Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Cleveland Play House (U351D140098)
Reader #1: **********

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Project 1. Need for Project</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance 1. Significance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Project Design 1. Quality of Project Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Project Personnel 1. Project Personnel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Management Plan 1. Management Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Project Evaluation 1. Project Evaluation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total 105 93

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2

Technology
1. CPP: Technology 5 5

Sub Total 5 5

Total 105 93
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: 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 clearly demonstrates need for the project and describes proposed services. Social and Emotional Learning, theatre education, academic achievement, a positive school climate are cited as needs for the target population. For example, Only 37% of district students scored proficient or higher in reading on the Ohio Academic Achievement tests (pg. 12). Additionally, research garnered from the 2013 Status of Arts Education in Ohio Public Schools suggest that access to instruction in drama/theatre, is limited, with only two percent of elementary school students, six percent of middle school students and thirty-nine percent of high schools had access the theatre/drama education. (pg. 10). Seventy-eight percent of schools reported that no one at the district level was responsible for implementing and evaluating arts programs (pg. 10). Evaluation of the conditions for learning, including the status of Social Emotional Learning in district schools listed eight contributing factors in the district that lead to poor school climate and student misbehavior, resulting in unsafe learning environments, including harsh and inconsistent approaches to discipline, poor adult supervision, and a lack of social and emotional role modeling by school staff (pg. 9). The target district is the second largest district in Ohio, serving more than 40,000 students, nearly 68 percent of whom are students of color, and 100 percent of whom qualify for free/reduced-price lunches (pg. 9). The intent of the project will be to improve social emotional learning (SEL) skills, increase literacy learning, and benefit underserved African-American students (Abstract, pgs. 3-4). The project will encompass the use of high-quality digital tools, training, and Common Core Standards-based instruction, integrating Drama, ELA, and SEL is thought to enhance and expand the current drama-based SEL curriculum. Professional development sessions and real-time coaching for educators will be provided to increase capacity to build theatre integrated lessons and a positive classroom environment. This will include large numbers of African-American, low-income students and students who attend Title One/SIG schools (pg. 8).
Sub Question

Weaknesses:
The applicant does not describe academic data specifically for the target schools and population to help demonstrate need. Data described is for the district. Specific and detailed data is not presented to support the need for social emotional learning, or a positive school climate.

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 cites an overall achievement and experience gap and weakness in the delivery of a robust education for the target population (pg. 14). Gaps and weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities are identified through multiphase gap analysis that included interviews with teachers and administrators, analysis of test data as well as a review of district and university policies and activities (pgs. 6-8). Key gaps in service and causes of those gaps are cuts in funding and a mandated emphasis on ELA and math; limited offerings in the K-8 schools; and the rural geographic isolation. For example, overall funding in California schools is still recovering from the Great Recession. It is predicted that school funding levels are still three years away from getting back to pre-Recession levels. Thus resources will remain tight for the foreseeable future. Arts education programs in the elementary and middle schools have been drastically cut over the past few years as schools struggled with budget reductions, low test scores, high populations of Title I eligible students, student attendance issues, and the mandated emphasis on math and reading from the California State Department of Education brought on by the schools’ Persistently Low Achieving School and Program Improvement status (pg. 6).

Weaknesses:
The applicant fails to demonstrate the magnitude of the identified gap and weakness. Little to no data is provided to support a weakness or gap in the provision of services that meet social emotional learning and academic data on the target population is limited to the overall district and is not specific to any academic area. Further, information on the provision of the arts as a need is not described as a weakness or gap in services and infrastructure.

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 project will yield utility that is sufficient for use in a variety of educational settings. Products described include unit exemplars with embedded interactive digital media; professional development and real-time coaching for teachers, PD and literacy technique training for teaching artists; software development including digital applications and self-publishing digital portfolios and literature logs, digital media labs and manuals; assessment tools. (pgs. 18-22). These products will meet a growing need for tools and techniques that address the integration of theatre, Social Emotional Learning and Common Core ELA practices. Program tools for students, educators, and teaching artists will be available nationally. They will be designed to be usable in a variety of setting by teachers, teaching artists, afterschool educators, theatre organizations and others. They will be scaffolded for varying age and skill levels, and technology components will be designed to provide a point of entry for all students and educators, no matter what their skill level. Information, materials,
processes and techniques that will be continuously improved and disseminated in a variety of settings (pg. 19).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found:
“This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.”

