

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/07/2014 02:08 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services (U351D140037)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	15
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 1: 84.351D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services (U351D140037)

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:

The applicant describes the need for the project and includes details regarding the demographics of the targeted high-need population (page 2), the percentage of high poverty and ELL students (page 3), and academic achievement statistics in math and English Language Arts (page 5-6). The applicant proposes a plan to meet the needs of the target population through a proven arts integration approach that was previously funded in 2010 by an Arts Education Model Development and Dissemination grant. The applicant has identified specific gaps in arts integration professional development that will be filled by project activities. There is a plan for the applicant to address weaknesses in connections with local cultural arts organizations by offering training opportunities on the Common core State Standards and building partnerships between treatment schools and cultural arts providers (page 8).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 describes the need for the project and includes details regarding the demographics of the targeted high-need population (page 2), the percentage of high poverty and ELL students (page 3), and academic achievement statistics in math and English Language Arts (page 5-6). The applicant proposes a plan to meet the needs of the target population through a proven arts integration approach that was previously funded in 2010 by an Arts Education Model Development and Dissemination grant.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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.

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant has identified specific gaps in arts integration professional development that will be filled by project activities. There is a plan for the applicant to address weaknesses in connections with local cultural arts organizations by offering training opportunities on the Common core State Standards and building partnerships between treatment schools and cultural arts providers (page 8).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 mentions products that will result from the project and includes a description of presentations at national conferences, a formative assessment, technology-based tool called 'pecha kucha', student work exchanges using technology, and shared knowledge of a model program through multiple methods of dissemination (pages 10-11).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The applicant provides evidence of using up-to-date knowledge of arts integration programming that positively impacts disadvantaged, ELL and Special Education students (page 7). Research is provided on page 12 that illustrates how students who participated in arts programs performed better in academic areas than those who did not, and had a higher rate of college completion and community engagement. Research regarding professional learning communities in relation to professional development is also described on page 14. The applicant describe a researched-based theory for programming design components (page 16), and provides a detailed logic model that specifies the resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts that will drive the project. The applicant provides support for the theory through references to four studies that indicate the value of arts integration, supports the collaboration of teachers and learners as investigators, and support for art as critical education experience (page 16). The applicant proposes to use a comprehensive arts integration approach to improve teaching and learning of the Common Core State Standards and

21st Century Skills (page 20). Components of the project include peer to peer meetings with content specialists, artists and teachers, professional development institutes, arts-integrated lessons plans, and year end meetings designed to review project accomplishments. The applicant provides a plan to develop and utilize products that will serve as resources beyond the end of the grant (page 22-23). Examples include a collection of unit plans archived in a digital library, protocols for documenting teaching tools that can be applied to diverse settings for future arts integration, and a social media community that will include a web-based tool-kit comprised of model lessons, assessment tools, video clips, and images (page 22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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 applicant provides evidence of using up-to-date knowledge of arts integration programming that positively impacts disadvantaged, ELL and Special Education students (page 7). Research is provided on page 12 that illustrates how students who participated in arts programs performed better in academic areas than those who did not, and had a higher rate of college completion and community engagement. Research regarding professional learning communities in relation to professional development is also described on page 14.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant describe a researched-based theory for programming design components (page 16), and provides a detailed logic model that specifies the resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts that will drive the project. The applicant provides support for the theory through references to four studies that indicate the value of arts integration, supports the collaboration of teachers and learners as investigators, and support for art as critical education experience (page 16).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

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 proposes to use a comprehensive arts integration approach to improve teaching and learning of the Common Core State Standards and 21st Century Skills (page 20). Components of the project include peer to peer meetings with content specialists, artists and teachers, professional development institutes, arts-integrated lessons plans, and year end meetings designed to review project accomplishments.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The applicant provides a plan to develop and utilize products that will serve as resources beyond the end of the grant (page 22-23). Examples include a collection of unit plans archived in a digital library, protocols for documenting teaching tools that can be applied to diverse settings for future arts integration, and a social media community that will include a web-based tool-kit comprised of model lessons, assessment tools, video clips, and images (page 22).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses.

