

**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: Everett Public Schools (U351D130015)

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	28
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	8
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	21
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	8
Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference		
Priority Four - Technology		
1. Technology	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	90

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Everett Public Schools (U351D130015)

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 proposed project will provide services to address the need of students identified as at risk of educational failure due to poverty, race/ethnicity, limited English proficiency, and special needs and who often struggle the most with school. The project will create a pathway for the elementary grade students (K-4) who presently attend the 3 K-8 target schools and who will be moving into grades 5-8 over the duration of the project. It will integrate standards-based arts education into the core curriculum; strengthen standards-based arts instruction across grades 5-8; improve students' academic performance including their skills in creating, performing, and responding in and through the arts utilizing all four arts disciplines (dance, music, theatre, and visual arts); and develop an effective Grades 5-8 transition model built upon a meaningful partnership between the three target schools (page e17). This project is intended to build a new model for improving academic performance by ensuring that middle-grades schools prepare students well for high school and that the transition from the elementary grades is carefully designed and implemented (page e19). The project also calls for training teachers in culturally responsive classroom practices specifically to address the diversity of the student population in the three target schools, each of which serves large percentages of ESL students as well as other racial and ethnic minorities. Risk factor described that put student at risk of education failure include high poverty among the target population and the effects of social factors such as child abuse and neglect, parental absence, and violence (pages e19-e20). Integration of arts education into academic classrooms has become a means of providing students, particularly those most at-risk of academic failure, with sound instructional strategies that support their learning as well as hands-on experiences in arts education.

b.

The applicant clearly outlines gaps and weaknesses in services and infrastructure that will be addressed by the project (paged e24-e25). Cited gaps and weaknesses include limited access to artists in the four arts disciplines and a lack of arts integration in other core academic subjects. While schools provide students in grades 5-8 with weekly music and visual arts instruction at each grade level, (instrumental, vocal, and general) few students participate in instrument. Currently, there are no theater programs or classes, dance classes, or media visual arts classes offered to students at any of the district's K-8 Schools. While schools provide students in grades 5-8 with weekly music and visual arts instruction at each grade level, (instrumental, vocal, and general) few students participate in instrument. Second the district's Everett's K-8 teachers have had little professional development that would enable them to effectively integrate the arts into their education program, and there is little coordination among arts and regular classroom teachers, a lack of school leadership capacity for arts-integrated instruction, and only limited support from local arts and cultural institutions.

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 will allow teachers to develop and implement standards-based art instruction daily in all four arts disciplines—music, visual arts, theater, and dance. As a result, the project will help all students reach proficiency and meet state and national arts standards. Project training will also provide teachers with prototype, standards-based curriculum units that focus on the Common Core State Standards model effective arts-integrated instruction, and it will provide the entire faculty at the three schools with transformative professional development experiences to develop culturally responsive practices. Teachers will sharpen their cultural dispositions that are necessary for teaching students from all cultural backgrounds; experience, study, and reflect on art-forms in and from a different cultural context; learn about the complexities of culture necessary for teaching students from cultural backgrounds (pages e25-e33). The project model has proven to be replicable, as it now operates in 20 schools in urban, suburban and rural settings (page e33). Project information will be disseminated via the World Wide Web, through publications and presentations, and local and regional media (page e36). The project will also seek to establish relationships with the Cultural Council, the Art Education Association, and the state's Department of Education to promote the program through their networks, newsletters, conferences and mass mailings; to have them present at summer institutes; and to seek their financial support (page e37).

Weaknesses:

a.
No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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 reflect the National Staff Development Council's Standards in its implementation of all professional development programs (page e35). The project design parallels the coherent design of SmART Schools that is based on current research on school improvement, teaching, and learning; and the relationship between arts and academic achievement (page e37). For example, Research on school improvement, teaching, and learning encompasses the research-based practices such as Teaching for Understanding which helps students to think critically, solve problems, develop, and express their creativity, and demonstrate their understanding by applying what they have learned to real-world problems. Other research based practices entail accommodating Multiple Intelligences; changing the school culture, building local capacity for continuous improvement, creating Professional Learning Communities, promoting collaborative leadership, and parent/community involvement (pages e37-e38).

b.

The applicant describes how the project will evolve as a comprehensive, whole-school change model designed to deepen educators' content knowledge in the arts and other core subjects, provide them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards (in this case the Common Core State Standards), and prepare them to use various types of classroom assessments (pages e40-e41). The model will create a foundation for systemic, sustainable change in teacher practice and school culture. This will occur through appropriate methods such as summer and academic year institutes, ongoing professional development, and leadership training.

c.

