

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/30/2014 01:28 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U351D140107)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	12
Significance		
1. Significance	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	20
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	83
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Total	105	87

Technical Review Form

Panel #11 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 11: 84.351D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U351D140107)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 1 - Need for Project in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.

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

Strengths:

See sub-criterion discussion.

Weaknesses:

See sub-criterion discussion.

Reader's Score: 12

Sub Question

1. (a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to serve two high-needs middle schools and presents in-depth evidence of the serious needs of the students in these two schools (e19-e20). The two schools serve student populations of color who have demonstrated persistent academic needs and demonstrate continuing weak academic performances. A plan is proposed for enhancing the arts services that are offered in these two schools (e20-e21).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (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 specifically defines the missing links between academic program options at the target school and the arts (e20-e21). The project proposes to fill the gap in arts services at these schools by working with the schools and their communities to plan comprehensive and rich arts programming that will provide teachers with professional development, students with arts learning opportunities, and, in time, implement completely integrated arts and academic programs. The plan also calls for offering art experiences to the families and communities, giving students the opportunity to engage in and showcase their arts learning.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant broadly defines a vision for enhancing the arts integration at the target schools, but there are no quantifiable details that make explicit the nature or magnitude of the gaps and weaknesses observed.

Reader's Score:

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 makes a strong case that this project builds on a decade of development and research on the integration of academics and the arts in the County and region's schools. The applicant has worked with prominent partners that have developed powerful tools (especially courses and assessments) and research evidence of the value of those tools for enhancing student learning and enhancing arts programming in schools (e24 - e25). The applicant reports that they will be replicating a "proven" model (e27) and that it will work with an external evaluation team to improve the tools and document the impact of their use.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's narrative would benefit from clear definition of what materials and products will result from the proposed project and the criteria that will be used to ensure that these products will hold promise for effective use in various other settings. Other than the refinement of products from previous projects such as the rubric called, "Measurement of Teacher Effectiveness" (e24-e25), the products to be developed by the new project are not discussed.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 3 - Quality of Project Design in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.

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

Strengths:

This is an elaborately planned program that seems to be well-grounded in a history of research-based innovation. The design calls for supporting further research and development to confirm the project's value to support the integration of arts and Common Core Standards across classrooms locally and regionally.

Weaknesses:

A comprehensive, apparently well researched project seems to be designed to serve only two schools over four years, and will result in a fee-for service set of products. Considering the rich foundation of learning and product development

described here, it would seem that the project should serve a much broader audience and be more widely incorporated into the County's and participating district's infrastructures.

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes a research-based program that integrates in-depth course work for each participating schools' teachers which introduces them to the tools of arts integration and academics. Teachers will apply the strategies and lessons learned through courses in their collaborations as members of professional learning communities (PLC), meeting monthly with their peers to support exchanges of experiences and new habits of mind (e32-e34). Faculty coaches will be available in participating schools to promote digital portfolios, self-reflection and collaborative planning within their PLCs. The applicant cites the evidence-based research on which their proposal is built, and makes a strong case for how their proposed strategy aligns with the evidence of research.

Weaknesses:

The project's apparently strong research base is inconsistently documented with citations that are not always complete and cannot always be followed, e.g., the "teaching for understanding framework" is referenced throughout but it is not clear which framework the authors refer to here, as many frameworks with this title have been widely used for the past several decades (e26). It is not clear how the summary references on page e27 align with specific elements of the project's components.

Reader's Score:

2. (b) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory.

Strengths:

The applicant provides an extensive review of this locally designed program and the continuing research program that has supported its implementation since 2003 (e17 & e22-e24). The arts integration professional development program and courses were developed in cooperation with researchers from Harvard's Project Zero (e23). The project proposed builds on over 10 years of research conducted by local district and university educators, local arts partners, and national researchers (e23), and it is grounded in the Teaching for Understanding Framework (e26). Incorporated into the course work and professional development are pedagogical concepts designed to promote inquiry-based teaching and learning across disciplines (e26).

