

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

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

Panel Name Panel - 7

Applicant Name	Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts -- ,	PR/Award No	U351D100025
-----------------------	---	--------------------	-------------

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	12
Significance	10	10
Project Design	25	25
Project Personnel	10	9
Management Plan	20	16
Project Evaluation	20	15
<hr/>		
TOTAL	100	87

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name	Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts -- ,	PR/Award No	U351D100025
-----------------------	---	--------------------	-------------

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.

The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure is marginally documented. A blanked statement is made that the first time third graders were administered the math and science test, the economically disadvantaged students passed at a rate 12 points lower in math and 11 points lower in science than all other students and nearly a quarter of the economically disadvantaged failed in comparison to ten (10) per cent of all other students. (Page 6)

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 is supported by current research. Among the referenced research is a statement that a math-focused curriculum in early education can make the difference and narrow the gap, especially for children living in poverty. (Page 2). Fairfax County has little or no in-class instruction conducted by arts specialists for pre-K and Kindergarten children. To close the gap, the applicant will provide an art program that enhances math and science skills for low-income pre-K and Kindergarten children, (page 3), as well as arts learning experiences for pre-K and Kindergarten, and increased professional development opportunities. (Page 5)

Weakness:

The applicant mentions the Title 1 schools and the ESOL students in Fairfax County, VA, where the project will take place. However, the two groups of students were not linked, nor were hard data on the academic achievement of either group given.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Significance

- 2. 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.

Strength:

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 settings is highly probable. Wolf Trap Institute has track record of providing effective professional development for teachers and skills development for young children through their Teaching Artist/classroom teacher partnership model. (Page 8) Deliverables will include written, recorded, and on-line performing arts-based content and techniques that integrate with math curriculum. A complete list of deliverables is provided in Appendix D. The project is adaptable to different education systems and locations. By the end of the grant period, fifteen (15) performing arts and arts education organizations directly connected with Wolf Trap around the nation will have replicated this project. (Page 10).

Weakness: 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) 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.**

Strength:

The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices is detailed. Of the approximate 75 references, all are current, except one and it dates to 1998. All relate to this project: math, early childhood education, professional development. Individually, they can be found throughout the application. The complete bibliography is found at Appendix F.

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 is comprehensive and also research-based. Teachers will be provided 108 hours of professional development. (Page 12) The plan described on pages 16 and 17 appears to be of enough quality, intensity, and duration to improve teaching. The curriculum, an innovative research-based early childhood art integration model, will be tied to national and local art and mathematics standards. (Page 13) Wolf Trap artists, in turn, will learn about early childhood math skills and guide their performing arts instruction to help the young children learn. Benchmarks for implementing the goals are given on page 14. A letter of commitment from the Fairfax Superintendent of Schools to partner with the project is attached in the appendix. A total of 20 schools will be recruited, ten (10) will represent the control group; the other 10 will served as the treatment schools.

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 is very comprehensively described. Some of the strategies will be incorporated into existing Wolf Trap's models; webinars will be developed; online resources will complement the formal documentation to name a few. (Page 18)

Weaknesses:

Note were noted

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 4. 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.

(2) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor: The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strength:

The quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project is exceptional. Each is an expert in her field. (Pages 20-23 and Appendix C).

The qualifications, including relevant training and experience of key project personnel are exceptional. All the staff has at least a Master's degree. A bio is provided for each staff member in Appendix C.

Weakness:

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 is unconvincing. The applicant may encourage diversity as it says on page 20, but all the people named as staff members on this project are female.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

Your comments and scores should address the following criteria:

5. **(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.

Strength:

The adequacy of the management plan presented to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks is adequate. Project timelines are presented on pages 38-42. Milestones and deliverables are shown on pages 41 and 42. Responsibilities are defined on pages 20-23.

The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel is appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. Of the six persons to work on the proposal, only one, the school liaison, will work full-time. (Page 26)

The procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the project are appropriate. Each classroom will be observed by a project team member at least during each semester. (Page 27) Everyone associated with the project will convene mid-year and prior to each Summer Institute to discuss program enhancement and strategies, review progress toward meeting goals and content, adjust and approve plans for the next year. (Page 28)

Weakness:

This proposal has no objectives. Five goals are presented on page 13. The management plan presented in the proposal lacks organization making it difficult to follow.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

6.

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:

An evaluation plan is included in the application narrative and will be used to shape the development of the project objectives from the beginning of the grant period. The period is from Fall of 2010 to the Spring of 2014. This is shown on page 46 of the application.