The applicant describes of the project will build capacity. The project will build the capacity of administrators, arts educators, and regular classroom teachers to sustain the program and engage in continuous improvement over time. For example, the Summer Institutes will increase the capacity of the entire school faculty to provide standards-based arts and arts-integrated education to all students. The collaborative leadership team training will prepare teacher leaders to provide the time, resources, and ongoing support to ensure the model's success. Professional Learning Community training will enable teacher leaders to create and facilitate school-wide teams that will take shared ownership of student success in the arts and other content areas, and staff will work with administrators and teachers to enhance and expand partnerships with local arts and cultural organizations, and higher education institutions providing them with ongoing professional development and resources (page e27).

Weaknesses:

a.

No weaknesses noted.

b.

The applicant does not describe any initiatives of which the project will be linked to. Linkage with school and/or district reform initiatives would have made the design stronger.

c.

The applicant does not describe funding sources that may be used to continue the project beyond federal funding. 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: 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:

a.

The applicant provide a statement that it will not discriminate on the basis of gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age in the education program (page e43).

Key personnel assigned to work on the project have been identified. The project will be guided by a project director, who has experience in managing DOE funded programs, and has worked as a teacher, guidance counselor and assistant principal in the district; school principals from participating schools (page e43). A project coordinator will be hired for the project upon funding of the project. Experience and qualifications outlined for the position are adequate to ensure a viable candidate holds the position. Candidates will meet the following expectations: a candidate with both strong arts and teaching background, ideally in the theatre arts; a minimum of a B.A. degree; and strong management skills (page e45).

Other staff working on the project will include project schools staff and consultants, all of which are clearly identified and have appropriate qualifications 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:

a.

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.

A resume for the project director is not included in the Appendix. The provision of a resume he would help provide information to ensure the individual is qualified and experienced to lead the project.

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:

a.

The applicant provides information outlining and appropriate management structure for the project. The Project Director will have ultimate responsibility for the implementation of this project. His time in this effort will be part of the District's in-kind contribution. The Project Coordinator (TBD) will report directly to him and will provide direct administrative oversight (page e53). Further, the applicant outlines a project timeline that is feasible to help guide staff in the management of the plan that covers the 4 year grant period. The proposed timeline consists of major project tasks, timeframes specified by months (page e53).

b.

The time commitment of key staff assigned to the project is described. The project director will devote (10% time dedicated to the project), and will meet weekly with the Project Coordinator to maintain district-wide oversight of the project (page e56). In order to ensure the success of the project, a Project Coordinator (full-time position) will be hired to work on the project. A clerical/administrative support individual will support the project for 1 day a week (Budget Narrative). Time commitments are appropriate to ensure proper management of the project.

c.

The applicant outlines appropriate strategies for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project (page e55-e56). Once the project is underway, monthly meetings will be held that include the project director, project coordinator, the project school co-directors, program evaluator, the other two school principals, and representative academic and arts teachers. These meetings will provide opportunities to solicit feedback, address strengths and weaknesses of the implementation on an on-going basis, plan for future professional development, and modify the program as needed. During the planning year the district and SmART Schools management staff and the project's evaluators will collect, share and review baseline data to refine the evaluation tools (Page e57). Reports will provide strong indicators of the successes and weaknesses in the design and implementation of the project. Identified weaknesses will be immediately addressed. Throughout the project, teachers will receive feedback on their use of arts-infused teaching strategies from peers, master teaching artists, the Project Coordinator and SmART Schools staff.

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.

Reader's Score: 21

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 evaluation will be conducted by a highly qualified, independent evaluation team with experience designing and conducting research and evaluation of school improvement models and designs (page e57). The plan will employ a mixed-method design that will incorporate both process and outcome evaluation elements. Quantitative data (including surveys) will be gathered at the start of the implementation period, representing baseline data for the project. Evaluators will be continuously collecting data from various sources throughout the life of the grant. Achievement, survey and attendance data will be kept in a database that will be updated as available, at least once each year. Surveys will be administered each year to measure growth and progress as the program develops. Qualitative data will be collected twice per year (fall and spring) during site visits at each school (pages age e72-e73). Evaluators will collect information during site visits and through a combination of document reviews and interviews with staff to determine the level to which resources are being used for program improvement. Quantitative data will be stored in and analyzed using SPSS. Evaluators will use an analysis of variance to ensure the program and comparison schools are adequately matched. In order to measure the effects of the program, the evaluator will use analysis of variance or analysis of covariance. Analyses will be performed using whole-school data as well as subgroup data. Qualitative data will be recorded and analyzed to identify the overarching opinions of the program. Evaluators will look for patterns in teacher and student behavior as well as examine what works best for participants and what needs to be refined (pages e72-e73).

b.

