

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2014 02:45 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Studio in a School Association, Inc. (U351D140072)

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	21
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	91
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 9: 84.351D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Studio in a School Association, Inc. (U351D140072)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant clearly demonstrates need for the project and services to address need. Demographic data is presented on the target population/area to help demonstrate need for the project (pgs. 3-4). For example, before redistricting in January 2013, the 2010 Census found that approximately 38% of CD 15 constituents lived at or below the federal poverty line, the highest poverty rate of any congressional district in the nation. In 2012, the mean household income for CD 15 residents was \$34,915, with the income of almost one in four families falling below the poverty level (U.S. Census, 2012). Further, the 2012 Census found that 42.8% of the CD 15 population over the age of 16 was unemployed. the percentage of students in the target schools eligible for free lunch ranges from 90.9% to 96.8%, and each school has an Economic Need Index (ENI) above 1.00, reflecting the high poverty rate. Additionally, academic data is also provided to demonstrate need (pg. 4). In the 2012–13 NYS English Language Arts (ELA) exam results, the percentage of students who met or exceeded the state standards ranged from a low of 5.1% to a high of only 10.8%, compared to the citywide average of 26.4%. The scores on the NYS Math Test were slightly better, with the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard ranging from 12.9% to 15.0%, compared to 29.6% citywide. ELA and Math Tests administered in spring 2013 were aligned to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The target population for the project is students in grades 4 and 5 attending four Title I NYC elementary schools, all of which include students who are low-income and at risk of educational failure (pgs. 1-2).

The applicant will provide appropriate services to address the needs of students at risk of educational failure. The project will expand Studio in a School's capacity to develop, evaluate, and disseminate arts integrated, standards-based, and technology-rich curriculum units designed to meet the academic needs of students in high-poverty, low-performing NYC elementary schools; build the capacity of high-poverty, low-performing elementary schools to

Sub Question

implement an arts-integrated, standards-based, and technology-rich program for students in grades 4 and 5; improve educational outcomes for students in high-poverty, low-performing elementary schools, through the design and implementation of an integrated, standards-based, and technology-rich curriculum including authentic and rigorous arts instruction that connects visual arts with skills and concepts central to Common Core Standards in ELA and Math (pgs. 7-8).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found:

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

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 clearly identifies gaps and weaknesses in services and infrastructure to include lack of arts education programming; the lack of rigorous models of arts instruction; the need for alignment of arts instruction with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS); and the need for innovative technologies in the classroom (pgs. 4-6). For example, a recent report released by the Office of the New York City Comptroller revealed that low income neighborhoods in NYC, particularly those in the South Bronx and Central Brooklyn, the target areas for the project, have shouldered a disproportionate level of cuts in arts funding, and that many lack even a part-time certified arts teacher or an arts or cultural partnership (pg. 5). Further, even with a full- or part-time certified arts teacher in the building, the student-art teacher ratio in a typical NYC elementary school does not allow for the provision of a rigorous sequence of standards-based arts instruction for all students (pg. 5).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found:

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

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:**

The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

A variety of curriculum and instructional related products will result from the project. The project will replicate the instructional techniques and curriculum practices developed, tested, and refined through the project and its related projects (pgs. 10-11). This will yield the development of 16 technology-rich arts units that support Common Core learning that take advantage of tablet apps and online resources—and include explicit strategies for development of higher-order thinking skills and differentiation strategies for ELLs and students with disabilities for use in grades 4-5, along with accompanying assessment tools and strategies. A new online arts-integration resource site, initially designed to support

project participants and later developed into a national resource, comprised of the 16 model units, assessment tools and protocols, prompts and response forms, images of exemplary student work at different grade levels, professional development videos, webinars, and links to appropriate works of art, children's literature, and other resources will also be refined through development. Lastly, the project will yield at least one article summarizing the findings of the evaluation, submitted and accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal (e.g., Studies in Art Education: A Journal of Issues and Research in Art Education, Review of Educational Research). The products are sufficient and have potential to be used in other settings.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found:

