

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/11/2014 03:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Springfield School District #19 (U351D140063)

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	24
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	14
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	91
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 5: 84.351D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Springfield School District #19 (U351D140063)

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 asserts the proposed project will provide services to address the needs of students at risk of educational failure in needs in five middle schools within four districts facing declining achievement over the last three years and currently fall in the range of below the bottom 5% to below the bottom 40% in Oregon. They precisely chart the demographics of the participating schools (in the participating district) identifying the school/ district, student enrollment, the percentage of minority, the percentage of the federal free meal program and academic needs in reading and math.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to provide adequate data to substantiate the magnitude of the gaps in services and need for the target population. For example, they failed to provide specific academic data for the target population and comparative data measuring students' needs compared to the State average or to similar schools.

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 asserts the proposed project provides services to address the needs of students at risk of educational failure in five middle schools within four districts. The target population faces declining academic achievement over the last three years and specifies that currently the target population falls below the bottom 5% in the district and below the bottom 40% in Oregon. They precisely chart the demographics of the participating schools identifying the percentage of minority students, the percentage of students eligible for the federal free meal program and academic needs of participant in reading and math. Pages E 21-23.

The applicant states the need for the program includes the state funding and budget cuts which have eliminated art teachers in one elementary school. They indicate also that because of cuts in funding, their school has proposed to cut student attendance requirements from 180 to 165 days during the 2013-2014 school year. Pages E 22-24.

They detail the lack of academic success of students in all the schools and identify specific factors in each school which impact student progress. For example, the Oaklea Middle School is indicated as rural with geographic isolation and economic poverty levels. Pages E 23, 24.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score:

2. **(b) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.**

Strengths:

The applicant identifies some of the gaps in services to be addressed by the proposed project. They identify the isolation of the small charter schools in a large city which negatively impacts the growth and innovation of their teachers. However, they specify the dedication of staff and note in one of the middle schools that students rely on the ingenuity and the good will of their teachers during enrichment period to integrate arts into learning objectives. Page E 25.

The applicant identifies recent professional development offered to staff by a consultant at the Research For Better Teaching. Correlated to this they assert their teachers are prepared and excited to launch ArtCore holistic model of integration using motivational strategies with arts integrated, standards based curricula. They assert through the proposed initiative, that schools will adopt a transformational focus on arts integration through intensive professional learning and collaboration and the development of curricular. Pages E 24, 25.

They specify the multi-cultural characteristics of the participating schools, identifying that 38% are minorities and about a fourth are Latino and representing a growing population. Therefore, the proposed program will implement culturally responsive arts disciplines and Latino artists to provide a positive impact by contextualizing learning of Latino students, honoring their perspective and presenting Latino role models. Page E 24

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to provide adequate data to substantiate the magnitude of the gaps in services and need for the target population. For example, they failed to provide specific academic data for the target population and comparative data measuring students' needs compared to the State average or to similar schools.

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 describes program products that will result from its implementation and notes the potential for long term use of products in a variety of other settings. They detail the ArtCore model to create a growing infrastructure of curriculum materials and engaging multimedia presentations with arts specialists, arts entrepreneurs, teachers, and students demonstrating their work. Page E 25.

The applicant indicates that program products will be located on an existing interactive accessible on line learning

platform to be made available for in school and out of school learning time. Page E 25.

The applicant aptly assert the program is positioned to contribute to extant models of arts integration through alignment across domains of college and career readiness, arts education and the core academic content area. Page E 26.

The applicant effectively specifies the program provides promise for adequately serving the needs of culturally isolated schools in both urban and rural setting by creating high quality digital teaching and learning materials that scaffold arts integration effectively based on established research-based best practices. Page E 26.

The proposed project precisely indicated that the program model will build a bank of professional made short video of arts specialists sharing aspects of their work aimed at a diverse audiences of middle school teachers and students. They clearly describe ObaWorld as the vehicle that students will use to submit their on- line e-portfolio to add to the program model. Page E 30, 36.

