

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/28/2013 07:56 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U351D130007)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	15
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference		
Priority Four - Technology		
1. Technology	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - AEMDD FY 2013 Application Reivew - 5: 84.351D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U351D130007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(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:

(a) The applicant indicated that the proposed MSEED will address the academic needs of middle school students. Although the overall test scores of the three project schools are relatively high, there are substantial differences between the test scores of students who are African American or Hispanic compared to those of white students, and those of low-income students compared to middle and upper income students. In the project schools, the difference between ISAT test scores of African American and white students is as high as 28 points in reading and 26 points in math; differences between Hispanic and white students are as high as 22 points in reading and 15 points in math; and differences between low-income students and non-low-income students are as high as 22 points in reading and 20 points in math. All three middle schools are failing to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and have been identified for federal and/or state improvement status. Students in the targeted schools' population have substantial populations of low-income students, ranging from 30.5% to 62.0%. Overall, the applicant provided a convincing narrative that demonstrated a need for the project to address the needs of students at risk of educational failure. (pgs. 5-9)

(b) The applicant provided a comprehensive narrative to address the gaps and weakness that will be addressed by the project. The applicant indicated that the district has had a lack of training in arts education, and it is important to begin implementing this training for teachers to meet the arts core curriculum. Teachers and schools need to develop the capacity for teaching the arts as well as learn to integrate the arts into their classrooms. Due to fund reductions over the years, there has been a decline in the arts in the district schools. Additionally, there has been a lack of a connection to community arts resources; therefore, individual schools have not been able to recruit, screen, assess, and train teaching artists for working in schools or partnering with teachers. To address this need, MSEED will create a sustainable partnership infrastructure among project schools to create a network of experienced professional teaching artists in all disciplines.

Other weaknesses and gaps that have been identified are:(1) lack of student assessment in the arts, and (2)the need for model dissemination across an entire district. Overall, the applicant has provided a coherent narrative that provides documentation that gaps and weaknesses exist in the district, and the AEMDD will provide opportunities for them to address the gaps.

We have discussed this selection criterion and we believe our scores are appropriate.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:

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 applicant is proposing to develop a variety of curriculum and instruction materials and products that can be utilized by educators in other settings. For example, the applicant will develop a Process Manual with templates to guide the development of school partnerships and guidelines to assist other schools with the creation of arts integrated curricula through teacher-artist collaboration. The templates will offer useful information for replication of CCAP's model in a variety of educational settings. Additionally, the applicant will develop a handbook of sample curriculum units to share with other schools to help them with the creation and delivery of arts integrated instruction based on national and state standards. The applicant provided a comprehensive narrative that effectively discussed a number of methods to disseminate information, materials, and products to improve arts integrated instruction. For example, the applicant will utilize their website to publish the products for teacher use in the classroom. Professional development will be offered in a variety of local, state and national settings for educators. Overall, the applicant effectively described a diverse selection of products and materials that will be developed through the project. The materials have great potential for providing potential replication in a variety of settings. (pgs. 23-28)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(a) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices.

(b) 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.

(c) 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) The applicant provided excellent up-to-date research based knowledge and theory throughout the proposal. The applicant effectively illustrated the project's theory of change, which is based on the research that centralized and school-based PD within a Professional Learning Community will develop knowledge and attitudes supportive of standards-based arts instruction in dance, music, theater, visual arts and media arts as well as arts integration with reading and writing. Additionally, the applicant provided high-quality, research-based evidence on the effects of professional development for classroom teachers and teaching artists to increase their capacity to create and deliver instruction that integrates the arts across language arts, math and other content areas in alignment with state and national standards. Overall, the applicant

provided a strong narrative that included evidence that an innovative, inquiry-based arts integrated curriculum, when properly designed and executed, will increase student achievement in reading and math, as well as students' social/emotional learning.

(b) The project's theory of change is based on Yoon et al. (2007) research that participation in professional development activities will positively impact teachers' attitudes, beliefs, content knowledge, and instructional self-efficacy (short-term outcomes), which will positively impact teacher practice (intermediate outcomes), and therefore positively impact student engagement and achievement (long-term outcomes). Therefore, the applicant will rely heavily on the use of learning communities at each school to implement professional development.

The purpose of the learning communities are to bring together community of teachers to reflect upon and improve their teaching practice. Based on the research, learning communities have been effective in enhancing teachers' effectiveness, and creating a shared sense of responsibility for students' success, increasing teachers' satisfaction and morale, contributing to a greater likelihood of systemic change and ultimately impacting student achievement. The applicant will use teaching artists with expertise in arts integration to provide coaching and modeling for teachers. Overall, the applicant provided an excellent response to the selection criteria and have developed comprehensive efforts for improving teaching and learning.