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 provides a description of non-discrimination policies that are in place for employees and students (page 23), and mentions Diversity Fairs that are used to encourage traditionally underrepresented groups to apply for employment. There is a plan to post hiring opportunities with agencies and publications that are affiliated with traditionally underrepresented groups (page 24). The applicant describes the qualifications of key personnel and includes details regarding a qualified project director, a curriculum director, and a technology consultant (pages 25-26). Resumes for key staff members are also provided in the appendix.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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:

The applicant provides a management plan that includes a chart depicting project activities, dates, and key personnel responsible for each activity (page 28-34). The applicant also provides a narrative that describes the qualifications of key project staff, key responsibilities that each will accomplish, and a reference to resumes.

The applicant provides details regarding the time commitments of the project director (.2 FTE) and a project coordinator (.4 FTE). A curriculum director, an evaluation manager, and a technology consultant will also support the project. A principal investigator with an evaluation firm is mentioned on page 40.

The applicant describes the use of a steering committee that that will guide continuous improvement efforts (page 39), and mentions monthly meetings, ongoing communications, and twice yearly planning sessions. There is a plan to have the steering committee review activities and make modifications in activities, objectives, timelines, and levels of effort, as well as project methodologies.

Weaknesses:

Details regarding project milestones are limited.

The applicant does not provide time commitments for the principal investigator.

It is unclear how the steering committee will make decisions for continuous improvement. Details regarding procedures for reviewing weaknesses in the operation of the proposed project are limited.

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 provides a management plan that includes a chart depicting project activities, dates, and key personnel responsible for each activity (page 28-34). The applicant also provides a narrative that describes the qualifications of key project staff, key responsibilities that each will accomplish, and a reference to resumes.

Weaknesses:

Details regarding project milestones are limited.

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 details regarding the time commitments of the project director (.2 FTE) and a project coordinator (.4 FTE). A curriculum director, an evaluation manager, and a technology consultant will also support the project. A principal investigator with an evaluation firm is mentioned on page 40.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide time commitments for the principal investigator.

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 the use of a steering committee that that will guide continuous improvement efforts (page 39), and mentions monthly meetings, ongoing communications, and twice yearly planning sessions. There is a plan to have the steering committee review activities and make modifications in activities, objectives, timelines, and levels of effort, as well as project methodologies.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the steering committee will make decisions for continuous improvement. Details regarding procedures for reviewing weaknesses in the operation of the proposed project are limited.

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:

The applicant provides details regarding an evaluation plan in a table on pages 42-43 that includes project outcomes, data sources and timelines. The applicant plans to hire an experienced evaluation firm to conduct evaluation activities such as a cluster randomized control trial to determine if the implementation of an arts-integration curriculum and professional development program lead to improved educator and student outcomes. The applicant mentions formative and summative evaluation activities that will include multiple sources of data. Both quantitative and qualitative measures are planned. The applicant provides a plan to collect performance feedback from multiple sources that will allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Examples include the use of teacher surveys and focus groups, and pre-post rubrics that will determine growth of teachers and specialists (page 44). There is a plan to document the participation in project-specific social media sites and to determine the degree to which participants find this collaboration useful through annual pre and post surveys (page 45). There is also a plan to measure student achievement in English language arts and mathematics using the PARCC assessment and a locally developed pre and post assessment of 21st Century Skills (page 47). The applicant describes evaluation presentations at conferences (page 48). The applicant provides a description of rigorous methods of evaluation that will be sensitive enough to produce evidence of promise. For example, the applicant plans to hire an evaluator to conduct a cluster randomized experimental design (page 49). Analysis of project data will include multivariate regression analysis or multilevel modeling when possible (page 46). The applicant mentions using statistical methods to determine significant differences between control and treatment groups, using measures of growth on surveys, rubrics and student assessments.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20**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 provides details regarding an evaluation plan in a table on pages 42-43 that includes project outcomes, data sources and timelines. The applicant plans to hire an experienced evaluation firm to conduct evaluation activities such as a cluster randomized control trial to determine if the implementation of an arts-integration curriculum and professional development program lead to improved educator and student outcomes. The applicant mentions formative and summative evaluation activities that will include multiple sources of data. Both quantitative and qualitative measures are planned.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 provides a plan to collect performance feedback from multiple sources that will allow for periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Examples include the use of teacher surveys and focus groups, and pre-post rubrics that will determine growth of teachers and specialists (page 44). There is a plan to document the participation in project-specific social media sites and to determine the degree to which participants find this collaboration useful through annual pre and post surveys (page 45). There is also a plan to measure student achievement in English language arts and mathematics using the PARCC assessment and a locally developed pre-post assessment of 21st Century Skills (page 47). The applicant describes evaluation presentations at conferences (page 48).