The project's logic model is presented on page e70.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's review of the program's evolution is, in places, hard to follow and not fully documented. For example, in the research review, references to projects and their evaluation are not consistently documented, so it is difficult to assess what evidence exists for the value of these programs. In another example of unclear documentation, on page e24, the applicant claims that the Measurement of Teacher Effectiveness. A "proven" classroom observation tool for documenting improvement in teachers' knowledge and use of the arts, includes no citation of sources indicating where or when this research has been reported (e24). Another area that is unclear is the promise to create a "trans-disciplinary pedagogical model," which is described as promoting "meaningful learning and deep understandings," but this description is offered with specific examples of how these valued ideals manifest themselves in classrooms.

Reader's Score:

Sub Question

3. (c) **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.**

Strengths:

The project builds on 10 years of locally developed, studied, and disseminated arts integration activities which has been disseminated within target schools and offered through professional development to an expanded group of schools and educators (e24-e26). This proposed project expansion is designed to extend work into classrooms that are implementing the Common Core Standards (e25). The project proposes to implement an intensive series of courses, professional collaborations, and continued coaching in two middle schools over a four-year period.

Weaknesses:

It is surprising that this apparently well-designed program, grounded in local and regional research programs for many years, is designed to serve only two middle schools. This appears to be a relatively narrow pilot study, rather than a comprehensive one. Within the life of the project, it is not apparent how this is a "comprehensive effort" that will reach beyond the two participating schools e32-e33).

Reader's Score:

4. (d) **The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.**

Strengths:

The applicant describes strong out-reach relationships with districts and partners in the region with whom it is collaborating (e38). Supporting the implementation schools will be the areas public broad casting radio station, KQED (e38), the Alameda County Office of Education, and the Alliance for Arts Learning and Leadership (e41), which unifies 18 school districts within the county under the umbrella of this model of arts integration.

Weaknesses:

The applicant indicates that the core of the project is a "fee for service model" which will be disseminated into new regions and locations (e42). With the considerable federal, district-based, and private investment in resources, training, strategies that comprise this program, it is surprising that potential beneficiaries will need to pay to gain access to the project's lessons learned and products. Additional outlets for dissemination might be planned, but it is not clear exactly how project's products and activities will be integrated within the county and across the region at no cost to potential beneficiaries after the grant concludes.

Reader's Score:

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 project proposes a strong and experienced lead staff that have broad-based arts integration and academic experience within the school district and in the region, including managing previous district-based integrated arts programs and working with research projects such as Harvard's Project Zero and others. The team includes practitioners with appropriate credentials and substantial experience implementing previous integrated arts programs (see resumes

e92-e123). In addition the staff includes educators who have worked with high risk and under-represented populations (e45).

Weaknesses:

Although it is implied that the project will seek quality personnel who are members of underrepresented groups, the applicant neither makes a statement demonstrating its commitment to this goal nor does it include evidence that summarizes the racial diversity of the proposed staff.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 5 - Management Plan in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.

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

Strengths:

A group of apparently talented and experienced arts educators and managers are the leaders and implementers of this proposed project.

Weaknesses:

It is not clear from the narrative or the proposed planning components how these many accomplished professionals will be coordinating and managing the implementation of the many potentially strong project components. While there is a strong narrative defining a vision, that narrative is not supported with clearly stated sets of responsibilities, products to be developed and completed, timelines, or outcomes.

Reader's Score: 17

Sub Question

1. (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.

Strengths:

The plan proposes five coordinating teams that will be working together to implement the plan under the direction of co-principal investigators and a project director, supported by consulting curriculum developers and teaching experts (e49-e54).

Weaknesses:

Although there is an extensive narrative that explains how five teams will be convened and how they will work together, the plan does not include a clear time line or list of milestones that will be used to accomplish project tasks. A clear set of responsibilities, product milestones, and outcomes should be charted. It appears that the project is staffed with no full-time person, and there is a danger that significant coordinating functions may fall through the cracks with so many busy but part-time personnel working without clearly defined accountability for

Sub Question

products or activities.

Reader's Score:

2. **(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.**

Strengths:

The responsibilities and experiences of the proposed project director and principal investigator are described broadly (e48-e49). The team appears to be experienced within the community of educators and artists and are clearly experienced project managers.

Weaknesses:

The project director and co-principal investigators appear to be part-time staff, not working even a full FTE during the life of the program. The project will be hiring numerous collaborating consultants, teachers, and artists, but the narrative has not made a clear case about the time commitments for each of the participants. As a result it is not clear how the project's keep personnel will be positioned to meet the project's objectives (e49-e54).