The plan includes benchmarks to monitor to assess the impact on teaching and learning. Those are shown on page 14 of the plan.

The plan identifies the American Institutes for Research (AIR) as the independent outside evaluator. AIR has more than a 60 year history. It specializes in the behavior and social sciences and has a deep substantive understanding of key issues in education. (Page 23)

The plan describes

1. The types of data to be collected. Those are student achievement scores in math, teacher performance, teacher attendance at training sessions. A comprehensive list is at Appendix B.
2. When various types of data will be collected. (Pages 35, 36, 37) (Appendix A)
3. What methods will be used: observation, examination, analysis.
4. What instruments will be developed and when. Those are a fidelity, classroom observation form, activity logs, teacher background surveys. (Appendix B)
5. When the reports of results and outcomes will be available. Those are listed by year. (Pages 36-37)
6. How the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and provide accountability information both about the success at the initial site and about effective strategies for replication in other settings. (Page 36)

The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes appropriate. This will be done at appropriate junctions: before, during, and after an activity. (Pages 35-37)

Weakness:

This proposal is void of objective performance measures; therefore, it may difficult to produce a reliable evaluation. It is difficult to determine if the evaluator's compensation is commensurate with the company's experience because the budget does not break out the pay. It is unclear how the data will be analyzed.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 15

[< Previous](#)

[^ Back to Top](#)

[\[FOIA \]](#) [\[Privacy \]](#) [\[Security \]](#) [\[Keyboard Tips \]](#) [\[Notices \]](#) [© 2007 U.S. Department of Education](#)

[Mobile Version](#) | [Full Site](#)

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

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

Panel Name Panel - 7

Applicant Name	Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts -- ,	PR/Award No	U351D100025
-----------------------	---	--------------------	-------------

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	10
Significance	10	10
Project Design	25	20
Project Personnel	10	9
Management Plan	20	16
Project Evaluation	20	15
TOTAL	100	80

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name	Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts -- ,	PR/Award No	U351D100025
-----------------------	---	--------------------	-------------

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.

Strength: The proposed program offers extensive professional development which would presumably assist students who are at risk.

Weakness: It isn't clear what the specific STEM needs are of pre-K and K students in FCPS. The application provides plenty of detail of STEM gaps nationally, but the universe of pre K and K FCPS students isn't as detailed. Does this target group receive any STEM curriculum? What are the gaps and weaknesses of the current math curriculum?

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

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.**

Strength: The applicant has an extensive background in product development and dissemination through its national network. The comment that this program would not be dependent on access to a performing arts facility (p. 10) extends the utility even further.

Weakness: none.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 3. 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.

Strength: The applicant's experience in creating training that teachers can replicate in their classroom (p. 11) is strong. The applicant's use of Learning Communities, parent involvement and the envisioned development of program materials is also strong.

Weakness: Most of the research cited is specific to the applicant's practices. The application would benefit from a review of literature outside of the applicant's universe. It also isn't clear what is happening in the FCPS universe- is there an ongoing effort to improve teaching in the district? If so, how does STEAM fit into this effort?

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

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.**

Strength: The applicant clearly articulates its hiring policies and ongoing

programs to bring individuals traditionally under-represented into the arts field (p. 20). The qualifications of key project personnel are strong.

Weakness: It wasn't clear how the applicant will carry out its recruitment of job candidates from under-represented groups with the proposed hire.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 9

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.**

Strength: The proposed management plan appears able to achieve the objectives within the time and budget considerations. The plan for weekly meetings (p. 27) will provide feedback during the formative process. The addition of liaison staff also builds into the plan's strength.

Weakness: The proposal would benefit from extending the communication beyond the key personnel. There is also concern that Flaherty-Willis will need to devote more than 60% of her current time to achieve the program objectives.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

- 6. 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.

Strength: The proposed methods of evaluation appear strong.
Weakness: The accompanying logic model doesn't present any feedback loops to assist in program enhancement. This is a critical piece in any formative evaluation.