Weaknesses:

None

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 effectively describes a high quality design of the ArtCore clearly addressing required the factors.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant indicates a brief statement referencing sustainability and expansion, adequate information was not provided to substantiate program sustainability and incorporation of project purposes, activities, and benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

Reader's Score: 24

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant identifies the proposed project as reflecting up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices. This is evidenced in describing a research study from 2005 by Lenhardt and Madden, identifying the potential for arts integration into the curriculum for activating student engagement through increased affiliation,

Sub Question

expression, collaboration and in-person and on line learning. They indicated that the program is modeled after social media platforms and ubiquitous YouTube to allow students to generate a digital portfolio of their work across disciplines. Page E 27.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score:**2. (b) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory.****Strengths:**

The applicant details a Logic Model and charts the Research-based Framework of Core Concept and Design which evidences its support by a strong theory. The Logic Model adequately delineates the program progress built on the inputs of a well-developed management team and art team focused in an arts integrated initiative which is grounded in core learning, and aligns activities to long range impact of strategies. Pages E 30, 31, 32.

The applicant clearly identify the program as built on the theory of a "constructivist approach." They aptly describe this approach as one that utilizes a broad spectrum of insight into the professional development of school leaders focused on enhancing residency experiences to enable school leaders to facilitate a learning climate which exposes students to applying arts integrated concepts beyond the local setting and into their community and the world. They concisely chart research detailing six students, specifying the critical concept and emphasis and identifying its application to the ArtCore dimension. For example the 8 Studio Habits of Mind, is applied in the Arts Specialists Immersion module. Page E 31.

The applicant adequately indicated that the program is grounded in practices that focus learning on student centered instruction, metacognitive learning skills, and social interactions in a collaborative and challenging learning environment. Page E 36.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score:**3. (c) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.****Strengths:**

Throughout the narrative the applicant clearly details the proposed project as being a part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. They indicated that the proposed arts integration instruction and learning model emerged from local collaboration over the past five years between the three rural Lane County middle schools, and through a 21st Century Community Learning program. Letters of collaboration are included in the appendix which affirms that the school faculty is enthusiastic about expanding the arts focus and aligning it with growth mindset work for a deeper and more transformative impact on arts integration and delivering standards based modules across the curriculum. Pages E40, 41, and 95-99.

Throughout the narrative the applicant effectively identify and describes the work of the local ArtCore School Teams that include core subject area teacher representing every grade level, school administrators, a school based art instructor and community leaders. This team is identified to serve as the nucleus of innovation for long term

Sub Question

planning over the four years. Pages E 43, 44

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant asserts a brief statement identifying that the sustainability beyond the grant period and potential for expansion within the participating schools will serve as a prioritized concern for project leaders. Page E 45.

The applicant identifies the program as incorporating the train-the-trainer model which will provide benefits behind the grant period. Page E 46.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant indicates a brief statement referencing sustainability and expansion, adequate information was not provided to substantiate program sustainability and incorporation of project purposes, activities, and benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

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 copiously describes the project leadership team identifying their relevant training and experience. They clearly identify members of the key instructional leadership team who are aligned with an expert panel serving on their Advisory Committee to seek guidance. Their resumes are included in the appendix noting their experience and relevant training. Page E 33 and Appendix B 3.

They identify the program lead partners noting the Springfield District #19, the Lane ESD and the Lane Arts Council who uphold strong policies as an equal opportunity employer. They provided a clear and concise chart identifying the Key Program Personnel and each staff member by name and title, and specified their training and experience. Resumes for

key staff are included in the appendix. Pages E 55-57.

It is noteworthy that a designated key management team member serves as a Project Liaison. She is an instructor at the University of Oregon Arts and Administration program and will provide a direct link from the middle school classrooms to the University for undergraduate and graduate students to increase interest in serving their practicum through the proposed initiative. Page E 58.