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

An extensive narrative describes how the five-team project structure will carry out their responsibilities and coordinate with one another, providing various feedback loops proposed to support continuous project improvement throughout the life of the grant (e49-e54). On page e69, an Arts Model Project Management Plan Flow Chart depicts the plans for coordinating project components and personnel.

Weaknesses:

The Management Plan Flow Chart and the narrative describing the project's operational processes detail personnel and activities that will be involved in conducting the program. However, these extensive descriptions fail to delineate clear responsibilities for providing feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Reader's Score:**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 6 - Project Evaluation in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.

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

Strengths:

See descriptions included in the sub-criterion.

Weaknesses:

See descriptions included in the sub-criterion.

Reader's Score: 17

Sub Question

1. **(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.**

Strengths:

The applicant details evaluation methods which use both qualitative and quantitative performance measures to document the project's intended outcomes (e 56 -e62). While many of the performance measures will be developed during the course of the project, there are plans to use existing and established academic achievement measures and some established arts surveys (e56-e57 and e60).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

2. **(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 applicant plans to collect both qualitative and quantitative evidence of project implementation and accomplishment that hold potential to provide periodic assessment of progress toward outcomes and performance feedback throughout the project.

The applicant proposes using "differentiated comparison groups" to measure achievement growth and performance outcomes (e63).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant has defined goals and measurement strategies, including providing tools about many validated measures, there is no clear explanation of the methodologies the evaluators will use to document implementation processes or outcomes. The fact that will be "many eyes on teachers" as these goals are pursued is evident (e57) but it is not evident how evaluators will quantify and analyze the impact of the many proposed project strategies and products. It is not why six comparison groups are needed to assess the impact of the project on two schools, or how these comparison groups will be selected (e63).

Reader's Score:

3. **(c) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence of promise (as defined in the notice.)**

Strengths:

A summary of annual evaluation deliverables is provided, which very briefly describes the core content of each of the annual reports that the evaluation will produce. In year four, the final report is expected to contain a technical appendix of instruments and it will be written as a "dissemination-focused report" (e64) that will include observations and findings that has the potential of serving as a "benefit" to others interested in arts-integrated programs.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that "without question" the evaluation will "be able to link the program overall and many of its key qualities to improved student learning," but the narrative fails to define the analytic procedures that will be applied to the extensive data collection proposed. As a result, the proposed methodology fails to define what kind of evidence will be produced that has the potential for demonstrating evidence of the project's potential promise (e63-e64).

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - 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 proposed project expands the previous research-based program into new technologies. It is designed to enhance and expand the use of technology to integrate arts and academic learning among teachers and with students in the targeted schools. The project will teach teachers and students to assess their own work through performance assessments that are conducted using various new digital media (e25).

Students will use performance based assessment that are documented in digital portfolios (e36).

Weaknesses:

The project appears to focus almost entirely on developing and beta testing digital portfolios as the key technological activity proposed. It is also directed only at two middle schools. Although these are worthy goals, the project appears to be engaging a limited amount of technology and has a limited reach - only into two schools. The proposal does not make clear the range of "high-quality" tools, materials or products that will be developed, used, or disseminated during the life of the project.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/30/2014 01:28 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/08/2014 03:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U351D140107)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	15
Significance		
1. Significance	10	9
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	24
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	93
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #11 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 11: 84.351D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U351D140107)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 1 - Need for Project in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

1. (a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly identifies the strong need for the project: 91-93% minority, high crime neighborhoods, 55% ELL, 70-80% below proficient on state tests, 75-100% low SES (pp. 18-19). The project intends to bring all stakeholders together as the arts are utilized to improve student achievement.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

2. (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:

In the two selected schools, many arts offerings have decreased as low achievement scores caused electives to focus on remediation in language arts and math (pp. e20-21). The students and the community have limited access to the arts, so the plan is to include arts consultants, part-time art teachers, afterschool instructors, and community partners into the project (p. e21).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

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:

Through grants since 2003, the Alameda County Office of Education (ACOE) has developed and honed several arts education products. The Integrated Learning Specialist Program (ILSP), the arts education model, was developed with Harvard's Project Zero. The ACOE now has components in place to expand and enhance the ILSP (p. e13, 22). Dissemination of the new project will be via websites (p. e28).