Weaknesses:

no weaknesses noted.

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 provides a description of rigorous methods of evaluation that will be sensitive enough to produce evidence of promise. For example, the applicant plans to hire an evaluator to conduct a cluster randomized experimental design (page 49). Analysis of project data will include multivariate regression analysis or multilevel modeling when possible (page 46). The applicant mentions using statistical methods to determine significant differences between control and treatment groups, using measures of growth on surveys, rubrics and student assessments.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

Criteria was not addressed.

Weaknesses:

Criteria was note addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/07/2014 02:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2014 09:50 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services (U351D140037)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	15
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	97
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 1: 84.351D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services (U351D140037)

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 Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services proposes a project serving two school districts in Suffolk County, New York: the Patchogue-Medford Union and the South Huntington Union. The applicants propose to expand an existing project to create lesson plans aligned with New York Common Core Standards with collaboration and sharing between teachers using video clips, web-based toolkit, and digital and social media. The applicants have ambitiously centered this project on four goals identified on page e14 as building capacity, increasing student achievement, increasing connections, and sharing tools and lessons. In this fully-developed proposal applicants address the needs of low performing high needs student's across four elementary schools. The applicants provide rich and plentiful data on the at risk student demographics. The demographics include enrollment data, grade level, %poverty, and ELL. The applicants also demonstrate how the services such as digital portfolios and web-site tool-kits will improve outcome data for ELL students and students with disabilities. There are several charts on other student indicators such as student performance data, race, and socioeconomic status.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

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

Sub Question

magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

Strengths:

The applicants clearly articulate the focus on two gaps in these low performing schools on page e24 to address with this proposed project: 1) teacher and school leader lack of understand the advantages of an arts-integrated curriculum and 2) the lack of skills in the development and delivery of a highly effective arts integration program. The applicants then thoroughly discuss how this project will offer teachers and school leaders the needed training in arts –integration instruction through annual three day professional development modules, a four day summer institute and targeted workshops. The applicants also thought through this plan very well as they also discuss how they plan to change the current funding for arts education from field trips to the arts instruction proposed to implement this project. The applicants include detail on how the training in arts-integration instruction will include aligning the arts curriculum with the Common Core Standards. The applicants propose several solid resolutions that will highly likely address the gaps focused on as described in this grant proposal.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

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 products developed such as arts integrated curriculum, professional development, instructional delivery, cultural partnerships, and knowledge sharing, promotion of 21st century skills, implementation of common core standards, images, videos, student work samples, retraces, and web links discussed in detail on pages e26 and e27 are likely products that have and will continue to be used effectively in other school settings. The applicants include demonstrate use of arts-integration efforts in other settings such as presentations at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and American Evaluation Association (AEA) conferences.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

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: 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:

A solid conceptual framework on rural community school leaders is illustrated on page 2 (e19). The project design is grounded in research and proven effective strategies in arts integration. The applicants discuss highlight four effective strategies from previous work in art integration and the 21st Century Skills: 1) student engagement, 2) student and teacher assessments, 3) professional development, and 4) materials/resources. The applicants cite current research studies within each domain above.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

A robust theoretical framework on the theory of action "Quality of Quality" focuses on collaboration and understanding of arts education between teachers, students, and the school participating community. The theory discussed on pages e33 – e36 is followed by a very detailed logic model in which the resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts of the proposed project are illustrated.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