Weaknesses:

None

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 clearly describes an adequate management plan focused to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The management team is identified to meet quarterly under the leadership of the Project Director, aptly specifying nine specific goals of the meetings. These include to; review progress, milestone and timelines, monitor the budget, review responsibly of all staff members, identify success and challenge of program implementation and to review feedback and the evaluation progress.

The applicant identifies the establishment of an ongoing feedback loop which they state will ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. They identify a range of measurement which includes focus groups. Classroom observation, student and teacher survey, personal interview and an analysis of student formative assessment.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to articulate specific protocols or procedure to ensure the program is completed within budget.

Information is lacking detailing the time commitment to the project by the Springfield Public School Special Project Coordinator.

The program was described as serving five schools in four districts; however, adequate information is lacking to substantiate the time commitment for key personnel is appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Information is lacking to designate any time frames for continued feedback to ensure continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Information was not provided that would describe the CBM formative assessment model, or the times the model will be used to secure feedback

The applicant failed to identify any method or timeframes for which feedback will be obtained from program partners.

Reader's Score: 14

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 clearly describes an adequate management plan focused to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The management team is identified to meet quarterly under the leadership of the Project Director, aptly specifying nine specific goals of the meetings. These include to; review progress, milestone and timelines, monitor the budget, review responsibly of all staff members, identify success and challenge of program implementation and to review feedback and the evaluation progress. Pages 58, 59.

They copiously detail a well-developed management chart identifying each program component coordinate to a program objective aligned to a timeline, a milestone, and the person responsible for its completion.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to articulate specific protocols or procedure to ensure the program is completed within budget.

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 asserts 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. They indicate that the Lane ESD School Improvement and Evaluation Specialist will serve .70 FTE as the Project Director and Principal Investigator. In this position she will be responsible for a wide spectrum of responsibilities including budgetary oversight, overall management of project planning and implementation, assurances to the model of the project design, curriculum support and alignment for model development, substantial oversight of the internal and external evaluation procedures and continued improvement and dissemination of results. Page E 62.

They clearly identify the LAC Executive Director who will serve .40 FTE as the Project Manager. Her responsibilities are clearly outlined and include leading the planning and implementation of the project design, developing a strong relationship between arts specialists, teachers and the school community, recruitment and thoughtful matching of Arts Specialist to the school and provide support for the development of standards based modules. In this position she will supervise the Project Coordinator and Program Assistant and C-lead the Management team. Page E 68.

Additional key staff such as the Project Coordinator and the Program Assistant are identified, their time on the

Sub Question

program noted and their responsibilities clearly defined. Page E 63.

Weaknesses:

Information is lacking detailing the time commitment to the project by the Springfield Public School Special Project Coordinator.

The program was described as serving five schools in four districts; however, adequate information is lacking to substantiate the time commitment for key personnel is appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

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 identifies the establishment of an ongoing feedback loop which they state will ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project. They identify a range of measurements which includes focus groups, classroom observation, student and teacher survey, personal interview and an analysis of student formative assessment. Page E 63.

They specify pre and post assessments will accompany each module to gauge how well students grasp and retain concepts. The results of these are discussed at monthly meetings. In addition, they identify the easy CBM formative assessment to be administered before and after each model with a random sample of at least 25 students. Page E 64.

Weaknesses:

Information is lacking to designate any time frames for continued feedback to ensure continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Information was not provided that would describe the CBM formative assessment model, or the times the model will be used to secure feedback

Sub Question

The applicant failed to identify any method or timeframes for which feedback will be obtained from program partners.

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 effectively describes methods of evaluation to be employed to provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. This is evidenced in providing a Schedule for Measurement Development and charting the annual deployment of the Easy CBM Benchmark assessment, the Smarter Balance assessment, the Survey of Grit, Mindset and Self-Efficacy, the 21st Century Skills assessment, teacher survey and observation tools and the attendance office referral data.

They aptly identify methods of evaluation which will produce evidence of promise. This is evidenced in identifying the program's overarching goal is to develop a school wide arts program model and process, infrastructure, training and system wide sustainability that are required to achieve optimal condition to impact important student outcomes. They assert to this end the management team will submit annual reports of finds and the external evaluator will submit annual and end of program report.