Weaknesses:

The proposed project would be strengthened by data to show the success of the previous projects.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 3 - Quality of Project Design in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.**

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 24

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

Each component of the proposed project is substantiated with up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

2. (b) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory.

Strengths:

The detailed logic model (p. e70) is supported by strong theory as well as the previous project products that will be enhanced and expanded by the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

3. (c) 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.

Strengths:

Each of the three project goals is supported with objectives and consequent activities to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students (pp. e32-38). Mandatory training in three, 30 hour courses in the second year of the project with the addition of 30 more elective hours of years 3 and 4 is an amazing and strong component of this project (p. e33).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

4. (d) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

Strengths:

The proposed project has the support of the area's superintendent education association and an association called Alliance for Arts Learning Leadership with over 50 organizations and 90 individual leaders, as well as multiple partners and funders (p. e41). Several outside the area school districts have paid the ILSP's fee-for-service, which brings in monies to continue dissemination (p. e42).

Weaknesses:

The project design timeline chart includes an Annual Integrated Learning Institute, but no discussion of who attends, how long it lasts, or the purpose of the institute (p. e40).

Reader's Score:

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 resumes of the key personnel reveal a highly-qualified staff to implement the project. Relevant training and experience of the personnel are quite extensive and impressive.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not discuss how personnel from underrepresented groups are encouraged to apply.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 5 - Management Plan in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

1. (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.

Strengths:

Five teams will all serve to manage the project (p. e49).

Weaknesses:

A chart that details each objective's timeline, responsibilities, and milestones would make it easier to understand and evaluate whether or not the tasks can be accomplished or adequately managed.

Reader's Score:

2. (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.

Sub Question

Strengths:

The ACOE is a consortium of 18 school districts with the support of extensive resources: a large IT department, a communications department, and a CCSS training department (p. e54).

Weaknesses:

50% for the program director and 20% for the project manager is rather low for the magnitude of this project. Time percentages for the four coaches also would be helpful.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

There is an extensive list of tools that will be employed to collect data; the five management teams have specific responsibilities in each year of the project (pp. e56-62).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

- 1. Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 6 - Project Evaluation in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.**

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

- 1. (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.**

Strengths:

A chart clearly defines each goal, objective and the measurement tools to be utilized as well as how often the data will be collected (pp. e56-62).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

In the evaluation chart, the "S" indicates semi-annual OR more in frequency of collection; the plan would be strengthened by a more specific time (quarterly, monthly, etc.) for several of the tools.

Reader's Score:

2. **(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 list of tools is listed for ample collection of data.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explain how the data will be analyzed for results; defining the statistical methods they plan to use is needed (T-Test, ANOVA, Nvivo?).

Reader's Score:

3. **(c) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence of promise (as defined in the notice.)**

Strengths:

The proposed project plans to use 2 schools for the comparison group in their quasi-experimental evaluation method (p. e54). The methods focus on what the teacher will learn to do instructionally and how effective those practices become. In addition, the evaluation concentrates on what the students will learn and whether or not their motivation to learn grows from their classroom experiences (p. e56).

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - 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 proposed project seeks to enhance and expand a previously-developed, arts education model by integrating digital technology and CCSS while using technology to document and then disseminate the results.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/08/2014 03:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2014 12:16 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U351D140107)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	13
Significance		
1. Significance	10	9
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
Sub Total	100	91
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #11 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 11: 84.351D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Alameda County Office of Education (U351D140107)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 1 - Need for Project in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 13

Sub Question

1. (a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.

Strengths:

The two schools that will be included in the proposed project are located in the highest crime neighborhoods in the country. Both schools are middle schools with high percentages of Hispanic and African American students with high numbers of students in poverty and free and reduced lunch recipients. Both schools fall below the State target and are lower than the average of all schools in the district.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (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:

On page 7 one gap is defined by the fact that "the course offerings in the visual and performing arts declined to the point where the arts are now taught through contracted services with local art organizations."

Weaknesses:

Academics were described as below the State average, however, no academic gaps are discussed as a need or weakness with quantifiable data.