(c) The proposed project design will build capacity in a variety of ways. For example, classroom teachers will develop professional skills to integrate the arts into their classrooms, and leadership skills to disseminate the program within their schools and districts. The project lead teachers, arts specialists, and reading specialists at the schools will be able to use their increased knowledge in arts integration with other teachers and lead professional development throughout the district. All project teachers will receive resource guides, manuals, materials, and curricular samples that can be utilized beyond the period of federal assistance.

Additionally, the applicant will have developed partnerships with a wide network of professional arts educators and resources, including Columbia College faculty and students, and community-based teaching artists, that can continue to be tapped beyond the period of federal financial assistance. These networks can provide schools with a resource for recruiting high-quality teaching artists in the future.

We have discussed this selection criterion and we believe the scores are appropriate.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor:

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

Strengths:

CCAP will follow the equal opportunity guidelines of Columbia College Chicago, and its Affirmative Action Search and Screen procedures. Columbia College encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of

traditionally underrepresented groups, and considers applicants for all positions without regard to race, color, religion, creed, gender, national origin, age, disability, marital or veteran status, or any other legally protected status.

The key project personnel, which will include the CCAP Executive Director, Director of Teaching Artist Development, AIM/TAD Program Manager, and External Evaluators, all of the key personnel are well qualified and will bring a significant amount of expertise to the project. Additionally, the Principal Investigator and Project Director for MSEED has over twenty years of experience in developing and implementing educational and intercultural initiatives designed to improve teacher practice and student achievement and effect whole-school change. The external evaluators will come from the Center for School Evaluation, Intervention and Training at Loyola University Chicago and the team has a considerable number of years experience.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide information on the key personnel involved with the project from the targeted schools. Some representation from school-based practitioners would provide much needed input.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

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

Strengths:

(a) The applicant detailed a very comprehensive and detailed management plan. The management plan included the program's objectives aligned with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones. The overall management of the project will be managed by the Project Management Team. The management team will meet quarterly to: (1) review timelines and milestones, (2) monitor the budget, (3) define the responsibilities of all staff, (4) implement and carry out an on-going review of the project plans, and (5) review and modify the activities of the project based on feedback received from the project's staff. The group will meet more frequently in the first project year for planning purposes. Planning and management at each school will be undertaken by the school's Steering Committee, composed of the principal, lead teachers, arts specialist, and CCAP project staff. Steering Committees will meet quarterly to oversee the on-time implementation of project activities in each school. Overall, the management was detailed and adequate for accomplishing all project tasks.

(b) The two key personnel which includes the Project Director and the Principal Investigator CCAP Executive Director, will be responsible for overall management and budget supervision for MSEED @ 15 % time commitment. He will support the development of infrastructure at the college level to sustain the dissemination strategy and leverage institutional expertise in curriculum development. Director of Teaching Artist Development (50%) will serve as Project Manager. She will lead planning and implementation of the project, cultivation of partnerships with principals and lead teachers, and recruitment and professional development of teaching artists. She will be responsible for overseeing external and internal evaluation procedures, and communication with external evaluators. Overall, the two key personnel responsible for leading and

implementing the major functions of the project have designated time commitments that are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the project. (pgs. 34-37)

(c) The applicant will utilize numerous processes and procedures to ensure feedback is collected on a quarterly basis from students, teachers and artists through focus groups, interviews, and satisfaction surveys. Feedback surveys will be gathered from participants at each professional development workshop. In addition, formative assessments of student learning will be administered before and after each curriculum unit is implemented, giving immediate feedback on student improvement in reading and math. Results of the feedback will be analyzed at quarterly Learning Community meetings, where teachers and artists can use the data to make improvements to curriculum and teaching practices. (pgs. 38-40)

The Project Management Team will use meeting times to analyze the data to determine improvements to project logistics, professional development sessions, teacher-artist partnerships, support and coaching for teachers and artists, and other overarching aspects of the project. Data will be shared with the External Evaluators, who will also conduct an independent analysis of the program that includes assessment of teacher and student learning.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

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

Strengths:

(a) The applicant's evaluation plan will utilize a variety of evaluation methods to conduct a thorough analysis of whether the project's objectives have been met. The evaluation will include summative and formative assessments to ascertain how the project can be improved as it is being implemented. The major goals of the evaluation plan are to : (1) assess professional development (PD) processes and participation; (2) assess the impact of PD on teacher abilities to design and deliver arts integrated curricular concepts and instruction, and participate effectively in PD programs; (3) assess the impact of arts integrated instruction on students' academic achievement in reading and mathematics, and on students' critical thinking, higher order thinking, and executive functioning skills. (pgs. 48-53)

Overall, the evaluation plan is comprehensive and all evaluation methods are aligned with the performance objectives. The plan is closely related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce both qualitative and quantitative data.