Reader’s Score: 10

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:
N/A

Weaknesses:
N/A

Reader’s Score: 22

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 demonstrates the project is based on up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices through cited research (pgs 15-18 Appendix, Bibliography pgs. 52-56). Through research-based practices integrated within core drama education techniques, students will receive weekly instruction led by highly-qualified theatre educators. All research based curricula are designed to use theatre as a tool to improve SEL skills as well as ELA skills. For example, to improve academic self-efficacy, student self-management, emotional competence, practices like frequent feedback on performances, modeling, persuasion ((National Center on Education and the Economy, 2007; Carroll, 2007; National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, 2012), providing tasks that are meaningful to children, given their interests and environments. Further, evidence-based practices to improve ELA skills, such as interactive shared reading, instructional conversations and literature logs, and oral reading are all inherent to the theatre rehearsal process and support by research cited in the Bibliography. High-quality professional development and planning, “real-time” coaching, and peer exchange are all described of for use in the project and effective practices used to help increase student achievement among students at risk of educational failure (pg. 16).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found:
“This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.”
2. (b) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory.

Strengths:
The applicant provides a logic model to help demonstrated strong theory supporting the project (pgs, 7, 14-15). The logic model is sufficient to demonstrate a rationale for the relationships among resources, activities, and intended results (Appendix). Research is cited on how activities and pedagogy associated with theatre education are capable of meeting students’ needs for belongingness, esteem, cognition, aesthetics and self-actualization. For example, students who are part of a theatre class or club often feel a sense of belonging because they have shared experiences with other participants (Brym, 2006). The applicant also describes an alignment of the project with Maslow’s theory (1943) that theatre has the ability to elevate a young person’s self-esteem. Performing gives them a sense of achievement and even notoriety in the school and community (Brym, 2006).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found:
“This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.”

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 applicant presents information describing how the project is part of a comprehensive teaching and learning initiative. The C.A.R.E. program was conceived to foster social emotional learning (SEL) skills while increasing academic readiness and literacy learning for students through theatre integrated lessons and self-curated learning labs. For districts, schools, teachers and students) (pg. 3). C.A.R.E is also designed to improve school culture and safety. Its use of high-quality digital tools, teacher training and Common Core standards-based instruction that integrates Theatre, English Language Arts and SEL. C.A.R.E. was piloted in 2011. Utilizing action research methods, C.A.R.E currently consists of one unit exemplar with embedded digital media across three grade levels. C.A.R.E. has served 1,000 students across four school districts with theatre integrated lessons incorporating SEL and ELA skills. In addition, more than 40 teachers have experienced realtime coaching in which a teaching artist delivers instantly applicable comments in regards to positive student performance feedback at the point of instruction (pg. 6). The project offered through a collaboration between Cleveland Play House (CPH), in partnership with the Cleveland Metropolitan School District (CMSD).

Weaknesses:
The applicant elaborates a theory of change for learning; however, no information is provided on how it will be actually implemented.

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 presents information how the project supports the potential and planning for the incorporation of the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant. Project educators will, over a four-year period, become confident in the delivery of theatre-integrated units of study and promote positive and supportive classroom management and improve conditions for learning for their students. They will acquire the skills, and dispositions necessary to facilitate academic self-efficacy, improve student self-management skills and increase student emotional competence. In addition, through theatre-integration practices that utilize interactive shared reading, oral reading, instructional conversations and literature logs, teachers and teaching artists will acquire the knowledge and understanding of integrating the arts into academic content areas (pg. 16). Thus, students involved in the, over a four-year period will develop critical skills while they learn to manage emotions, care about others, make good decisions, behave ethically and responsibly, and avoid negative behaviors. Teachers will build skills to continue this shift in school practice for a supportive and safe learning environment (pg. 18).

Weaknesses:
A detailed plan of sustaining or incorporating the project model in current work is not described by the applicant to include financial support.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

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

In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor:

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

Strengths:
Key personnel assigned to work on the project are clearly identified (pgs. 34-40). Staff will be comprised of a Director of Education/Project Director - 25% time allocation; a Managing Director - 4% time allocation; an Artistic Director - 4% time allocation; HR/Finance Department - 5% allocation of staff time; Creative Design Department - 10% time allocation of staff time; Development Department - 5% allocation of staff time; a Project Manager; Teaching Artists, an external evaluator and consultants. Staff has regional and national reputations in the field of theatre, theatre education, educational technology and education research. Members of the team have experience in creating and managing school arts partnerships, professional development programs for teachers, and teaching artist training. They have presented at conferences, created innovative software and conducted national research. Resumes of team members are included in the Appendix.