Question Status: Completed
Reviewer Score: 15

[< Previous](#)

[^ Back to Top](#)

[\[FOIA \]](#) [\[Privacy \]](#) [\[Security \]](#) [\[Keyboard Tips \]](#) [\[Notices \]](#) © 2007 U.S. Department of Education

[Mobile Version](#) | [Full Site](#)

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

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

Panel Name Panel - 7

Applicant Name	Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts -- ,	PR/Award No	U351D100025
-----------------------	---	--------------------	-------------

Questions

	Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria		
Need for Project	15	12
Significance	10	10
Project Design	25	21
Project Personnel	10	9
Management Plan	20	15
Project Evaluation	20	16
TOTAL	100	83

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name	Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts -- ,	PR/Award No	U351D100025
-----------------------	---	--------------------	-------------

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:

- The applicant proposes to work with the neediest children in one of the largest school districts in the nation. Over 35% of the children in the Title I schools are low income (p. 6).
- The project will provide arts education programming in PK and Kindergarten where currently little programming currently exists (p. 6).
- Data was provided on the lower math achievement of grade 3 low income students in the Title I schools to be served, further highlighting the need to intervene early. The project will provide professional development to 40 PreK and Kindergarten teachers in strategies that address the SOLs in both the arts and math through an enhanced art infused curriculum that will be delivered through developmentally appropriate methods that serve to motivate learning (p.6).

WEAKNESSES:

- Hard data on academic achievement in Science or math in the primary grades was not provided

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 12

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 project replicates the design of other effective practices models that have been used successfully by the applicant and replicated by other regional programs in the past (p. 7) utilizing a collaborative Teaching Artist/Classroom teacher partnership model (p.8) and the Wolf Trap Institute Residency Model (p. 9). Past regional partnerships that have been successful include early childhood centers/schools in Fairfax County and the surrounding DC metro area.

-- The project may represent the only effort to infuse STEM into early childhood, increasing the likelihood the program will be replicated in other settings.

-- The professional development is multifaceted to include multiple continuing opportunities for the partner classroom teachers to embed their learning within their classroom instruction to increase the likelihood the learning will be implemented and sustained over time. (p.8). These learning experience include an 8 week residency, a Summer Institute, and follow-up with another residency period.

-- In addition to regional replication within the public schools (Fairfax, Montgomery, Prince George, and Loudoun) (p. 10), the applicant belongs to a wider education arts community within the Wolf Trap organization that includes 15 other Wolf Trap arts organizations that have replicated other projects by the applicant, representing a natural infrastructure for this project to be replicated in other areas of the country (AZ, DE, AK, TN, MS, GA, KS, LA, NJ, NYC, NC, TX, NY, NV, FL, PA) (p. 10, 19).

WEAKNESSES:

-- No weaknesses 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) 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:

-- A sound rationale for the project was supported by numerous studies that highlight the need for intentional inclusion of math and science instruction prior to entry into elementary school (pp. 1-3) in early education as well as components of the STEM/STEAM project (pp. 3-6).

-- The applicant has a successful history spanning 30 years in working with young children from low income families and their teachers in Title I schools located in the partner school district. This predictor indicates an increased likelihood that the proposed project will build on the successes of the past to design a program that will meet the needs of the learners and will extend beyond the funding period (p. 5).

-- The project incorporates the priorities and identified needs of the partner FCPS, demonstrating shared ownership in the project and increasing capacity for the project to be sustained over time (p. 5). Letters of support from FCPS were included in the appendices.

-- The applicant's model from past successful programs will be utilized and is supported by positive program impact results (p. 11). This represents research using an experimental design done on actual replicated Wolf Trap programs.

-- The design of delivery of the professional development (residencies

and a summer institute) is supported by literature (p.12).

-- The curriculum for STEAM will utilize past evaluation findings and recommendations from other early childhood arts education projects implemented by Wolf Trap to create high quality programming that is aligned to standards.

-- Project goals are outlined on pages 13-14.

-- The applicant has outlined project activities to be conducted each year to meet specific goals and ensure quality programming through the efforts of a representative advisory group (pp. 14-17).

-- The design includes a modeling component followed by a gradual release to practice that is accompanied by coaching from the Teacher Artist in two different genres/forms over the two year training period.

-- The design expects trained classroom teachers to share their strategies with other teachers and parents within their school settings (p.17).

WEAKNESSES:

-- Information on how the Teaching Artists are selected was not provided in the narrative.

-- Teacher selection will be the responsibility of the treatment schools in the project, but how these schools would select their 4 PK and/or Kindergarten teachers was not provided. A teacher who volunteers might yield different results than a teacher who was appointed to participate, the results of which may have nothing to do with the project. Perhaps a brief explanation of how selection/assignment fits within research using randomized trials would be helpful.