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

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 21

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 project is based on up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices that links participation in the arts with the development of critical thinking skills that may transfer to other subject areas. For example, evidence of the effectiveness of increasing the quantity and quality of the arts on student performance is clearly document by the recent study, Reinvesting in Arts Education: Winning America's Future through Creative Schools (May 2011) found that students who participate in the arts are more engaged, cooperative, and confident, have higher GPA/SAT scores, and demonstrate higher levels of math proficiency and spatial-temporal IQ scores than students who do not participate in the arts (pg. 12). Sufficient research and effective practices are also described to support the project address the incorporation of innovative technology in arts-focused instruction and student assessment; targeted and intensive professional development for classroom teachers, teaching artists, and principals that includes their participation in professional learning communities; and strategies to promote parental involvement and create a school environment that views the arts as an integral component (pgs. 12-15).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant elaborates on the project's theory of change, summarizing the goals, objectives, and outcomes that have been established for the project by the arts project planning team (pgs. 15-20). A graphic depiction of the project's logic model is included as an Attachment to the proposal. The applicant provides a solid hypothesis on student participation in art-integrated programs that align with standards for student.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a description of actual theoretical theories or frameworks from available research that will support the project. The applicant's focus is on theory of change.

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:

This proposed AEMDD project extends a unique and effective public-private partnership between Studio and the NYCDOE's Office of Arts and Special Projects (OASP (pgs. 9-12). The project is part of ongoing efforts to ensure the provision of comprehensive arts education initiatives aimed to help schools integrate high-quality visual arts education activities and embedded assessments with their ELA and math curricula that are align with required standard and help address student achievement. This expansion and enhancement project will help enable the applicant continue to build on a successful model for integrating the visual arts into the core curriculum in a way that acknowledges the depth and complexity of the arts experience while supporting the basic skills that provide the underpinnings for academic success.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not indicate if the project is part of any district wide initiative to transform learning environments in schools to include successful and sustained arts integrated instruction.

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 clearly describes how the project has potential and planning for the incorporation of the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant. Because the applicant's work in over 165 schools each year through various related arts projects serves a highly diverse student population, strategies developed with the support of this grant would continue to strengthen work in the years to come. The documentation and sharing of approaches and the creation of an online community of educators working on integrating the visual arts into the core curriculum will

Sub Question

allow the impact of all of the applicant's work to expand to teacher and reach students in other educational settings across the country. Further, the innovations developed in both Framing Student Success and Arts Achieve and expanded upon in this project will be taken and made available on line as effective tools to support student progress toward Common Core State Standards (CCSS) across the state, with a special focus on addressing the needs of the most challenged students, their schools, and their teachers.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide information on the sustainability of the project and its related projects should federal assistance becomes unavailable. The development of a solid plan of sustainability will also help ensure the capacity that has been built through the project(s) will continue

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:

Key personnel assigned to work on the project are clearly identified. Staff is experienced and has training in arts education, teaching, and working with at risk students (pgs. 14-17). Resumes in the Appendix support relevant qualifications. Key staff will be comprised the President & CEO of Studio, a Project Director, and staff from Metis Associates, the external evaluators (pgs. 34-36), and a Digital Resource/Project Coordinator to be hired (pg. 37).

The applicant states All positions at Studio in a School are filled without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, HIV/AIDS status, veteran status or any other characteristic protected by law (pg. 34). All are encouraged to apply.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found:

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

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

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

following factors:

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 17

Sub Question

- 1. (a) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The applicant presents a management plan that is adequate to help guide staff and ensure that the objectives of the project are achieved with high quality, on schedule, and within budget. A project director has been charged with overall project management to ensure that implementation is proceeding on schedule and within budget (pg. 37). The Digital Resource/Project Coordinator to be hired will be to ensure that the collaboration between the schools and Studio runs smoothly and according to plan. The management plan includes a Project Steering Committee (PSC), providing leadership in the alignment of the curriculum units being developed, refined, and implemented, and support citywide dissemination activities (pgs. 37-38). A timeline showing key milestones/project tasks, and persons responsible in each year of the project is provided.