The applicant states it is the policy and practice of Cleveland Play House to provide equal employment opportunity to ALL persons, regardless of one's race, color, creed, religion, sex, age, national origin, citizenship, mental or physical disability, military status, veteran status, sexual orientation, political beliefs, or any other irrelevant factor (pg. 34). Hiring practices within the Education Department include a partnership with the Office of Disability services at four local universities (via a Rosemary Kennedy Internship Contract,) partnership with career services at universities around the country, including
HBUs (Historically Black Universities.). The applicant does not begin the interview process until at least one highly qualified person of color is included in the pool of candidates.

Weaknesses:
The applicant does not include any school district staff as part of the personnel assigned to work on the project. Inclusion of school staff would help ensure professional development is appropriate to meet student needs, and project components are fully aligned with student needs.

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 applicant presents a management plan that is adequate to help guide staff in the management of the project. A Cleveland Play House project team will lead management efforts, holding convening three times yearly with BOA Education Committee, advisory council, school building leadership teams and teaching artists and other project personnel in order to assess the project’s effectiveness in meeting objectives, timelines and milestones (pg. 40). Lead Agency Cleveland Play House will be responsible for the coordination of the partnerships with the school district and LemmingLabs and project, fiscal management and reporting, interfacing with the US DOE, project reporting, overseeing continuous improvement and making changes to project design, software, evaluation logistics, and coordination of sustainability planning and dissemination (pg. 41). A Project Director will be responsible for the project hiring, structure, and oversight. A Project Manager (to be hired) will manage the project’s day-to-day logistics and evaluation, a Resident Teaching Artist will supervise (4) full-time teaching artists and coordinate project training and coaching (pg. 41). A timeline outlines major project tasks with yearly time frames for completion to help guide staff (pg. 43).
Sub Question

Weaknesses:
The BOA Education Committee is referenced several times in the proposal and involvement in major project tasks, however no information is present on the makeup and function of this committee. The timeline of project tasks is not sufficient to guide staff in managing the project. Timeframes are broad (yearly); milestones are not clearly specified, persons responsible for ensuring tasks are completed is not delineated. More details are needed to form a comprehensive plan to guide staff.

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 time commitments of the project director and other key staff are specified by the applicant (Budget Narrative, pg. 42). - Director of Education/Project Director - 25% time allocation; a Managing Director - 4% time allocation; an Artistic Director - 4% time allocation; HR/Finance Department - 5% allocation of staff time; Creative Design Department - 10% time allocation of staff time; Development Department - 5% allocation of staff time; a Project Manager- 100% time allocation. Commitments are sufficient ensure project goals are met.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found:
“This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.”

Reader’s Score:

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

Strengths:
The applicant outlines sufficient activities that will yield feedback on the project and allow for continuous improvement in the operation of the project (pg. 44). For example, the Project Team will gather multiple forms of data to ensure feedback and continuous improvement, with formal review occurring multiple times a year, while action research methodology occurring continuously. Summative reports with formative feedback, will be gathered at least once each year using varied methods, including student test data, student and teachers surveys, and principal interview. Internal Assessment Tools will include action research methods, qualitative internal and student assessments, teacher, administrator and consultant feedback, internal staff observations will all be gathered for analysis multiple times each year.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found:
“This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.”

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:**

The applicant outlines an evaluation plan that is adequate to yield both quantitative and qualitative data on the success and impact of the project (Abstract, pgs. 3-4). The evaluation will use a randomized experimental design creating a program group of four schools and a control group of four schools, matched on academic achievement history. Data collection strategies will include surveys of students, analysis of teachers’ strategies and lessons and tracking student SEL and test scores (pgs. 2, 44-48). The evaluation will include monitoring of both the project strategies (process or formative evaluation) and its outcomes (summative or impact evaluation) (pg. 44). All of the data collected by these methods will be entered into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and Multi-item scales for such measures as standardized tests will be computed and checked for reliability using alpha coefficients where appropriate, thus producing quantitative data (pg. 48). The proposed evaluation is sufficient to provide teachers, schools, districts and policymakers with valuable data about the impact of theatre integrated learning and companion technology, teacher preparation and real-time coaching, on student achievement on standardized literacy tests, SEL skills, school culture and safety. Expected outcomes include increased student achievement; increased teacher capacity to plan and deliver theatre integrated instruction while redefining classroom culture and safety; and replicable project components. Project goals and outcomes are clearly specified for the project. A qualified external evaluation has been identified to help conduct the project evaluation (pg. 44).