They identify that in the climate of high stakes standardize testing, narrowed curriculum and punitive measurements for school labeled as failing, the proposed model of arts integration will provide an accessible alternative for schools looking to a path to transformation through creativity and innovation.

Weaknesses:

None

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 effectively describes the methods of evaluation which 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. They clearly describe the instruments to be used including detailing research question to elicit qualitative feedback. In addition, benchmark measures are identified and aligned to progress goals specifying the data to be secured. E 64-66.

An external evaluator is identified to provide a summative evaluation in which they clearly identify collecting data on levels of student engagement, 21st Century skills development, and integral data on the impact on students' academic achievement and on the program impact on teacher knowledge. Page E 66.

Sub Question

In addition, the summative evaluation process is identified as providing specific information related to program implementation and delivery of services on school wide effectiveness across instruction and academic achievement indicators. They indicated that the assessment will provide essential information in assessing 21st Century skill development, mindset and creative dispositions. Page E 67.

Weaknesses:

None

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 effectively describes methods of evaluation to be employed to provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. This is evidenced in providing a Schedule for Measurement Development for charting the annual deployment of the Easy CBM Benchmark assessment, the Smarter Balance assessment, the Survey of Grit, Mindset and Self-Efficacy, the 21st Century Skills assessment, teacher survey and observation tools, and the attendance office referral data. Page E 50.

They identify the responsibility of the management team to submit detailed progress reports annually with preliminary findings. They also indicate that within six months of the conclusion of the project the evaluators will write and submit at least one article to a peer-review journal based on the findings of the program. Page E 71.

Weaknesses:

none

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 identified methods of evaluation which will produce evidence of promise. This is evidenced in identifying the program's overarching goal which was to develop a school wide arts program model and process, infrastructure, training and system wide sustainability that are required to achieve optimal condition to impact important student outcomes. They assert to this end their management team will submit annual reports of findings and the external evaluator will submit an annual end of program report. Page E 7.1

They identify that in the harsh climate of high stakes standardized testing, narrowed curriculum and punitive measurements for schools labeled as failing, the proposed model of arts integration will provide an accessible alternative for schools looking to a path to transformation through creativity and innovation. Page E 71.

Weaknesses:

None

Sub Question

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 details ArtCore which is clearly designed to improve student achievement and 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.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/11/2014 03:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/07/2014 03:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Springfield School District #19 (U351D140063)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	13
Significance		
1. Significance	10	9
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	24
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	91
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 5: 84.351D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Springfield School District #19 (U351D140063)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

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

Strengths:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 13

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant has shown strong evidence that the proposed initiative will provide services to students at risk of educational failure. The proposed schools for this project clearly serve high-poverty students of high educational need: the schools are in the bottom 5-40% of state schools; one meets the "persistently low-achieving school" criteria (p 1-2); another is geographically isolated; and their communities have low community education levels. In two of the four schools, math proficiency on State tests is below 50% of students, and all show declining student achievement over the last 3 years (p 2)

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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 shown strong evidence of the specific gaps or weaknesses identified and the methods by which the proposed project will address them. Budgeting issues have necessitated cuts not only to arts education funding, but also to the number of school days. Non-art teachers offer informal classes on an inconsistent basis (p 4). Rural, geographically-isolated students are particularly isolated from arts instruction and cultural resources (p 2). This program would formalize arts education training and resources across these schools, utilizing a strong technological component.

The applicant proposes that its outcomes and associated products will eliminate gaps in college and career readiness, achievement in core subjects, and arts education (p 5).

Weaknesses:

The applicant cites some data regarding the gaps in college and career readiness among some of its schools; more information about how these gaps compare to other schools in the district or the State as a whole would be helpful. Additionally, if there are gaps between achievement within minority student and non-minority student populations, additional data supporting this gap would be helpful.

