

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/11/2013 08:42 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Arts Education, Inc., The (U351D130027)

Reader #2: *****

	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	29
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	22
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	94
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference		
Priority Four - Technology		
1. Technology	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	94

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - AEMDD FY 2013 Application Reivew - 3: 84.351D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Center for Arts Education, Inc., The (U351D130027)

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 specifies how the project will serve at-risk student populations that are both underserved in the arts and not meeting proficiency in English Language Arts and mathematics (pages e20-e21). Project services will allow the implementation and documentation of arts plus arts integration units of study that prepare students for success throughout their middle schools years and into high school, college and careers. This will occur through increased student engagement to improve student arts, academic and social-emotional development, and support of teacher and school leadership development through professional development.

b.

The applicant clearly outlines gaps and weaknesses in services and infrastructure that will be addressed by the project. Identified gaps and weaknesses include a heavy emphasis on schools towards achieving progress on state tests; lack of instruction time spent on courses involving the arts; and drastic declines in key areas of arts spending at the middle school level (page e24).

Weaknesses:

a.

No weaknesses noted.

b.

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:

a.

The applicant describes utility of products and information that will result from the project that can effectively be utilized in other settings. The project builds on the successful elements and research findings of past AEMDD programs to investigate how students' artistic work combines with arts integrated studies to develop capacities of learning aligned with the proposed National Core Arts Standards and the Common Core State Standards (page e27). The project will serve as a replicable and sustainable model for implementing and sustaining arts instruction, teaching and learning practices in middle schools in other communities, thus helping build capacity. For example it will produce middle school content specific models for building educator capacity that include professional development in arts content and skills (theater, dance, music, visual and media arts in the context of arts integration); integrated curriculum design; teaching for transfer strategies; action research methodology (inquiry action planning, evaluation, reflection); documentation of student work (including digital portfolio processes); and assessment of student learning in the arts, academics and the connections between the two. These models address the roles of Educator Teams (comprised of classroom teachers, arts specialists, and teaching artists) guided by project Coaches and School Liaisons (page e28). Other products and information will include Grade Level Arts Plus Arts Integration (A+AI) Unit Exemplars (including embedded assessments); Grade Level Student Learning Documentation and Assessment Instruments/Protocols; Fully Codified Program Standards, Criteria and Rubrics. Information will be disseminated via project videos, and published frameworks, a website, a blog, and networking with community partners (pages e28-e31).

Weaknesses:

a.

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 states the project will incorporate the most up-to-date knowledge. The project will incorporate action research as a means of building the professional capacities of participating educators to implement and document high quality arts-integrated units of study. Research studies and related literature that inform the designs of this initiative are identified (Appendix). Several Conceptual frameworks support the project that helps deepen understanding in and across project dimensions. Frameworks include Cranton's Educator Roles which focus on expert teaching practices; the Common Core Standards: ELA and Math, grades 6-8 which outline the middle school standards for ELA and Math; Depth

of Knowledge focusing on levels of cognition; and the National Core Arts Standards Framework Matrix, emphasizing standards for arts learning. Other frameworks include the NYC Blueprint for the arts, and modes for creating arts rich schools (pages e31-e33). Project goals and outcomes are based upon these research based frameworks (pages e33-e35).

b.

The applicant presents a clear description of how the project is linked to other efforts designed to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. The project builds upon the core project components of SASI, the applicant's current pilot study of arts and language literacy development in two public elementary schools, and the PAIR research project (pages e32, e37-e38). SASI demonstrated that transforming arts-deficient middle schools into arts rich communities (providing arts experiences and opportunities) had positive effects on school leadership, cultural partnerships, and student performance on standardized tests (achievement). The proposed project will investigate interrelated dimensions of arts teaching and learning that will inform middle school education, in particular the relationships among arts skills development, arts integrated learning and academic achievement. Thus, the project will employ elements of two AEMDD School Arts Support Initiatives (SASI), as well as pedagogical frameworks and action research methods that illuminate how arts education develops the skills necessary for students to succeed in middle school and beyond. Accordingly, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and newly proposed National Core Arts Standards (NCAS) will be a part of the program.

c.