**Weaknesses:**

Quantifiable performance measures are not described in the evaluation effort the project; thus creating a disconnect between measures and objectives. The applicant also proposes to use a rating sheet; however, no information is provided on what will be rated.

**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.
**Sub Question**

**Strengths:**
The applicant describes how methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. The applicant will produce twice yearly cumulative reports on results. In addition, the applicant will produce quarterly briefs on the activities and outcomes of the project for the broader school community, including news from students and teachers. The briefs will be both project engagement tools and will facilitate continuous feedback on the project to those involved. Reports will include both quantitative and qualitative data about the project. Activities encompass the External data evaluation, which will include summative reports with formative feedback, will be gathered at least once each year using varied methods, including student test data, student and teachers surveys, and principal interviews. Internal Assessment Tools will include action research methods, qualitative internal and student assessments, teacher, administrator and consultant feedback, internal staff observations will all be gathered for analysis multiple times each year. Partner and School inputs, which will include district strategic plan and school site plans, will be gathered and reviewed at the beginning of each year (pg. 44).

**Weaknesses:**
No weaknesses found:

“This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.”

**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:**
In collaboration with the external evaluation, the applicant will conduct research on the impact of theatre education on academic achievement and gains in SEL skills, to test casual links among multivariate factors among teacher professional development and student art, academic outcome, SEL skills and school safety and culture. At the conclusion of the four year grant period, the applicant will have quantified results to inform and influence education stakeholders, decision makers, and the field at large: validated research will demonstrate the significant benefits for students, educators and schools where theatre is fully integrated into the school’s academic and social community. Staff members will have increased and essential knowledge, informed by action research, that will directly inform the applicant's work in schools. The project will be a replicable model for urban K-8 schools nationwide (pg. 33).

**Weaknesses:**
No weaknesses found:

“This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.”

**Reader’s Score:**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Technology**
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 project meets Competitive Priority #2. Embedded within the curriculum are interactive video components that allow children to watch multi-generational, multi-cultural people enact a variety of scenes that explore a spectrum of emotions. Children are able to select and view alternative endings to the videos, thus exploring consequences of choices and unmanaged and managed emotions (pg. 5). In addition, LemmingLabs, in collaboration with all project curriculum administrators and practitioners, will develop self-directed learning software (digital applications) designed as companion tools to enhance SEL specifically, academic self-efficacy, emotional competence and self-regulated learning. Software to create, edit and self-publish digital portfolios and literature logs will also be created. Self-curated Digital Media Labs, including software, hardware, equipment and instructional tools will be distributed and available to participating schools.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses found:
“This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.”

Reader’s Score: 5
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Applicant: Cleveland Play House (U351D140098)
Reader #3: **********

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need for Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Need for Project</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Significance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Project Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of Project Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Project Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Personnel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Management Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Management Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Project Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Evaluation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Priority Questions             |                 |               |
| **Competitive Preference Priority 2** |     |               |
| **Technology**                 |                 |               |
| 1. CPP: Technology             | 5               | 5             |
| **Sub Total**                  | 5               | 5             |

**Total** 105 91
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:
NA

Weaknesses:
NA

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 proposal provides a complete description of Cleveland Metropolitan School District, including specific data related to poor academic achievement (p. 12) and negative school climate (p. 12-13). For example, only 37% of students in the entire district scored proficient or above in English/language arts. The proposal also described negative long-term outcomes, including one of the lowest graduation rates in the nation at 34% for African-American students.

Weaknesses:

Specific data should be provided for the 8 schools that will be included in the project (p. 46)

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:

Major gaps are present for the implementation and evaluation of arts programing. Overall, the district spends an average of only $3.00 per student for all arts education (p. 11).
Sub Question

Weaknesses:  
Comparison data for the per-student spending on arts education would strengthen the statement of need by providing evidence that this figure is below typical practice in large urban school districts.