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 strength in this proposed project can be noted in this section of the grant proposal. The assertion that the arts professional development and training targeted for teachers will lead to improved student outcomes, closing the achievement gap, improved quality of instruction, and improved leadership is supported. The explanations given are

Sub Question

useful in understanding the logic and magnitude of the grant proposal in their comprehensive efforts to build arts capacity and increase student achievement. The local, regional, and national impact of this study on leadership, instruction, and student outcomes is adequate for the scope of the proposed project. The applicants thoroughly make a strong argument for improved teaching and learning on pages e37 – e39.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

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 outlines replication and dissemination details to support their efforts to sustain the proposed project after the grant funding period ends on page 22. The applicants well informed discussion includes project products such as shared libraries and links to district curriculum maps, portfolio artifacts a, web-based tool-kits, images, video clips, and presentations at national conferences date as potential products that will be extended beyond the grant cycle. The applicants supplement that discussion of products with further support for personnel, time, and funding support from community leaders and the school community all in an effort to sustain the purposes and benefits of the ongoing work in arts integration.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

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 applicants put forth the Eastern Suffolk (ESBOCES) equal employment opportunities, affirmative action, and non-discrimination policies as support toward their efforts to hire those from underrepresented groups as project personnel

such as secretaries and teaching artists on page 23. The applicants also thoroughly discuss other efforts to recruit minority personnel such as diversity fairs for minority and women businesses and publications in minority affiliated organizations.

The applicants highlight the strong resumes and letters of support in the appendix as evidence of arts integration qualifications, trainings, and experiences of the key project personnel. In addition to the information found in the Appendix, the applicants provide details and specific experiences about each of the key project personnel such as the technology consultants, the project director, the curriculum director, and the project coordinator on pages 24-27 to further justify the extent to which their qualifications are complete for the needs of this proposed project.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

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 is satisfactory for supporting the proposed project in reaching its goals and objectives of arts integration in selected schools. The applicants show the project activities, dates and key personnel to perform the tasks in a reasonably constructed table on pages 28-34. The table includes clearly defined roles and responsibilities assigned, manageable timelines, and appropriate personnel to promote implementation of the proposed project.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

There are no identified weaknesses.

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, capabilities, and experiences of the project director and other key personnel with the exception of the principal investigator are adequate for the project as proposed and detailed description is provided on page 35. The applicants include a thorough discussion of six well-developed management goals: 1) management and training of grade level teachers, 2) management and recruitment of teaching artists, 3) manage training and professional development activities, 4) Manage workshops, 5) manage implantation and replication products, and 6) manage experimental and control sample groups.

Weaknesses:

The applicants failed to identify a principal investigator for the proposed project. Therefore, the time commitments for the project director (apparently assigned the role of overseeing the proposed project) at .2FTE is not adequate for the scope of the project. The application would be enhanced if the applicants had selected and clearly defined the rights and responsibilities of a principal investigator.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicants describe the role and responsibility of a steering committee tasked with overseeing and safeguarding the ongoing continuous improvement process for the proposed project. The highly qualified steering committee consists of the project director, the project coordinator, the project evaluator, and the curriculum director. The applicants describe how this committee will meet on a regular basis face to face, through emails and teleconferences to review project activities and make recommendations for changes in project activities, objectives, and timelines etc. as needed.

Weaknesses:

The applicants did not provide any details on communication feedback loops that include partners, stakeholders, teachers, and students. The applicants also failed to demonstrate feedback and continuous improvement data collection instruments such as pre and post surveys, questionnaires, teacher observations, focus groups, and interviews.

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: 20

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 applicants propose a rigorous experimental research design using a mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative) evaluation approach. The cluster randomized control experimental study is appropriate to produce strong evidence particularly in the school setting as it can be difficult to obtain a control and experimental group. This design has been recognized as the most rigorous research design by What Works Clearing House. The use of both quantitative and qualitative methods will allow the evaluators to collect a wide variety of data to support program implementation and impact. The evaluation research goals and objectives are tightly coupled/aligned with the project goals. There is sufficient implementation data outlined to indicate the extent to which the project is on track to meet its goals and objectives. The analytic approach and its details are clearly articulated and there is an adequate description of the evaluation instruments described to collect quality data. The applicants include a thorough discussion of reliability and validity of the key components, effect size, power analysis, formative and summative assessments, data sources, and data analysis tools. The comprehensive logic map/chart on pages 41-43 includes specific timelines for evaluation activities. The project evaluator is a well-known national evaluation industry and that also adds strength to this section of the application. This evaluation is highly likely to be implemented with fidelity and serve its purpose of supporting assessment of achievement of project goal and objectives.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in the section of the grant.