Sub Question

Reader's Score:

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:

With the history of several arts programs funded through the US Department of Education over the past decade, page 13 states the "the model will become stronger and more completely documented through this proposed project. There is a window of opportunity to increase effectiveness, expand and create systemic change not only statewide but nationally." All materials will be available through a website created with the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

Although the previous programs were identified as successful, data from the programs would be beneficial to support how the materials and products would be developed further.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 3 - Quality of Project Design in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.**

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The proposed project is based on ten years of implementation and research on similar projects conducted by the Alameda County Office of Education. Current research to support the proposed project includes the successful components that will be replicated in the proposal for effective practices. These components are described through research citations included on pages 15 and 16 as "integrating academic disciplines with various subjective and objective epistemologies and methods of inquiry."

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (b) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory.

Strengths:

The proposed project incorporates the theory of instruction innovation as represented in the Logic Model. The Model addresses three goals: GOAL 1: Improved Teacher Effectiveness; GOAL 2: Increased Student Achievement; GOAL 3: ILSP Expansion and Enhancement.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

3. (c) 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.

Strengths:

The proposed project includes both teaching and learning goals. The teaching goals include the use of coaches in the classrooms and the use of professional learning communities. The use of digital portfolios with communities of practice will also be part of these goals. The student learning will be supported through the increase of the engagement by 80% of the student as measured by observations and an overall increase in student achievement in math, English language arts and science.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

4. (d) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

Strengths:

Through the four years of the proposed project the integration of arts into specific content areas and increase the frequency of performance based assessments, alignment to national and state art standards as discussed on page 23. A timeline gives full descriptions of all activities on pages 25-27.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

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 qualifications of key personnel are presented with vast knowledge and experience for the defined role as discussed on pages 42-46.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not specify procedures for encouraging applications from members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 5 - Management Plan in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.**

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 17

Sub Question

- 1. (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.**

Strengths:

The management plan includes several distinct teams which are the planning and implementation team, core management team, professional development team, school site leadership team and the technology team. Each team will be led by an appropriately experienced and educated leader with other members from across the district and the university partner.

Weaknesses:

The timeline includes dates and activities only. More information on the objectives of the proposed project with clear milestones for each project tasks need to be included in the overall timeline description that includes who is responsible for each task completion.

Reader's Score:

Sub Question

2. (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.

Strengths:

The Co-Principal Investigators have clearly defined roles and responsibilities that include overall project management. Each of the Co-Principal Investigators have time commitments for the proposed project as 30%, however the Alameda County Office of Education is giving them 20% more time as an in kind contribution. This give each of the Co-Principal Investigators a total time commitment of 50% on the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Each of the team leaders will provide information on the expectations and implementations of the components for their team as part of the overall proposed project. The Planning and Implementation Team will meet monthly during the first year of the proposed project to insure that all milestones are being met. This team will continue to meet in the following years of the proposed project as determined by the implementation successes of the first year.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. Please provide a brief summary and your scores for Question 6 - Project Evaluation in the space below. If you opt to not include a summary, please indicate N/A in the comment boxes. Your detailed analysis and comments for each of the sub-criteria should be provided in each of the subsequent, specific sub-questions. Scores are not captured at the sub-question level and can only be provided here.

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

1. (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.

Sub Question

Strengths:

One of the teams for the proposed project is the evaluation team led by an experienced program evaluator. The performance measures will include both qualitative and quantitative data from both student and teacher assessments and observations.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (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 proposed project includes three main purposes, formative analysis to guide program practices, longitudinal change assessments to test program impact and comparison group assessments to test of significance of measured changes as described on pages 42-48.

Weaknesses:

To completely understand how the data will be collected and analyzed more details are needed to support the evaluation methodology. The use of a comparison group is discussed in the evaluation plan, but details on developing the quasi-experimental design are needed. For example stated on page 48, "test scores will be collected for the two program schools and for a cluster of about 6 comparison Oakland middle schools on an annual basis." How these schools will be selected and exactly how many schools will be used as comparison needs to be defined fully.

Reader's Score:

3. (c) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence of promise (as defined in the notice.)

Strengths:

The description of the evaluation includes comparison schools, which has potential to provide evidence of promise to the implementation of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - 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:

Digital portfolios will be used by all teachers in the proposed project and to support the teachers to share lesson plans with the support of the coaches.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2014 12:16 PM