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 authors describe a series of products that will be completed at the end of the grant period, including unit exemplars with embedded interactive digital media and self-publishing portfolios (p. 18). The complete list of dissemination approaches outlined on page 22 make clear the project staff’s commitment to future replication and the listing of key audiences clearly indicates how the project staff will target specific groups for eventual replication.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader’s Score: 10

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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.
Sub Question

Strengths:
The proposal makes direct connections between up-to-date research and each of the key targeted areas of the C.A.R.E. program. For example, a series of appropriate references are provided linking theatre in education to improved English/language arts performance (p. 26-27).

Weaknesses:
On page 25, the authors make a connection between perseverance and theatre’s influence on students’ sense of belonging and self-management. This reviewer is unclear how perseverance and belonging are directly linked to self-management skills and, as such am unsure how theatre in education directly connects to self-management skills.

Reader’s Score:

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

Strengths:
The proposal includes a clear and concise logic model that links all relevant inputs and outputs (p. 7).

The authors make a link between the C.A.R.E program and action research as the theory of change leading to teacher change and, subsequently, increased student performance (p. 2).

Weaknesses:
Although the authors make the link between action research and behavior change, no specific theory of change was described. The authors need to describe the link between theatre and the intended outcomes, but also provide a description of how theatre performance changes student behavior.

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:
As described on page 30, the project will work directly with all school staff to integrate the C.A.R.E. program into each of the four treatment schools. The program is aimed at increasing English/language arts performance as measured by the Ohio state assessment aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

Weaknesses:
This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

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.
Sub Question

Strengths:
On pages 32-33 the authors make a clear link between quantitative evidence of program effectiveness, dissemination of those results, and subsequent influence upon stakeholders within and beyond the participating district to continue and proliferate the project.

Weaknesses:
Although the assumption that quantitative results may influence ongoing implementation, a clear plan, including sources of future funding and activities for proliferating the project should be described.

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:
On page 34, the authors clearly describe both nondiscrimination policies at the district and the non-profit partner and a plan to recruit diverse applicants for all positions. For example, the district has a partnership with four university Office of Disability services to increase diverse applicants.

Overall, all project staff described appear to have the artistic, management, and evaluation experience to conduct the project.

Weaknesses:
The absence of a district-level or school-level staff may limit the key staff’s ability to complete the project as a local educator may be necessary to ensure school compliance.

Although not a weakness with regards to expertise, the artistic director’s experience with adult focused content plays (e.g., Venus in Furs about sadomasochism and In the Next Room or the Vibrator Story about the history of the vibrator) was a noted concern as the project is targeting elementary students and not all parents are as welcoming of such content.

Reader’s Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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:
NA

Weaknesses:
NA

Reader’s Score: 16

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 proposal provides descriptions of all key staff’s roles and a description of the to-be-hired project manager on page 41. A broad timeline of activities is provided on page 43.

   Weaknesses:
Overall, the project management plan is lacking in specificity and detail. No aligned plan was provided with responsibilities and timelines, and no milestones for the objectives were described. Overall, as written, it is unclear of the project could accomplish described tasks.

   No information is provided about the BOA Education Committee and the Advisory Council (p. 42) and it is unclear who will serve in these roles and what their responsibilities will be.

   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 project will include five full-time staff and a project director slated for 30% FTE. This allocation of personnel is appropriate to meet the needs of the project as described.

   Weaknesses:
This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

   Reader’s Score:

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

   Strengths:
As described on page 44, the evaluator will provide formative data multiple times as year and annual quantitative summaries of student-level performance.
Sub Question

Weaknesses:
The proposal should include a description of specific times for data to be shared (e.g. quarterly) and a description of who will use the data should be provide to adequately describe how the project will ensure continuous development.

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:
NA

Weaknesses:
NA

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:
The proposal includes a table on pages 47-48 to link evaluation questions and the proposed measures. For example, to assess exemplar pedagogical practice, direct observations with a rating sheet will be conducted (p. 48).

Weaknesses:
Although the authors describe the proposed measures, the description of those measures is not clear enough to assess the extent to which they will result in aligned outcome data. For example, the proposal describes a rating sheet used for direct observation, but no description of items or reliability approaches are provided. A primary measure is the teacher surveys, but no information or sample items are described in the proposal. Also, a description of the University of Chicago Social Emotional Learning measures needs to be fully described.

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.
Sub Question

Strengths:
The authors provide a description of periodic performance feedback on page 47, including two cumulative reports annually and quarterly briefs distributed to both the school and the project staff. Overall, as described, the evaluation has a clear plan to ensure periodic assessment.

