses.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

6. (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: Comprehensive, well-designed evaluation plan identifying objective performance measures and performance feedback and progress. Tables match outcomes to evaluation strategies (pages 38-40).

No weaknesses.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

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	Puget Sound Educational Service District -- Arts Impact, Teaching and Learning	PR/Award No	U351D100119
-----------------------	--	--------------------	-------------

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	15
Significance	10	10
Project Design	25	24
Project Personnel	10	10
Management Plan	20	20
Project Evaluation	20	19
TOTAL	100	98

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Puget Sound Educational Service District -- Arts Impact, Teaching and Learning

PR/Award No U351D100119

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.

1. **(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-

Quoted need for the arts from an education research study in Washington. (page 2)

Utilized demographic and achievement data to demonstrate need. (page 4)

Explained gaps and weaknesses in arts education through the four areas of the AERI II Report. (Page 6)

Used evaluation from the 2005 AEMDD project to show the success of the program in reducing the gaps and weaknesses in arts education. (Page 9)

Weaknesses-

None noted.

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-

Applicant has a history in the field of arts integration and trained nearly 500 teachers. (page 11)

Demonstrated scope of replication through the diversity in communities being a part of this program. (page 12)

Student assessment results were utilized by four different levels. (page 12)

Tools for dissemination were listed. (Page 13-14)

Weaknesses-

None noted.

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. (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-

Project design describes research that supports arts-infused learning, mentoring and professional learning communities from current research. (page 15)

Applicant utilizes best practices in their design. (page 16)

Year One utilizes collaboration in planning and design across curricular areas. (page 18)

Attached a comprehensive logic model which pairs goals and objectives with curricular outcomes.

Utilized quantitative and qualitative data to inform the development of the new project. (page 21)

Weaknesses-

The sustainability of the project was described in a way that talks about teacher skills but not about the fiscal sustainability beyond the federal funding.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

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

Strengths-

The applicant talked about embedding cultural competence in its organizational culture as well as the federal and state regulations talking it to a higher level than just compliance. (page 26)

Barnum has extensive experience working on AEMDD grants. (page 27)

Team has worked on the original project and has experience in professional

development programs and arts infusion.

Position descriptions for the people that were described and their role in the grant project to match skills to experience.

Weaknesses-

None noted

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.**

History of managing a large budget. (page 30)

Included a project timeline with responsibilities and milestones.

Showed that the Project Director would be supported in the work she did with a coordinator and specialist. (page 33)

Weaknesses-

None noted.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

6. **(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-

Data collection is ongoing and comprehensive. (page 35)

Instruments identified for evaluation. (page 35-37)

Evaluation table matching outcomes to methods was provided. (page 38)

Weaknesses-

The benchmarks were not set for the student data in the evaluation section. (page 40)

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 19

ARTS IN EDUCATION MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION TECHNICAL REVIEW FORM

REVIEWER'S NAME (PRINT): _____

DATE: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

PR #: U351D100119

PUGET SOUND EDUCATIONAL SERVICE DISTRICT

<u>SELECTION CRITERIA</u>	<u>MAXIMUM PTS</u>	<u>ASSIGNED PTS</u>
1. Need for Project	15	<u>15</u>
2. Significance	10	<u>8</u>
3. Quality of Project Design	25	<u>20</u>
4. Quality of Project Personnel	10	<u>10</u>
5. Quality of the Management Plan	20	<u>18</u>
6. Quality of Project Evaluation	20	<u>18</u>
Subtotal	100	<u>89</u>
TOTAL		<u> </u>

General Comments: _____

PR #: U351D100119

(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:

Anecdotal commentary of individual stories of students' needs. Documented need for professional development as a means of providing services to students. Training classroom teachers as arts educators using exploration and experiential learning is a part of project. The District has 11 years of success with *Arts Impact*. When teachers implemented lesson plans for AI/AL students exceeded performance targets

Weaknesses:

None

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

Score 15

PR #: U351D100119

(2) SIGNIFICANCE (10 points)

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

1

- (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 AI model has been replicated successfully. AI awarded a DOE PDAED grant in partnership with the Seattle School District. It includes criteria based performance assessments that are co-rated for reliability. Student assessments are developed to reflect sensitivity to the concepts taught. Evaluation rubrics are developed and tested.

Weaknesses:

Does not clearly explain how this initiative will build statewide capacity or how it will impact access and equity to arts education in Washington.

For Significance the maximum score is 10 points.

Score 8

PR #: U351D100119

(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

1

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:

The approach to project the represents an understanding of the key concepts to be assessed including mentors, PLCs, best practices, etc. This project is part of a statewide effort to improve teaching and learning. The two year, 108-hour, job-embedded model empowers teachers to infuse the arts into core curriculum content. Well thought out logic model.

Weaknesses:

The proposal is not consistently numbers based in terms of percentages of improvements (though in the discussion of objectives percentages of improvements are discussed), but emphasizes practical outputs.

For the project design the maximum score is 25 points.

Score 20

PR #: U351D100119

1

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:

The District is proactive in reaching out to and hiring underrepresented groups. Of the current employees, 25% represent ethnic majority groups. Cultural competence is embedded in the organizational culture and programming of the District. There will be a Program Specialist (F/T) on the project that will be paid for from other sources.

Weaknesses:

None

For project personnel the maximum score is 10 points.

Score 10

5

PR #: U351D100119

(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 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:

Clearly defined plan with project timelines, responsibilities, milestones,

Weaknesses:

The role of the Program Specialist was not at all reflected in the Management Plan as outlined in the Project Timeline, Responsibilities, and Milestones.

For the management plan the maximum score is 20 points.

Score 18

PR #: U351D100119

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 BERC Group is well qualified and has experience in conducting evaluation projects similar to this one. The evaluation design is based on an experimental design that collects quantitative and qualitative data on an on-going basis. There will be annual evaluation reports on program delivery and achievement of program goals and objectives.

Weaknesses: Self-selection of teachers while a standard program element could be enhanced by giving consideration to some type of criteria for selection.

Weaknesses:

Self-selection of teachers while a standard program element could be enhanced by giving consideration to some type of criteria for selection.

For Evaluation the maximum score is 20 points.

Score 18