(b) The applicant has demonstrated in the narrative that the evaluation plan will provide regular performance feedback and accountability, as well as monitor how well the project is meeting the project's intended outcomes by using a variety of formative methods for analysis.

For example, the Project Manager and the School Steering Committees will receive monthly feedback from the Management Team and the External Evaluators to ensure that timely and valid data are provided for both formative and summative outcomes. Benchmarks have been developed to ensure feedback will allow periodic modifications and

improvements. Overall, the applicant has developed an excellent plan for periodic assessment and feedback, thus ensuring progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (pgs. 48-54)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference - Priority Four - Technology

- 1. Projects that are designed to improve student achievement (as defined in the notice) or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

The applicant has a plan for effectively utilizing technology to ensure teacher effectiveness. For example, the MSEED's focus on arts integration is a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement through the use of high quality digital tools and materials.

During the project, the MSEED teachers will receive comprehensive training to learn to use digital tools themselves during professional development: hardware such as digital cameras, video cameras, audio recording equipment, sound and video editing equipment, and iPads, and software in graphic design, photo editing, video editing, sound editing, web design, blogging, and presentation. Increased abilities in these areas of technology will allow them to participate more fully in co-creating and co-teaching media-arts integrated curriculum with teaching artists. In addition, professional development sessions will help teachers to explore the use of digital media to assess student learning in all art forms, not only media arts. For example, effective use of photography to assess student work in visual art, and video recording of live student performances in dance, theatre, and music for assessment purposes.(pg. 12)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/28/2013 07:56 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/28/2013 11:02 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U351D130007)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	14
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference		
Priority Four - Technology		
1. Technology	5	3
Sub Total	5	3
Total	105	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - AEMDD FY 2013 Application Reivew - 5: 84.351D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U351D130007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(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 application provides appropriate data to support the needs of the students and schools for this project. For example, the applicant identifies the specific schools to be served and provides demographic data on the students to be served. All three targeted middle schools are failing to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and have been identified for federal and/or state improvement status. (p 19/117)

The application includes student achievement data to clearly demonstrate the gaps in subgroup achievements. In addition, the project description addresses how this project will bridge this gap. (p 20/117)

The application indicates that staff representing all partners (College Arts partner, school district and individual school staff and students) have been actively involved in the development of this project. (p 12/117)

The application identifies multiple gaps (p 23/117), such as lack of training in Arts Education, Systems for Connecting to Community, Lack of Positive Arts Role Models and Mentors, Lack of Student Assessment in the Arts, and a need for model dissemination across an entire district.

The application also provides a detailed, but succinct discussion of how representatives for all levels of participants (65 administrators, principals and teachers) provided feedback through personal interviews to help define these need areas as well as develop the solutions. (p 22/117)

We have discussed this criterion and we believe our scores are appropriate.

Weaknesses:

The application does not discuss how art is or is not a part of existing school programs.

The application states that the applicant has been working with the school district for 8 years, without fully clarifying how this project aligns with the previous work they have done together. (p 89/117)

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:

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 offers a significant impact on the participants as it will directly serve 1,200 students and 30 teachers in three project schools, and indirectly serve approximately 650 additional students and 12-15 additional teachers over the four years. (p 18/117)

The project will produce a variety of products and program documentation which will add to the existing curriculum, improve instructional approaches, showcase student creativity as well provide tools and artifacts to share this model in other settings. (p 25/117) For example, the project will produce a process manual with student artifacts and templates to guide the practices for developing a school partnership, the creation of an arts integrated curricula through teacher-artists collaboration and the evaluation of these component.

The application provides clear examples and details to explain how dissemination activities will take place. (p 26/117)

Because the project will serve a diverse student population, documentation of project results will show its effects across varying demographics. (p 27/117) This documentation can be utilized to replicate this project and its activities by staff at other sites and in a variety of settings.

The project's plan for replication includes detailed steps to implement, document, record, analyze for how problems and challenges were overcome, so replicators can learn from and adopt the program model for middle school students at other sites. (p 58/117)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(a) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices.

(b) 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.

(c) 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 application weaves its use of up-to-date research through each aspect and phase of the project with citations and clear integration of both theory and proven practice to ensure the success of the project.