Weaknesses:
This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

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 evaluation will use a randomized control trial design with 4 schools assigned to treatment and 4 schools assigned to control. As described, the evaluation may meet What Works Clearinghouse criteria as evidence of promise.

Weaknesses:
This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

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 project involves the development of software as part of the integration process with digital applications and digital portfolios. This approach clearly demonstrates integration of technology.

Weaknesses:
This criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

Reader’s Score: 5
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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:
NA

Weaknesses:
NA

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 applicant proposes to support students at risk of education failure who are in need of services to improve student performance in the Cleveland Metropolitan School District (CMSD). The applicant describes the target school district as an urban, economically and ethnically diverse community with 48% of youth living in poverty. It is the second largest district in the state of Ohio, with an enrollment of 40,000 students. Approximately, 68% are students of color. Of those students, all (100%) are eligible for free or reduced lunch. The applicant also describes the safety and well-being of the students as an overarching issue to school climate, citing violence and shootings as a contributor to poor school. Only 2% of elementary school students, 6% of middle school students and 39% of high school students had access to theatre education. The applicant cited that 78% of schools reported that no one at the district level was responsible for implementing and evaluating arts programs. The applicant also makes the case that the absence of the arts programs contribute to poor student behavior as noted by the national statistics on suspensions and expulsions and the total of 11,254 Delinquency and Unruly cases filed in Cleveland's Juvenile Division, of which 64% were African American youth.

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant included vital information, the omission of significant data rendered the response incomplete. For example, the applicant omitted the rate of unemployment, the level of educational attainment and other demographics to assist the reader in fully understanding the contextual roots of the issue. The level of educational attainment would have supported the notion of most of the students as first generation for achieving a high school diploma and college degree. The unemployment rate would further address the degree of poverty and joblessness concentrated in the specific area. Additional statistics regarding student behavior within the district would have provided an opportunity to parallel the Cleveland data to the National data for analysis.
Sub Question

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 cites several gaps and weaknesses in services of the district as the overarching issue. The applicant also explains the effects of the gaps and weaknesses on student performance. For example, the lack of the capacity of the district to provide theatre education to all students creates a problem of access to a quality education. The lack of the capacity to provide technology for all students and teachers contributes to the digital divide and contemporary formats of teaching and learning. The lack of financial resources are the products of poor student performance, reduction of teachers, the increase in Title I Schools with only 37% of student scores were proficient.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

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 cites several products that have utility and can be replicated. The products are described as unit exemplars with embedded interactive digital media, PD and real-time coaching for teachers, PD and literacy technique training for teaching artists, software development including digital applications and self-publishing, literature logs, digital medial labs, manuals and assessment tools. The training and support extension by theatre educators fosters effective application for teacher development. The model has the potential to produce positive results in replication and maximum utility of products and digital materials to ensure teaching and learning.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

Reader’s Score:  10

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:
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 cites current and relevant research as the foundation for the project design and effective practices. The scholarly research is focused and supportive of the goals and objectives of the project. The research references reinforce the rationale for the design and thorough engagement into the learning patterns and styles of students. The research is in alignment with the scope of the project and the National Common Core Standards.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

Reader’s Score:

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

Strengths:
The theoretical framework is supported by the theatre principles of theatre arts to promote learning as a hands-on approach to education. Through the application of theatre education the student will learn strategies and techniques to improve skills for self-management, increase emotional competence, develop academic self-efficacy.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

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 applicant demonstrates the program is structurally anchored to an extensive comprehensive intent to improve teaching and learning while fostering rigor and academic standards. Goals and target numbers are identified. The project will use 80 classroom teachers, 4 teaching artists and 60 administrators. The project will launch a pilot to test the implementation components of the project, assess materials and provide feedback through the coaching techniques.

Weaknesses:
Although the applicant cites objectives, the measurement for outcome achievement is unclear. The benchmarks are missing, the timeframe for achievement is omitted, and the range for the increase is not defined.