Reader's Score:

Sub Question

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:

There is a strong discussion of continuous feedback, dissemination, and reporting of project findings facilitated through the evaluation processes. The applicants have a strong and promising formative evaluation process to ensure data collection to support monitoring of progress and to enhance communication feedback loops. The applicants present several modalities for providing performance feedback such as national arts conferences, social media, regional meetings, web-based data banks, and research conference. The applicants a reasonably sound comprehensive plan for addressing feedback and the monitoring of project progress.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in the section of the grant.

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 applicants provided a remarkably strong evaluation plan. The evaluation team is a well-known, highly credible and experienced in the area of evaluation research. This supports the overall implementation and effectiveness of the evaluation approach. This comprehensive evaluation includes all the necessary components of an exceptional approach that will likely result in adequate assessment of effective implementation strategies and the collection of quality performance data that will improve educational outcomes for all students in arts education. The applicants propose a well-designed evaluation plan in which they describe how the proposed project will be evaluated, reported, and disseminated and thus produce strong evidence of promise of project achievement of goals and objectives.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses 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:

There are no strengths identified.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not address the technology competitive priority preference.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/15/2014 09:50 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/20/2014 09:32 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services (U351D140037)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	13
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	17
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	0
Sub Total	5	0
Total	105	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 1: 84.351D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services (U351D140037)

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:

This section is well developed.

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:

Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Education Services (ESBOCES) has applied for grant funding for its C3 Squared – Creative Classroom Collaboratives: Creativity- Competence and Confidence to assist with building the learning capacity of staff members; to increase student achievement; to increase connections between the local cultural arts organizations and schools; and to share tools and lessons at the local, state and national level.

The grant applicant has provided adequate information on a need for an arts integration model to expose students to arts and cultural experiences currently not available. It is noted that eight elementary schools have been selected within two school districts, of which, three did not make adequately yearly progress for disadvantaged students.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses within this section of the grant application.

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:

Information on gaps in African American, Hispanic, and white student performance in math and ELA has been presented in the grant application. Also, ESBOCES has addressed that there are achievement gaps in ELA and

Sub Question

math with English Language Learners and with student with disabilities.

The extent to which the applicant desires to address student academic gaps is sound. A plan to provide teachers with access to professional development through two yearly summer institutes and time to collaborate within the school day is addressed in the grant application.

Weaknesses:

The percentage point difference data in Table 2 on page 5 of the grant application do not align. For examples, the applicant notes that 25% of black students are proficient in ELA, 58% of white students are proficient and there is a 23 percentage point difference. Using the same figures, when subtracting the figures from the two ethnicity groups there would be a 33 percentage point difference and not a 23 percentage point difference.

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 desire to create slideshows to synthesize the arts integration process by creating formative assessment tools with the pecha kucha method is innovative. The school board has done a good job explaining how previous project products were utilized in the fifty districts in the consortium. ESBOCES also noted that data findings were shared at research conventions and national conferences. With grant funding, it is feasible for ESBOCES to conduct a rigorous evaluation of its current project products and the consortium could easily disseminate results in a variety of settings.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses within this section of the grant application.

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:

Full points have been assigned.

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 grant applicant has successfully linked current research to its project design. The desire to provide students with diverse artistic learning experiences and to provide positive opportunities for students at-risk to failure is understood. The consortium has also produced supporting evidence of research on the importance of authentic assessment and the need for quality professional development partnerships.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses within this section of the grant application.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Throughout the grant application ESBOCES has noted the importance of artistic experiences should be an enduring and effective part of learning. Theory tying to this belief is effectively presented in the grant application. It is clear that ESBOCES desires to have authentic experiences with quality engagement for both students and teachers. On pages 17 through 19 of the grant application ESBOCES has presented a logic model that effectively supports cited theory and the goals of the project.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses within this section of the grant application.