-- Even though Wolf Trap has historically had successful partnerships with FCPS, it would have been helpful to include a memorandum of understanding with FCPS for this particular project.

-- Research on Fairfax county effective practices was not provided.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 21

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:

-- Dr. Bredekamp is an Early Childhood Education specialist, an absolute necessity for this project since the students to be impacted by the project are low income PreK and Kindergarten students in Title I schools (p. 14). She will act as a consultant to the project.

-- Ms. Willis has extensive experiences. She directed the Wolf Trap Institute for Early Learning Through the Arts for over 10 years and arts-in-education programming for over 37 years. (p. 20). She is responsible for Project oversight.

-- Project Director, Ms Kouyate, has extensive experiences in art organizations and government agencies (p.21).

-- The Curriculum Supervisor, Ms. Phillips, has over 34 years of preschool and elementary teacher of children with special needs. Additionally she has training in the Theater Arts.

-- Maria Gallagher, a second consultant, comes from the school district

as an early childhood trainer and has worked with the applicant in the past on other art infused professional development projects.

-- All Teaching Artists assigned to the project represent different forms of performing arts and have experience delivering professional training to deliver their art with diverse early childhood backgrounds (p. 23).

-- Personnel involved from the evaluation research team AIR have the necessary background and experience to provide data on the fidelity and success of the model project utilizing a randomized field trial approach.

-- Bios of major personnel in the project were also included in the appendices (p. 52).

WEAKNESSES:

-- There was no mention of how the applicant will encourage members of underrepresented groups within key personnel.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 9

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:

-- A representative advisory group will be established to oversee

program development, services, communication and research to ensure quality programming (p. 14).

-- A project Timeline is included on pages 38-42 and highlights expected deliverables over the four year funding period.

-- Time commitments are appropriate to the responsibilities listed for each of the major project personnel (pp. 24-27).

WEAKNESSES:

-- Even though all major components of a management plan are presented throughout the narrative, it would have been helpful for the reader to have them all presented visually in one location (i.e. a matrix showing the goals, the activities, persons responsible, benchmarks and timeline) would have increased understanding of how the components are integrated rather than separate. Goals are on page 13. Benchmarks on page 14 are not tied specifically to goals. Project activities are on pages 16-19 but the reader had to keep referring to page 13. Timeline and deliverables are on pages 38-42. Objectives were not included.

-- Feedback and communication/reporting systems were only described between Ms. Willis and her superiors and subordinates. More extensive reporting systems may be present but were not provided.

--The budget narrative in the appendices does not provide a specific breakdown on how much each consultant earns, how much each Teacher Artist earns per component activity, nor how much each cooperating teacher earns during the two year training and classroom integration period. Teaching staff at FCPS must be compensated fairly to ensure fidelity, compliance, and a positive attitude toward training and classroom integration to get accurate results in the evaluation. Since the narrative does not provide how specifically Teacher artists or Classroom teachers are selected, these two variables may combine unfavorably. The worst scenario would be to assign teachers rather than get volunteers in the treatment schools and then give them little or no compensation for their time to attend professional development, make lesson plans, attend meetings, etc on top of their regularly assigned responsibilities.

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:

- The applicant will contract the services of an outside evaluation organization, AIR, to conduct the research and evaluation of project goals and components (p.23).
- The evaluation contains both quantitative and qualitative measures in both formative and summative form.
- The evaluation includes the measurement of student outcomes using FCPS tools for measuring learning and Math reasoning. The Virginia Standards of Learning will also be assessed at the PreK level.
- The research utilizes an experimental design (p. 32) to determine impact of the program. Treatment and non treatment schools will compare student performance on the same measures.
- Research will also focus on linking teacher practice to student achievement in the comparison study. (p. 30).
- The evaluation plan is built upon sound research techniques that are specifically designed to elicit the data necessary to determine effectiveness of program components as well as the impact of the overall program on increasing student achievement in math through arts integration. It is highly detailed and specific.
- A schema detailing evaluation components and data collection timeline was included in the appendices.

WEAKNESSES:

- The data collection timeline matrix did not include collection and analysis of student achievement data (p. 46).
- It is not clear how data will be analyzed. Especially in consideration that objectives were not included.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 16

[< Previous](#)

[^ Back to Top](#)

[\[FOIA \]](#) | [\[Privacy \]](#) | [\[Security \]](#) | [\[Keyboard Tips \]](#) | [\[Notices \]](#) | [© 2007 U.S. Department of Education](#)

[Mobile Version](#) | [Full Site](#)