The applicant presents a clear explanation of how the project will build capacity. For example, professional development sessions for classroom teachers across all grades will build capacity to sustain arts integrated studies. Network meetings and peer exchanges will help school leaders develop strategies for budgeting, scheduling, and assessment as well as for raising outside funding (page e39). As the benefits and outcomes of the project are experienced, school leaders and communities will be motivated to advocate for quality arts programming in their school. To further help sustain the project, towards the end of the grant period, the applicant will apply with each project school for out-of-school-time funding through the CASA program, discretionary \$20,000 grants from New York City Council members, that can be used to support afterschool art and in-school art Performances (pages e39-e40).

Weaknesses:

a.

No weaknesses noted.

b.

No weaknesses noted.

c.

Letters of support provided in the Appendix do not provide commitment to provide support of any type to continue work from the project beyond the grant period.

Reader's Score: 29

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:

Key personnel assigned to work on the project have been identified. The project will be guided by the Center for Arts Education (CAE) Staff. The individuals responsible for the project have local and national reputations as leaders in the field of arts in education and education research. Members of the project team have experience in creating and managing school arts partnerships, professional development programs for teachers and school leaders, and teaching artist training. They have presented at conferences, published articles on arts education, and designed and conducted nationally recognized research studies. Experience and qualifications are evidenced by the Resumes in the Appendix. For example, CAE Deputy Director began her career as a dancer and dance educator. She has been with CAE since 2008, and has designed and developed programs, budgets and proposals and has been involved with the SASI AEMDD project since its inception. She is a NYC public school parent. Further, the CAE Research & Project Coordinator has worked as a teaching artist, children's theatre director and has taught early childhood special education in a high-need school as a NYC Teaching Fellow. She oversees CAE's pilot study on Arts & Language Literacy and Parents as Arts Partners. She also holds an MS. Ed. in Elementary Special Education. Other qualified and experienced staff working on the project will include project schools staff and consultants community partners, all of which are clearly identified and have appropriate qualification and experience in the arts, education, education reform, and leadership as evidence by the description in the narrative and the resumes in the Appendix.

Weaknesses:

Methods to encourage applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented are not addressed. For example, target populations of which to advertise project positions are not addressed, nor are methods of advertisement.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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 provides information outlining how management of the project will occur. The management plan addresses internal and external roles, and the use of human resources to ensure execution, monitoring and control of the project.

The plan includes roles and functions of key staff and partners. A schedule of timelines/milestones and benchmarks are specified to ensure completion of major project tasks (page e115-e117). A detailed organizational structure is provided that delineates clear lines of authority (page e115). A chart of program objectives, to be achieved on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines & benchmarks are also clearly delineated (pages e59-e65).

b.

The time commitment of key staff assigned to the project is described. The Center of Arts Education Staff will manage the project. Time commitments are specified and are appropriate to ensure oversight of the project (Budget Narrative).

Year 1 - Project Director (60% FTE)
Project/Research Coordinator (50% FTE)
Director of T&L (25% FTE)
Deputy Director (8%)

Year 2 - Project Director (50% FTE)
Project Coordinator (75% FTE)
Director of T&L (10% FTE)
Deputy Director (5% FTE)

Year 3 - Program Director (60% FTE)
Project Coordinator (75% FTE)
Director of T&L (10% FTE)
Deputy Director (5%FTE)

Year 4 - Program Director (60% FTE)
Project Coordinator (75% FTE)
Director of T&L (10% FTE)
Deputy Director (7%)

Year 5 - Project Director (15%) FTE)
Project Coordinator (20% FTE)
Director of T&L (10% FTE)
Deputy Director (4% FTE)

c.