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 offers moderate evidence of the likely utility of the products resulting from the project that may potentially be used by schools in other settings. The applicant proposes an impressive series of video shorts that include multiple tools for teachers to implement the ArtsCore program in their own schools, including interviews with arts specialists, arts entrepreneurs, teachers, and students(p vii). By utilizing videos, rural schools and students can have more exposure to artists (p 6), which offers a cost-effective approach to supporting geographically-isolated students.

Utilizing research-based best practices, the project will also offer students the opportunity to create art online (p 6).

Innovative online Professional Learning Networks and a student peer network will also support the dissemination of this project's products (p 4).

Weaknesses:

The applicant proposes to disseminate the materials "aggressively" (p 7) but does not offer details on how it will do so; e. g., through conferences, papers, press releases, etc.

Reader's Score: 9

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: 24

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides strong evidence of the up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices to address the needs and problems of its schools. The project significantly reflects up-to-date knowledge regarding arts education as well as motivational learning practices such as self-efficacy and confidence (p iv, 8-9, 10).

The research discussed, and its application within the project design, shows a deep and nuanced thought process in construction of the model. For example, the discussion of expectancy-value theory for student success (p 12), the discussion of appropriate feedback language (p 13), or the application of artist-in-residence theory to their teaching artists program (p 16) offers important insights into the development of this model.

The project is also developed on the results of 3 quasi-experimental designed studies of similar initiatives (p iii-iv) and encourages students to be creative, innovative, and risk-taking (p ii).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

Reader's Score:

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

Sub Question

Strengths:

The proposed project shows strong evidence of being supported by strong theory. The applicant's project theory is impressive and clearly tied to a strong and nuanced understanding of research within the areas of arts education, college and career readiness, and academic mindset. The logic model on page 9 and the research framework chart on page 10 tie together the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, strategic impacts, and research basis for those assumptions.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any 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 provides strong evidence that the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards. The applicant proposes to develop a research-based "unifying framework" for all educational programs at the target schools, which is an excellent way to create consistency and continuity among various efforts (p 28). The project ties into other district initiatives to increase college and career readiness. Additionally, the project will develop effective professional development based on research-based principles; the professional development will include 100 hours of training, co-teaching, collaborative curriculum development, and professional learning communities (p iii-v, 16, 17). The proposed training schedule and details on page 25 show a progressive, clear theory of purpose and execution strategy.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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 shows moderate evidence that the proposed initiative has the potential to be incorporated into the applicant's work beyond the grant period. The applicant proposes to document much of its learning products in online videos, work samples, lessons plans, and other supportive materials, which will be available as a resource for other teachers' professional development and reference (p 30). Additionally, trained teachers will eventually help to train other teachers (p 33), thus relieving the need for budget for outside training.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

It is unclear what financial or time resources will be available to: (1) new teachers to study the online resources; or (2) trained teachers to support other teachers.

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 strong evidence that the key personnel have relevant training and experience to this project. The proposed project team has a significant amount of varied experience in a variety of key areas, including project management; grants management (including DOE grants); arts and music integration; video production; technology platforms, and creative justice education (p 34-37). The project advisory committee will include one of the original creators of an innovative feedback program (p 14) which will be incorporated into the project.

The applicant voices a clear commitment to diversity and plans to include among its team artists from Mexico and West Africa.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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:

n/a

Weaknesses:

n/a

Reader's Score: 15

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 offers strong evidence that the proposed management plan will meet the objectives of the initiative successfully and within budget. The management plans shows evidence of a thorough engagement and understanding of the necessary activities, responsibilities, milestones, and interdependencies of the various tasks to successfully accomplish this project. Especially impressive is the applicant's deep discussion of the rationale and vision for the phased-approach on pages 22-30 and the complementary timeline on 38-40 that details how the strategy and vision will be accomplished.