The applicant outlines evaluation methods that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Evaluators will collect information during site visits and through a combination of document reviews and interviews with staff to determine the level to which resources are being used for program improvement (page e73). Evaluators will examine what supports are needed, if any, to assist program staff in their efforts. Evaluators will also collect observational and feedback data from technical assistance activities. Follow up questions and observations will be performed to determine the lasting impacts. Information will be supplemented by interview and survey data on the effectiveness of technical assistance. Evaluators will use this data to explore challenges and barriers within the system and develop recommendations for improving or streamlining the process (page e74).

Weaknesses:

a.
No weaknesses noted.

b.
Frequency of interviews and observations is not described to determine appropriateness of the periodic assessment of the project.

Reader's Score: 8

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:

a.
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: 06/14/2013 12:38 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Everett Public Schools (U351D130015)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	12
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	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Sub Total	100	89
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference		
Priority Four - Technology		
1. Technology	5	1
Sub Total	5	1
Total	105	90

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Everett Public Schools (U351D130015)

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 refers to three included schools for proposal designated as Title 1, in which more than 77% of the student population is eligible for free/reduced lunch (p. e10).

B. Applicant refers to US Census statistics illustrating high level of students for which English is not their first language (50.3%), as well as higher than statewide averages of free lunch (65.4%) and reduced lunch (11.9%) statewide (p. 3). Additionally cites evidence of higher poverty levels (14%) (p. 3).

The applicant refers to how this proposal will demonstrate the efficacy of the arts in improving achievement for students at risk of educational failure due to poverty, race/ethnicity, limited English proficiency (p. 1).

Applicant states there are currently no theatre programs/classes, dance classes, or media visual arts classes offered to students at any of the Everett K-8 schools (p. 8).

Applicant refers to lack of arts integration in other core academic subjects (p. 8).

Additionally, applicant states that teachers at Everett K-8 have had little professional development that would enable them to effectively integrate arts into their education program (p. 8).

Proposal for Project Director and Project Coordinator to work with leadership teams to further identify specific gaps and needs in its arts program and student achievement overall (p. 9).

Weaknesses:

A. None.

B. Applicant states that currently all schools have a fulltime visual arts teacher and music teacher. Additionally the district has 2 violin teachers, 5 traveling band instructors, although few students participate because of prohibitive costs of musical instruments (p. 8). These statements by the Applicant do not indicate weaknesses or gaps in the core arts that signify a need for development.

Reader's Score: 12

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 project is intended to build a new model for improving academic performance in grades 5-8 based on arts-integration (p. 2).

Recent changes in the district's reading programs have been expanded to Adopt the Bay State Reading Institute to refigure curriculum and instructions, providing opportunity for success of this project (p. 7).

Applicant states this model will be thoroughly documented, evaluated, and disseminated so that it can be replicated with other Everett K-8 schools and disseminated to schools and school systems throughout Massachusetts and the country (p. 3).

Applicant states that SmART Schools program began with 5 pilot elementary schools in Rhode Island that continue to receive widespread recognition for their success in transforming school culture, enhancing teacher performance, and improving student achievement (p. 17).

Additionally, applicant refers to tremendous flexibility of model used in implementation of the proposed project and how Moving Up SmART will become a distinct model in its own right based on needs and assets of the district and 3 target schools (p. 18).

Illustrates project's need to identify new and existing local artists, strengthen and expand partnerships with education, arts, and cultural organizations, orient and train master teaching artists (p. 19).

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. Applicant cites several research studies and evaluation data that support effectiveness of its design and implementation (pp. 10-14; 21).

Model based on previous evaluation of 5 pilot schools in RI (p. 24).

B. Applicant explains how proposal represents a comprehensive, whole-school change model, designed to deepen educators' knowledge in arts and other core subjects, providing them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards (p. 25). Applicant refers to how these goals will be achieved following professional development after planning, design and creation of model (p. 25).

C. Applicant cites success of previous pilot program after completion of model arts integration program (p. 27). Cites ability of training to ensure model's success and expansion into partnerships with local arts and cultural organizations (p. 27).

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 states prohibition of unlawful discrimination of employees based on race, color, origin, gender, age or disability (p. 27).

Applicant provides education, training and experience of extensive list of key project personnel (p. 28, Appendix E).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides notice that project coordinator will be hired pending funding with strong arts and teaching background, with no mention of multi-cultural awareness expectations (p. 29).

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. Project Director will have ultimate responsibility for implementation of this project, other key personnel have been identified as to the specific tasks they will be responsible for performing (p. 36).

B. Applicant states belief based on past model success that time allocations and management processes are appropriate and adequate to meet objectives of proposed project (p. 40).

C. Applicant states project designed to ensure feedback and continuous improvement based on new strategies, methods of service delivery and materials developed during the life of the project (p. 40).