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 grant applicant has successfully outlined efforts to improve teaching and learning for both students and teachers. The desire to create summer institutes that are learning experiences that are engaging and provide opportunities for professional growth is evident in the grant application. With the creation of peer-to-peer meetings, the school district has established a commitment to supporting staff with arts integration.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses within this section of the grant application.

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:

The plan for teachers to meet two times a year to assess units created for the project is justifiable. The desire for ESBOCES to conduct yearly meeting with program personnel to review artifacts and project accomplishments demonstrates that all stakeholders have a vested interest in the project success and that increasing student achievement is the consortium's utmost priority. By creating digital libraries to store artifacts, protocols for online documentation, and a commitment to present findings throughout the nation, the consortium has effectively demonstrated a commitment to sustain the work for use beyond the years of the grant cycle.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses within this section of the grant application.

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 commitment to employ personnel from groups that have been traditionally underrepresented is clear and strongly documented in the grant application. The effort to post employment opportunities in publications and organizations affiliated with traditionally underrepresented groups and organization of diversity fairs is justified.

The grant applicant has included a detailed table of the duties and responsibilities for project personnel. Also, resumes describing experience and qualifications are also evidenced in the appendix. All personnel hold vast experiences in arts integration, arts education, and arts education research. Listed below are the key project positions that will ensure the success of the project:

- Project Director
- Project Coordinator
- Curriculum Director
- Technology Consultant
- Principal Investigator
- Evaluation Manager

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses within this section of the grant application.

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:

This section is well developed.

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 timeline listed in Table 5 on pages 28 through 35 of the grant application clearly defines the activities and responsibilities to ensuring the project's success for all four years of grant funding. The application has specifically outlined plans that are connected to the project.

Weaknesses:

There is limited information on project milestones.

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:

Goals to have the project director and coordinator work collaboratively to monitor progress of the project are supported in the grant application. ESBOCES has done a good job of presenting the school level management goals of the director and coordinator.

Weaknesses:

The grant applicant has not provided clear detail why only 20% of the project director's time will be dedicated to project management. Also, there is limited information on the time commitment of the project investigator.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

ESBOCES has created a C3 Squared Steering Committee to provide continuous improvement of the project. Efforts to communicate via face-to-face meetings, email, teleconferences, and document transfers have been adequately addressed.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The grant applicant has not fully described how teachers, students, and community members can support the project by providing feedback.

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:

This section is well developed.

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 description of how both quantitative and qualitative data will be gathered is sound. The following documents have been effectively described to be included in the evaluation of the project:

- Meeting agendas
- Attendance sheets
- Training materials
- Lesson plans
- Pre and post surveys from treatment teachers, arts specialists, and teaching artists
- Data and open-ended surveys from focus groups
- Documentation from social media participation
- Review of student work and curriculum samples
- Analyzing student achievement in ELA and math on the New York state exams
- Observations from professional development sessions
- Performance assessment rubrics
- Surveys from school leaders

Evaluation efforts to analyze data are thoroughly described in the grant application. ESBOCES has included a table that describes data sources, project outcomes, and a time line for execution on pages 41 through 43 of the grant application.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses within this section of the grant application.

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:

It is noted that findings from both formative and summative evaluation activities would be shared on an as needed basis and presented in annual local evaluation reports.

Weaknesses:

It is not noted how this information will be shared with the public. The applicant has not addressed if reports would be accessible to parents and other community members.

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 methods of the C3 project have been thoroughly described. By creating treatment and control groups, ESBOCES, has effectively provided information on a commitment to provide quality data on successful arts integration, student engagement, teacher engagement and professional development, increased student achievement. With grant funding, the goals of the ESBOCES application can be achieved and will produce evidence of promise.

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses within this section of the grant application.

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:

N/A

Weaknesses:

The grant applicant has not specifically addressed the competitive preference.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/20/2014 09:32 AM