The underlying structure, of a Management Team and school-based ArtCore School teams, offers significant overlap and opportunities for constant feedback and fine-tuning of the model (p 37-38).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any 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 applicant offers moderate evidence that the time commitments of the key personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. The proposed time commitments of the key project personnel appear appropriate and adequate to meet the plan's objectives: the project director/PI's .7 FTE reflects the enormity of this role, and the Project Manager's leadership of the planning and implementation phase appears to be aligned with the planned .4 FTE (p 41-42).

Weaknesses:

The .40 FTE time commitment of the Project manager does not seem sufficient given the significant responsibilities for this role. Further information is needed regarding the time commitments of the external evaluator and the Springfield Public Schools' Special Project Coordinator.

Reader's Score:

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

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant offers moderate evidence of adequate procedures in place to ensure feedback and continuous improvement. The applicant offers a mix of formative and summative measures to check ongoing progress of this initiative, including pre- and post-assessments; an easy CBM assessment to a randomly selected group of students; surveys, interviews, focus groups, and classroom observations (p 42-43).

The school-based teams will review the data on a monthly basis, which ensures adequate frequency to identify and address issues before they get out of hand. Similarly, the Management Team will evaluate program progress on a quarterly basis.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how program partners' input will be captured. Further, the project director and manager will prepare quarterly summary reports for the Management Team and External evaluator to review (p 43) to identify issues requiring attention, and determine and address underlying causes. While the commitment of these personnel is quite clear, generally speaking, it is the opinion of this reviewer than an external evaluator could provide a more objective analysis of the data and identify issues of concern for the team.

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:

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 applicant has provided strong evidence that the proposed objective performance measures are clearly related to the project's goals and will produce qualitative and quantitative data. The project evaluation plan shows strong evidence of the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the project's outcomes of increased academic achievement and academic mindset; strengthening teacher professional development; and strengthening the school's overall culture.

The questions to be analyzed are sound and are supported by various methods for collecting rigorous quantitative and qualitative data (p 43-46). The incorporation of technology into the ongoing formative assessments (p 48-49)

Sub Question

offers a time- and resource-effective way to collect objective student performance data.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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 strong evidence that the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessments of project progress. As stated above, the evaluation offers numerous opportunities for ongoing feedback, including surveys and qualitative data as well as student achievement data through the online learning system. The applicant's stated plan to meet monthly at the school-level and quarterly at the Management Level also provides significant opportunity to reflect on success and areas of improvement. By including Management within these meetings, recommendations of the External Evaluator can be authorized and acted upon quickly (p 42-43).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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 strong evidence of the proposed evaluation methodology's ability to provide evidence of promise. The quasi-experimental design matched non-equivalent comparison group is sound and offers numerous opportunities for digging deeply into the results of the initiative, including comparing multiple cohorts within the same school to test the effects of intense treatment and involvement by the arts specialist (p 48). The chart on page 50 offers an excellent summary of the overall evaluation plan over the four years.

The table in Appendix B2 (p e89-90) offers a detailed and compelling explanation for the planned variables within the model. The plan makes clear that this project and its evaluation has been thoroughly and strategically considered.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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 shows strong evidence of utilizing high quality digital tools or materials in professional development or to improve instruction. The strength of the proposed project is in its reliance on high-quality technological tools, including the utilization of learning management systems to house resources, work samples, lesson plans, and community applications (p 30). The plan to incorporate technology to offer app development and work with digital cameras and 3D printers will likely engage students in a meaningful way (p vi).

The learning management system will also offer an opportunity for teachers, students, and other stakeholders to reflect upon the success of the initiative in an ongoing manner. Of particular interest are the plans to offer an e-mentoring component, which has been shown to be effective with female STEM students in studies (p 27).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/07/2014 03:00 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/13/2014 01:00 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Springfield School District #19 (U351D140063)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	13
Significance		
1. Significance	10	9
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	23
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	90
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 5: 84.351D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Springfield School District #19 (U351D140063)

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:

Weaknesses:

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:

As stated on page e22, this proposal is targeted to improve academic performance of the five schools through arts integration due to the students' declining performance over the years and high percentage of minority students. The applicant noted that the percentages of minority students and their eligibility of free meals was one of their considerations for this criteria. In addition, the mathematics and reading performance levels of each of the schools were well documented in a table and texts.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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 presentation of the educational conditions of each of five schools were thoroughly presented (pp. e23 - e25). Information on the academic performance levels, the descriptions of school service levels, financial conditions, minority ratios, and art class status would serve as the important background knowledge to help the project's success. The needs of the applicant district for each school were well aligned in this proposal.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide comparative data among schools which would help reviewers to understand the comparative status of the targeted schools with regards to their school performance level.