The applicant outlines appropriate strategies for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. At network and individual coaches meetings, evaluative results will have dedicated time for discussion. Teachers' reactions to school-based PD will be documented and considered to provide formative evaluation to better meet the needs of the participants. Sharing data on the implementation process with the project team will afford the opportunity to assess and subsequently re-organize critical aspects of the model (page e53).

Weaknesses:

a.

Major project task are not aligned with program goals and objectives, nor are individual persons delineated to help ensuring tasks are accomplished. Inclusion of this information would help ensure the project is managed appropriately.

b.

No weaknesses noted.

c.

No weaknesses noted.

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 outlines an evaluation plan that is adequate to measure project performance in meeting objectives related to intended outcomes, and will yield both quantitative and qualitative data on the success and impact of the project. The project's research and evaluation plan will be designed by the Principal Investigator in consultation with the proposal planning team. The evaluation will use a quasi-experimental design to measure the impact and success of the project according to a set of guiding research questions (page e52). Each project school will be matched to a control school having similar characteristics. A post-test only design will be used to evaluate student achievement in academic areas. By collecting student outcome and teacher performance data for project and comparison schools, the evaluation will reveal whether project school students outperform their peers in comparable schools and will provide a deeper understanding of possible links between teacher behavior and student performance (page e53). Additionally, the evaluation has designed procedures to determine the statistical significance of the project model (pages e56-e59). For example, instruments that will be used to measure student achievement will be the NYS standardized assessments in ELA and mathematics. Quantitative data will be collected annually for the AEI and control group students when the state exam scores are released. Statistical comparisons will be conducted on data from the pre-program-implementation year; to assess baseline comparability of treatment and control school student achievement scores (page e58).

b.

The applicant outlines evaluation methods that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The program design, management and evaluation plan include program controls, over-site and feedback mechanisms that ensures the project unfolds on-time and on-budget (page e49). The principal investigator will share findings at a minimum of two times annually. Regular feedback of preliminary findings is a key aspect of the evaluation process. The principal investigator will share findings at a minimum of two times annually. Additionally, at network and individual coaches meetings, evaluative results will have dedicated time for discussion. Teachers' reactions to school-based PD will be documented and considered to provide formative evaluation to better meet the needs of the participants (page e53).

Weaknesses:

a.

No weaknesses noted.

b.

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:

- a.
No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not present information specifying how the project design includes the use of technology in the preparation of teachers in improving instruction. Additional no information is presented on the development, implementation or evaluation of any digital tools or materials.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/11/2013 08:42 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2013 03:15 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Arts Education, Inc., The (U351D130027)

Reader #1: *****

	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	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference		
Priority Four - Technology		
1. Technology	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - AEMDD FY 2013 Application Reivew - 3: 84.351D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Arts Education, Inc., The (U351D130027)

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. Applicant cites how this project will serve at-risk student populations that are both underserved in the arts and not meeting proficiency in English Language Arts and mathematics (pp. 1-2).

B. Applicant states arts education and integration classes are targeted towards Title 1 NYC public schools not fulfilling state mandated levels of arts instruction (p. e12).

Applicant states that schools in NY are not providing the arts education that is mandated by law based on SASI evaluation (pp. 3, e147).

Applicant targets NY middle schools where a majority of students have been proven to be at risk for educational failure, as well as underfunded and underperforming schools with high percentages of homeless and impoverished populations (p. 4).

Cites statistical evidence supporting decline of arts instruction in NY middle schools (p. 4).

Weaknesses:

A. None.

B. None.

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:

Applicant references how this project will build upon two previous AEMDD funded projects, which created sustainable, cohesive arts education programs in underserved urban middle schools (p. 1).

Further states how AEI will serve as a replicable and sustainable model for implementing and sustaining arts integrated teaching and learning practices, as well as gaps in experience, achievement and research (pp. 8-9).