Weaknesses:

The timeframes for completion of miles/tasks are broad (yearly). Incremental timeframes would help ensure accomplishment of required milestones/tasks. The applicant does not make a differentiation between project tasks and 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:

The time commitments of the project director and The Digital Resource/Project Coordinator are specified by the applicant (pg. 42). For example, the Project Director of will dedicate 40% of her time to the project, overseeing the project. The Digital Resource/Project Coordinator will dedicate 100% time to the project. This position will serve as a liaison with principals of the participating schools; provide logistical support for the classroom teachers and teaching artists in the project; prepare and submit purchase orders for all project-related expenditures; support data collection and evaluation activities; archive, manage, and post digital material to the online toolkit; and coordinate the work of the web designer, videographer, and photographer (pg. 37). Time commitments are sufficient to ensure project goals are accomplished.

Weaknesses:

The CEO is described as the key personnel driving the quality of the project; however not FTE commitment is described for the individual. Further, a large amount of duties are specified for Digital Resource/Project Coordinator. The may result in lesser quality and hinder efforts in meeting project goals

Sub Question

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Several mechanisms will be put into place to ensure that timely feedback is gathered, discussed, and utilized to support effective project implementation and continuous improvement (pg. 42). For example, the Project Director and Digital Resource/Project Coordinator will meet on a bi-weekly basis to ensure that the project is being implemented in a timely, efficient, and effective manner. In addition, the Project Director will hold monthly meetings with the schools to review implementation status, discuss any obstacles encountered, and collaborate on solutions to address implementation challenges. The Project Director and Digital Resource/Project Coordinator will meet with all outside partners on a bi-monthly basis to ensure that services being provided by these partners are proceeding smoothly and on schedule.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found:

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

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

1. (a) **The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**

Strengths:

The evaluation will include an examination of progress toward meeting both implementation (process) objectives and outcomes. In a table the applicant describes the data sources and evaluation methods that will be used to

Sub Question

assess the project's outcomes. Data sources and timelines for the evaluation are also provided (pg. 44-46). The experimental or quasi-experimental design will compare outcomes for students participating in program activities to those for students in nonparticipating control or comparison groups. The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) performance measures for the AEMDD grant program, student achievement in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics will be assessed through scores on the Partnership for Assessment Readiness for Common Core (PARCC) assessments, and the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) (pg. 50).

The applicant will retain an independent research and evaluation consulting firm that has extensive experience using experimental, quasi-experimental, and other designs to evaluate academic enrichment programs, arts education programs, and professional development initiatives in school districts around the country (pg. 43).

Weaknesses:

Limited information is presented how the project evaluation methods will yield quantitative and qualitative methods. Data collection for the evaluation is vaguely described.

Reader's Score:

2. **(b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

Results from the evaluation will be used to monitor the project's progress toward meeting its intended outcomes, and to assess the extent to which the project is ensuring relevance of program activities to participants' needs and adherence to the proposed design. Findings from both formative and summative evaluation activities will be communicated to project staff on a regular (i.e., monthly) and as-needed basis through telephone and email communications and through the evaluator's regular participation in the quarterly Project Steering Committee meetings and individual monthly meetings with the Project Director (pg. 51). This is sufficient use of evaluation results.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant states the theory of change will be tested using the project evaluation, a quasi-experimental well-matched comparison group design to meet the WWC evidence standards with reservations. The project's theory of change posits that when students participate in well-crafted, standards-based arts units, aligned to the national arts and Common Core Standards, implemented in a technology-rich, collaborative environment (with teacher choice, time provided for co-planning and co-teaching with professional visual artists, online resource support, and professional development for differentiation), they will attain visual arts skills and competencies as outlined in the NYC Blueprint for the Arts, and their achievement in visual arts, math, and literacy will exceed that of matched peers (pg. 52).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not present clear information to determine a conveyance of evidence of promise. Earlier in the application theoretical linkages to the project design from research were not adequately described, thus the connection of empirical evidence to support the theoretical linkage cannot be determined.