Weaknesses:

A. Much of the management and coordination and implementation of the project is referred to as ongoing (graph/p. e53).

B. Applicant does not provide specific data to back up confidence in success of time allocations/management within project.

C. Applicant does not specifically document procedures to ensure continuous feedback/improvement within framework of the project.

Reader's Score: 18

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. Applicant aligns goals, objectives and expected outcomes of the project as based in the Logic Model, which will be evaluated by an independent team based on qualitative and quantitative outcomes (p. 41).

UCLA Center X will evaluate based on process and outcome evaluation elements. Qualifications of independent evaluation team, UCLA Center X provided (p. 42-43).

B. Outcome data for treatment schools and comparison schools will be calculated and reported on an annual basis, serving as a benchmark to monitor progress towards objectives each year, ensuring project staff are aware of desired outcomes being achieved (p. 44).

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:

Target schools will post information about Moving Up SmART, as well as sample curriculum on school and district web pages to reach practitioners, policy makers, parents, and the general public in order to share and disseminate information about program activities, accomplishments, and outcomes. (page 20)

Weaknesses:

Applicant includes no discussion of how technology will be integrated into project as a learning tool.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/14/2013 12:38 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2013 01:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Everett Public Schools (U351D130015)

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

Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Everett Public Schools (U351D130015)

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 proposes to support the Everett Public Schools, an urban based district in with a diverse, multi-cultural population of 41,667 residents north of Boston, Massachusetts. In the academic year 2012-2013, the enrollment of Everett Public Schools was 6,672. Approximately 50.3% of the students were First Language not English compared to 17.3% statewide. Of the enrolled, 11.7% were Limited English Proficient compared to 7.7% for the state. Accordingly, 14.9% have special education needs compared to 13.2% nationwide. Of the total (6,672)student enrollment, 65.4% receive free lunch compared and 11.9% receive reduced lunch, in comparison to 32.1% students receive free lunch and 4.9% reduced lunch for the state. Overall, 77.2% of all children in Everett are considered low income, in comparison to 37% living in the state. Everett has extensive at risk factors, such as ranking of the 18th highest reporting of child abuse and neglect; low educational attainment with 37% of children living in single parent households; 21.1% of adults lack high school credentials; 14% of the children live in poverty; and increase violence, with and without weapons, trending upward. Of the district, the project has identified three public schools (The George Keverian School, Sumner G. Whittier School and Madeline English School) for kindergarten through 8th grade. Enrollment for these three Title I schools total 2,434, of these students 1,016 are the target 5th – 8th graders and 77.4% are eligible for free or reduced lunch. All three schools have a high risk population of above 80% -92%.

The applicant cites several gaps and weaknesses in services, including limited access to artists in the four arts disciplines and lack of arts integration in other core academic subjects.

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 cites several products that have utility and can be replicated through several strategies to disseminate and promote the Moving Up SmART Model, such as the local and regional media to provide linkages through print and broadcast media outlets; the world wide web to act as a resource to store sample curriculums on the districts and schools web pages; publications and presentations throughout academic journals and national conferences and establish a network of county and state level partners.

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) Teaching for Understanding research provides the program rationale; (b) Changing the School Culture study provides a theoretical framework; and Creating Professional Learning Communities study supports the teaching methodology through the integration of the arts and the impact on academic performance and behavior.

The applicant demonstrates the Moving Up SmART project is aligned with the comprehensive plan to improve teaching and learning while increasing academic rigorous standards. The program provides services to middle school students exclusively to alleviate academic deficiencies.

The applicant demonstrates the program is structurally anchored with the Everett Public School District and the community. 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. Proposed personnel were appropriate and the professional experiences were relevant to ensure proper management of program goals and objectives, as well as fiscal management of the grant.

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 activities, timelines, milestones for accomplishments, responsibilities and partner involvement and commitments. Activities are clear and relative to the achievement of the project goal. Organizational structure is apparent by the design of events and frequency of occurrences to support teaching and learning of middle schools students and teachers.

The applicant provides a description of the responsibilities and time and effort of the key personnel. Itemized positions and commitment to the project is clearly defined in the budget narrative. The personnel are appropriate and adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project.

The applicant provides a clear process of collecting, analyzing and disseminating data twice a year to key stakeholders for improvement. Opportunities for review, assess and evaluate program procedures are on-going for project enhancement.

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 method is the Logic Model and the plan includes an experienced independent evaluation. The quasi-experimental design will include quantitative and qualitative data. Two types of assessments will be executed, formative and summative. The evaluation plan includes the collection of data and analysis reporting to stakeholders as ongoing and annually. The formative will provide ongoing feedback for adjustments and the summative will be submitted annually. The applicant demonstrates a plan to assess progress for student achievement.

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: 06/17/2013 01:55 PM