Proposes that carefully documented research methods from this project will create models for professional development for educators, protocols, rubrics and assessment standards to determine effectiveness for other future projects (pp. 9-10).

Weaknesses:

None.

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. This project will build upon earlier AEMDD arts initiatives, in addition to Common Core State Standards and National Core Arts Standards (p. 13).

Design goals based on previous research studies are cited, in addition to specific conceptual frameworks to be included, addressing specific facets of learning, curriculum, and arts integrated learning (p. 14).

B. Applicant cites a broad-based initiative, including interdisciplinary, effective teaching practices and curriculum development based on appropriate standards based curriculum (p. 13).

Project design goals include integrating educator learning, student learning outcomes, community inclusion through integration of arts-integrated learning (pp. 15-17), strengthening this application.

Project calls for two master teaching artists at each school site to extend high quality arts instruction in classes as well as strengthening art as a core subject (p. 17).

C. Applicant refers to, and cites statistics that show successes of creating sustainable school programs historically (p. 20).

Applicant describes strategy to apply for additional grants from NY funding to support art and performances (p. 20).

Weaknesses:

- A. None.
- B. None.
- C. None.

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:

Applicant successfully addresses the need for qualified and underrepresented groups as illustrated in the application, citing the educational and professional experience of project personnel. Additionally, expresses diversity of race, origin, gender, sexual orientation and age of CAE project staff.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 10

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:

Management plan based on past two AEMDD projects, NYC DOE project, designed in partnership with AEI principal investigator, ongoing CAE residencies (p. 24). Well organized distribution of individuals/benchmarks for project ((p. 25-28).

B. Well organized distribution of individuals and specified tasks within framework of proposal (p.25-28). Presentation of time commitments of key personnel appropriate based on past project successes (p. 25-28).

C. Applicant cites confidence in continuous improvement of project based on network meetings, visitations, coaching, teaching artist units, evaluation/documentation/data collection, dissemination to ensure project success on time and on budget (pp. 28-30).

Weaknesses:

A. Management plan states deadlines determined on a yearly basis only (e83-86).

B. None.

C. None.

Reader's Score: 23

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. Project research and evaluation plan designed by the Principal Investigator in consultation with the proposal planning team strengthens this application. Investigator cited as serving several federally funded research projects (p. 31) is an asset to the project proposal.

Evaluations include educator professional training outcomes, student learning outcomes, whole school community outcomes, inter-related research outcomes, institutional transformations (p. 31-32).Both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected for evaluation, feedback to be shared bi-annually.

B. Extensive and detailed presentation of types of qualitative and quantitative data that will be collected annually (pp31-46).

Weaknesses:

A. None.

B. None.

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:

None.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not address integration of technology as it relates to pedagogy, curriculum and student learning.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2013 03:15 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/03/2013 12:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Arts Education, Inc., The (U351D130027)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	10
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	30
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
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	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - AEMDD FY 2013 Application Reivew - 3: 84.351D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Center for Arts Education, Inc., The (U351D130027)

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 applicant is proposing to serve three to four New York City Public Schools, specifically middle schools with Title I status. The target population is approximately, 1500 students and 50 educators. The applicant will provide services to under-funded and underperforming public middle schools with high percentages of African American and Hispanic student enrollment, high numbers of English Language Learners and students that require special education programs. The schools will demonstrate significant at risk of failure characteristics, such as a high immigrant population, single parent households and impoverished student population.

The applicant submits the gaps and weaknesses of services, infrastructure and opportunities are a result of the change in priorities and reduced funding. Approximately 50% of middle school students across New York City are not meeting grade level standards, resulting in achievement gaps. Art instruction, in New York City Schools has demonstrated a downward trend, the budget for art supplies and instruments decreased by 3.1 million and art education services have declined by \$4.1 million within the same period. Although, the state department of education has well defined learning standards, the infrastructure does not provide a mechanism to audit compliance or ensure enforcement. The middle schools demonstrate a loss of 63 arts teachers and the elimination of Project ARTS funding, \$67.5 million categorical funding for arts education. The AEI program is designed to address the prevailing achievement and experience gaps and weaknesses in the delivery of a robust education by infusing schools with arts plus arts integration teaching and learning practices. Through rigorous professional development, planning, coaching, peer exchange and other program elements, school personnel will gain both the knowledge to deliver arts and arts integrated instruction and understanding.