The applicant provides both research and identified best practices showing how this project is designed to address the three identified needs (i.e., low income (30.5-62%), student achievement gaps, and social/emotional development). (p 20-21/117)

The application includes a clear description of the project's research based approach and history of collaboration with the district's overall effort to improve teaching and learning, guided by goals in its five year strategic plan.

In particular, the project has been planned in close collaboration with the district superintendent as part of a district-wide effort to increase access to the arts in schools. (p 36/117) For example, the application discusses how the district superintendent has participated with those planning this project to design it as part of a district-wide effort to increase access to the arts in the schools guided by its five year strategic plan to improve teaching and learning.

The applicant uses clear detail to describe how its curricular framework will guide teachers and artists in designing curricula that explicitly addresses the Common Core standards in English Language Arts and state and national standards in the arts. (p 37/117)

The proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond federal funding in a number of ways such as improved professional skills, enhanced organizational structures to strengthen the professional communities, the development of a technical assistance core of professionals for other schools and districts plus the development of partnerships to support the project activities beyond this project. (p 38-39/117)

For example, District 65 schools and teachers will develop a wide network of professional arts educators and resources, including Columbia College faculty and students, and community-based teaching artists, that can continue beyond the period of federal financial assistance.

We have discussed this criterion and we believe our scores are appropriate.

Weaknesses:

The application lacks specific feedback from schools on how this program will be implemented at the specific sites.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor:

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

Strengths:

The applicant has policies in place for following equal opportunity guidelines of Columbia College Chicago, and its Affirmative Action Search and Screen procedures. (p 41/117)

The application identifies the project staff by name and with their strong qualifications in developing and implementing educational, arts and intercultural initiatives. (p 40/117)

The qualifications of the personnel are supported by attached resumes.

Weaknesses:

The application includes a general response to including diverse hirees and committee members in the project, but lacks specific strategies for doing so or describing what it has learned from similar projects about engaging personnel appropriate for addressing the cultural aspects of the population to be served.

The staffing plan does not include anyone with experience working with the targeted student population (middle school students).

The application does not clearly address why all personnel are all part of the existing IHE and Arts Council with no district or school personnel or partners.

The application lacks specific strategies for training staff in the cultural aspects of the population to be served.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project by considering the following factors:**

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

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

Strengths:

The application identifies the management team members, describes their responsibilities and how they will meet quarterly as a larger group, with smaller, more frequent meetings as needed. (p 41/117)

The application also describes how school based steering committees will work together to ensure smooth implementation of the project at each school site. (p 41/117)

The application includes a discussion of specific lessons learned from previous similar projects that are being applied to strengthen the success of this project. (p 45/117)

The management plan has been designed so that that the program's objectives will be achieved on time and within budget, with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones. The application provides a detailed chart showing the alignment among the objectives, timelines, milestones and persons responsible for each component of the project. (p 41/117)

The time commitments of the Project Director/Principal Investigator, Project Manager, and other key personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. The responsibilities for each role are explained in clear detail. (p 45/117)

The roles of the key personnel and management team are designed to ensure that the goals and objectives of the project are carried out in a timely way.

The application describes how and when feedback will be gathered and shared. The feedback will apply multiple measures and methods to be reported quarterly. The project includes multiple examples of how feedback will be used to determine needed improvements or adjustments at each level of the project. (p 47/117)

The applicant provides a clear and consistent discussion throughout the application of how this project will use a range of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the project, with the goal of further developing this project as a sustainable and replicable model.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

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

Strengths:

The application discusses thoroughly how the evaluation plan is designed to provide a thorough analysis of whether the project's objectives have been met through a summative assessment and how the project can be improved as it is being implemented through a formative assessment, using both objective quantitative and qualitative data. (p 48/117)

The application includes a thorough description of the tools and procedures to be applied or developed for this project. (p 48/117) For example, the project will employ an experimental design with students and a pre-post assessment design with teachers to analyze the impact the project has on the 30 participating teachers and their 1200 students.

The evaluation plan includes measureable objectives (and benchmarks) supported with clearly described procedures for assessing progress in meeting those objectives. (p 54/117)

The project identifies both internal and external evaluators and describes their qualifications. (p 46 and resumes)

The data collection and analysis procedures are specifically designed to allow for comparison data and on-going data collection for program improvement, while also allowing all students to benefit from the anticipated outcomes of this program. (p 51/117)

The applicant discusses the variety of ways in which feedback information will be gathered throughout each phase of the project and then used in a variety of ways to manage progress towards the project's stated objectives. (p 58/117)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference - Priority Four - Technology

- 1. Projects that are designed to improve student achievement (as defined in the notice) or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

The applicant describes the specific plans, technology, tools, and training for teachers that will fulfill this competitive preference priority. (p 67/117)

The project's focus on arts integration includes media arts activities and tools, thus demonstrating its comprehensive approach to improving student achievement through the use of high quality digital tools and materials. (p 66/117)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not identify the current technology resources or gaps.