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 model, ArtCore, was designed to create curriculum materials and multimedia to improve the academic performance and college and career readiness of students who might be culturally isolated. The video vignettes of professional development would also serve as a good technology tool to help teachers to exercise their instructional practice in an efficient way (i.e., exercise of learning, discussion, utilizing resources, etc.). The project also paid attention to the generalizability of the project results by selecting participating schools to represent urban and rural settings.

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide a dissemination plan of the project results.

Reader's Score: 9

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 23

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:

Starting with four clear objectives, the proposal presented up-to-date research results regarding the goals of the project model on page e31. By breaking down six innovative features of the model (motivational factors to learning and achievement, formative assessment, and school-wide arts transformation, research-based model), the project provided the effectiveness of the project model by quoting both researchers' findings and empirical outcomes on pages e29-e39.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided a logic model on page e30 and a table of research results using the logic model on page e31. The theoretical backgrounds of the project model were also presented by breaking down six features of the project with both prototypical (i.e., Bandura, 1977) and current up-to-date research on pages e33-e40.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any 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 effectiveness of the model with several key components were well presented in an organized manner. The project contained detailed suggestions on how art integrated curricular should be implemented. The implementation of art integrated curricular was well aligned with the development of teacher instructional skills. The professional development for teachers was well planned with specific phases and detailed activities.

Weaknesses:

The implementation plan of the art integrated curricular did not show a clear connection with the improvement of student performance.

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 plans to use an extended effect of the ArtCore program beyond the grant period (p. e54), keeping integrated arts activities with Lane Arts Council.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

There was not enough information provided on how the project activities would be maintained to have the long-term effect.

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 key personnel of the project including the project director provided credentials in working with funded grant activities and arts education.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 15

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.**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant provided timeline, milestones, and responsibilities under each component.

Weaknesses:

The budget allocation for each component was missing.

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 descriptions of time commitment of the project director and other key personnel were included in the proposal.

Weaknesses:

The applicant provided general statements of time commitment of key personnel for activities. It would have been helpful if more detailed information (i.e., hours of work for each key personnel) had been included in the management plan.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

For each component, regular meetings were planned for training, development, and implementation.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide specific information on how feedback and the process of continuous improvement would be handled.

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:

Weaknesses:

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 presented clear evaluation objectives with research questions, outcome measures, benchmark measures, and measurement of outcomes. The research questions and outcome measures have specified to assess the growth (improved) of achievement and the magnitudes of the growth, examining the long-term effects of the ArtCore. In measurement descriptions, both qualitative and quantitative measurement were included.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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 included outcome measures as periodic assessment of progress under each of four performance objectives. The well-planned periodic progress assessment was arranged for each objective and activity. The quantitative method for formative evaluation was well-designed from the design, data collection, and analysis for periodic progress evaluation and feedback.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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 objective performance measures were planned with seven outcome measures of student improved performance, 21 century skills, teacher practice and knowledge of arts integrated teaching, student's non-academic factors, relationship measures between achievement and self-efficacy, and school wide effect such as instructional and academic behaviors (pp. 48-50; pp. e69-e70).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

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:

Recognizing the importance of social networking and digital media among the students, the proposal tried to incorporate networking to core curricular. The project using the ArtCore planned that students would learn app development from software developers, share their work, and get feedback from art specialists and peers; while teachers access and contribute to the curricular using technology.

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly reviewed and discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and I could not find any weaknesses.

Reader's Score: **5**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/13/2014 01:00 PM