Weaknesses:

The applicant proposes the program will respond to the needs of 3 to 4, New York City, Title I middle schools without providing statistical data to ensure understanding of the contextual environment. The application would be strengthened with the additional data, such as the numbers or percentages of the diverse populations, students of immigrant families, and single parent households enrolled in the schools; the numbers of English Language Learners and special education middle school students in need of services at the target schools; and the academic performance in critical disciplines (reading and mathematics) of the students in comparison to the national, regional and state norms.

Reader's Score: 10

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 cites several products that have utility and can be replicated. These products are listed as Middle School Content Specific Models for Building Educator Capacity, Grade Level Arts Plus Arts Integration (A+AI) Unit Exemplars, Grade Level Student Learning documentation and Assessment Instruments/Protocols, Fully Codified Program Standards, Criteria and Rubrics, in addition to the AIE Project Dedicated Microsite, CAE website and advocacy partners network. Although, the applicant states that the products will be designed, a timeline for replication and plan for execution was omitted.

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:

The applicant cites current and relevant research as the foundation for the project design and effective practices. The research included: (a) Cranton's Educator Roles provide the rationale for the program and the direct implications of expert teaching practices; (b) Studio Thinking provides a theoretical framework for student learning; (c) Depth of Knowledge extend the understanding of student levels of cognition; (d) Arts Plus Arts Integration Frameworks supports the teaching methodology through the integration of the arts and the impact on academic performance and behavior.

The applicant fully demonstrates the AEI project is one of the components the comprehensive plan to improve teaching and learning while increasing academic rigorous standards. The AEI programs will exclusively target middle school students through rigorous professional development, planning, coaching, peer exchange and other program elements.

The applicant demonstrates the program is structurally anchored to the New York City School District and the community at large. Partnerships exist and personnel from the school district are included in the project to further ensure school guidelines and standards are practiced. The project demonstrates a model to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond federal assistance.

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:

The applicant submitted a profile of administrators with credentials to provide quality program leadership for the job descriptions and responsibilities. In review of the proposed personnel, they are appropriate and their experiences demonstrate suitability for job performance and grant management.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

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 applicant demonstrates a program management plan with the identification of major project activities, milestones, timelines and the identification of persons responsible for the outcomes. Additional information demonstrates a plan for partner organizations' commitments and involvement with the project.

The applicant provides a description of the responsibilities and time and effort of the key personnel. The personnel are included in the budget narrative, specifically identifying positions and salary. The positions, job descriptions and time committed to the project are appropriate and support the program objectives.

The applicant describes a clear process of collecting, analyzing and disseminating data to key stakeholders for improvement. The process allows for opportunities to review data, initiate adjustments to enhance program and personnel development.

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 evaluation plan includes the application of the Logic Model conducted through the leadership of an experienced independent evaluator. The evaluation will use a quasi-experimental design with each AEI school matched to a control school. Data collection will include quantitative and qualitative documents for analysis. The evaluation will measure Educator Professional Training Outcomes, Student Learning Outcomes, Whole School Community Outcomes, Inter-related Research Outcomes and Institutional Transformation. A random sampling of nine students from 12 to 16 matched 6th grade classrooms at each control and treatment school at the beginning of the project and monitored for 3 years of project implementation.

The evaluation plan includes the collection of data and analysis reporting to stakeholders a minimum of two times annually. The evaluation plan includes an assessment of student performance and teacher development.

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 did not respond to this question.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not respond to this question.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/03/2013 12:18 PM