The application does not address to what extent the project may be building on existing resources.

The application does not describe how the use of technology may need to be adapted for the student population to be served (e.g., limited English, cultural and linguistic diversity).

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/28/2013 11:02 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/30/2013 04:45 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U351D130007)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	14
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	28
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	96
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference		
Priority Four - Technology		
1. Technology	5	3
Sub Total	5	3
Total	105	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - AEMDD FY 2013 Application Reivew - 5: 84.351D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Columbia College Chicago (U351D130007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(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 application shows that the population to be served includes students in three middle schools of Evanston and Skokie, IL, some of who are performing quite a bit below grade level (p. e19).

The application makes it clear that there are specific gaps in arts education, lack of ways to link to community arts resources, and other gaps (p. e22-23).

We have discussed this criterion, and we believe our scores are appropriate.

Weaknesses:

The application shows that many of the students at these schools are performing at grade level, which seems to run counter to their argument.

The application would be strengthened if it showed how there were specific gaps in core curriculum, which could be addressed by the program they propose.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:

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:

This is a particularly convincing portion of the application – the requestors lay out a series of different products that will be generated by the program, including sample curriculum units, a handbook, and documentation (pp. e25-26). While many portions, such as sample curriculum units, seemed beneficial, one particularly interesting addition to the products was the "Program documentation" which will include video, audio, and journaling by both teaching artists and teachers implementing the curriculum. This would seem to be particularly helpful in helping other teachers to work through the

process of integrating the arts into their curriculum.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project by considering the following factors:**
 - (a) **The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices.**
 - (b) **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.**
 - (c) **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 application lays out the research upon which the proposed project is based (particularly pp. e28, e60-65), and is quite convincing in this regard. Particularly effective is the close examination of four major programs which have actually been carried out in different states (Different Ways of Knowing in Kentucky, the Whole Schools Initiative in Mississippi as two examples), and discussing how these are similar to the proposed project.

The application discusses the Evanston/Skokie school district's five-year strategic plan, which includes this attempt to improve educational outcomes (p. e37).

The application shows convincingly that it will produce teachers and organizational structures which will endure after the period of funding (pp. e38-39). Perhaps most convincing were the ideas that the program would create organizational structures which could help to replicate the curriculum and lessons after the initial period of funding; and the idea of networks of arts resources. When teachers see a level of engagement of their students with an artist or at a museum, for example, they will be likely to use such a resource again, even if it is not mandated.

We have discussed this criterion, and we believe our scores are appropriate.

Weaknesses:

The application could be strengthened if it were demonstrated that the Evanston/Skokie school district were particularly committed to integrating the arts within the curriculum.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor:

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

Strengths:

There are a number of clearly qualified and experienced people associated with the project (pp. e39-40). Some of the personnel who seemed particularly valuable to the project were both David Flatley, the Principal Investigator and Project Director, but also Lynne Pace Green, Director of Teaching Artist Development, who seems to have a particularly rich background in arts education. It also strengthened the application to see that there was a dedicated Center for School Evaluation at Loyola University Chicago, which will no doubt add to the capabilities of the evaluators.

Weaknesses:

One possible weakness is that the application identifies a single individual, David Flatley, to be both the Project Director and the Principal Investigator – it would probably be better if this were two separate individuals (p. e40).

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

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

Strengths:

This is a generally excellent part of the proposal, particularly the quite detailed and specific timeline, pp. e42-45.

Many individuals will be involved, and there is clearly to be a great expenditure of time for the whole.

This is a particularly strong part of the application – feedback is to be gathered from students and teaching artists, as well as teachers (p. e47). Also, the feedback will be gathered periodically, rather than only annually or bi-annually.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project by considering the following factors:

(a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

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

Strengths:

The application outlines how both quantitative and qualitative data will be gathered (pp. e48-e52). There seem to be ample opportunity to gather feedback, at multiple times, from all stakeholders.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference - Priority Four - Technology

- 1. Projects that are designed to improve student achievement (as defined in the notice) or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

The application outlines how technology will be used by teachers for documenting performances, and perhaps to be taught to students (p. e67).

Weaknesses:

The use of technology is not fully integrated into this application, and its use for students is not as compellingly described.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/30/2013 04:45 PM