Reader’s Score:
Sub Question

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 Cleveland Play House and Philiber Research Associates provide a host of resources to the project, leadership, trained personnel, and budding research opportunities. The design describes the school as the arm to ensure school guidelines and standards are practiced. The model demonstrates a comprehensive approach, including diverse student learning methodologies, and best teaching practices to impact theatre education on academic performance. The project demonstrates a model to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond federal assistance.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

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 applicant cited the discrimination policy and the core philosophy for inclusion of all individuals as the foundation for the execution of employment practices. The applicant cited a plan of recruitment, and assurances for practice and enforcement and partnerships with organizations to ensure the likelihood of candidates to demonstrate the core value system designed to implement the policy. The applicant submitted a profile of administrators with credentials to provide quality program leadership. Proposed personnel were appropriate and the professional experiences were relevant to the achievement of program goals and objectives, financial management and other programmatic operations.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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:
NA

Weaknesses:
NA

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 applicant cites project goals, objectives, with outcomes in relationship to resources and activities using the logic model to support a process for student achievement. Components include a timeline with responsibilities outlined, trainings for practice and enforcement of concepts and skills, and the addition of an external evaluator for assessment and modifications for improvement. The divisions of responsibilities are clearly defined between the Cleveland Metropolitan School District, the Cleveland Play House and Pilliber Research Associates. The applicant suggests that partners are equipped with the expertise to perform designated functions that contribute to the overall management plan and project design. A calendar of task and events are included to demonstrate the events scheduled to occur annually. A chart is included to outline the staff responsible, the number of total hours committed to the effort, the identification of the project year, and the total for the entire project period.

Weaknesses:
Although, the applicant provides a timeline and responsibilities, the information is incomplete. The applicant does not provide a thorough connection to the outcomes and the implementation plan. More detailed information is needed to ensure a conclusive review. Based on the information, the reader can not ascertain the direct connection of the personnel to the plan of action to ensure quality management.

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 applicant provides a description of the responsibilities and time and effort of the key personnel in hours over the term of the project. Itemized positions are clearly defined. The personnel are appropriate and adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

Reader’s Score:

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

Strengths:
The applicant describes a collection of data and frequency with key stakeholders for improvement. The feedback plan incorporates diverse populations instrumental to the success of the project, such as school administrators and teachers, Cleveland Play House Staff, and Philliber Research Associates with various formats using internal
Sub Question

assessment tools and external data evaluation. The project will meet multiple times a year to ensure feedback is continuous. The applicant will assemble summative reports with formative feedback intervals. Data collection will include student test scores, student and teacher surveys, and interviews with principals.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

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:
NA

Weaknesses:
NA

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:
The applicant includes an evaluation plan to enhance the project. The evaluation is described as a two pronged method. The first part will monitor project strategies using the formative assessment to analyze the process and the summative to provide an assessment of the impact or outcomes. The design uses a randomized control trial to measure outcomes on different levels and populations. The applicant provides evaluation questions and data collection strategies. The data will be analyzed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The evaluation will produce quantitative and qualitative data to address the outcomes and impact of the schools receiving the treatment (uncontrolled group) and the schools without the theatre arts program (control group). The applicant proposes a quasi-experimental study with the goal of empirical evidence.

Weaknesses:
The applicant cites various populations, types of data and clearly describes the procedures for the evaluation process, including the collection of data such as the student test scores, teacher and student surveys and principal interviews. The applicant does not provide a foundation for clarity of understanding the benchmark for measurement in relationship to student performance. The applicant does not provide enough data on the target student population beyond the notation of the school is low performing. Additional information is needed. Based on the lack of information, the results of the assessments is inconclusive as to whether the intelligence is significant to the research of the project.
Sub Question

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 evaluation plan provides frequency of assessment with diverse formats for project modifications for continued success. The evaluation plan includes the collection of data and for timely feedback and project adjustments. The evaluation allows for on-going data collection and analysis reporting throughout the project period. Interviews will be conducted with district school principals, surveys will be distributed to teachers and students participating in the project for feedback for immediate improvement. Meetings will be conducted with the annual report at the end of the year. The compilation of reports and other periodic data strengthens the opportunity for feedback and project modification. The applicant demonstrates a comprehensive plan to assess project to improve student achievement.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

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 applicant cites a plan to retrieve data with reliability and integrity to provide intelligence as evidence of promise for duplicating project and publication. The plan for the research proposes potential to provide additional strength to existing literature and teacher professional development.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.

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 applicant will provide training to teachers and students using various technologies, such as unit exemplars with embedded interactive digital media, PD and real-time coaching for teachers, PD and literacy technique training for teaching artists, software development including digital applications and self-publishing digital portfolios and literature logs, digital media labs and manuals and assessment tools to increase academic achievement, maximize the utility of the products and increase the opportunity for model replication.

Weaknesses:
The criterion was thoroughly discussed and I did not find any weakness.