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 address Priority Two - Technology (pg. 2). One of the key enhancements to the project model is the integration of technology designed to increase student engagement, enhance instruction, and support professional development and dissemination activities. The arts-integrated curriculum units will be enhanced to incorporate new fine art media as well as new technologies (i.e., SmartBoards and iPads) to both create and assess student art. The project will provide teachers and teaching artists with these technology resources and training to use them (and other technology tools) in their classrooms to support instruction and assessment. Studio's new teacher-oriented web platform will serve as a place for teachers to access resources and tools (i.e., training videos, curriculum resources, and student exemplars) to assist them in the instruction and assessment of their students. The site will be shared more broadly in the final year of the project to promote the use of these resources by educators across the city and nation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found:

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

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/17/2014 02:45 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2014 09:54 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Studio in a School Association, Inc. (U351D140072)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	14
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
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	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	94
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 9: 84.351D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Studio in a School Association, Inc. (U351D140072)

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: 14

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 outlined on pages 3 and 4, a clear link between the four participating schools and their need for academic support is made. All schools serve a population with 90% receiving free and reduced lunch, and the highest performing school has only 10.8% of students meeting state proficiency standards in English language arts.

Weaknesses:

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

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 proposal indicates that schools have limited access to art teachers (p. 5) and lack arts integration and alignment with the Common Core State Standards (p. 6).

Weaknesses:

Although the proposal articulately connects a broad lack of art resources, specifically art teachers, the specific resources available/in place at the four participating schools should be described.

Sub Question

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

- 1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:**

The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

The proposal makes a clear link between the project and the intended outcomes, specifically increased student math and language arts performance. A number of specific products were listed, including 16 technology-rich units (p. 11), an online resources center (p. 11), and publication of peer-reviewed manuscripts (p. 12).

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 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.**

Strengths:

A clear and precise link between arts integration and student academic achievement is made in the proposal. All cited works are relevant to the project and up-to-date. For example, links with the Reinvesting in Arts Education study by May (2011) and the benefits of increase access education by Netto (2012).

Weaknesses:

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

Sub Question

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The proposal includes a clear theory of change model and graphic logic model to support the process objectives and outcomes (p. e84).

Weaknesses:

Although a descriptive theory of change is discussed, a link between the theory of learning and the project should be described. The arts integration model is part of a curriculum based on one of a number of learning theories (e.g., constructivism). The proposal should make those links explicit.

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 proposal provides a complete description of the links between the Expanding the Frame program and systemic change in teacher and school activities. For example, as part of the program school leaders will receive 18 hours of professional development (p. 26) and teachers will attend plenary workshops (p. 27) and receive job embedded professional development (p. 28). In addition, the program will be aligned with the Common Core State Standards to ensure programming links with rigorous academic standards.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The authors indicate that the Expanding the Frame model will be (a) provided as an online resource for dissemination and replication (p. 33) and (b) connected to work conducted by Studio in a School in other schools.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not describe any additional plans to build infrastructure for sustaining the practices beyond the grant or any potential sources of future funding.

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 proposal clearly describes the procedures in place to ensure non-discriminatory practices by Studio in a School and indicates that the artists included in the program are from diverse backgrounds. The application will also encourage diverse applicants by advertising at Fine Arts program (p. 34)

All key personnel have significant experience and expertise to complete the project as described. The project director has a demonstrated a successful track record of acquiring, managing, and completing grant projects (p. 34).

Weaknesses:

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

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: 18

Sub Question

- 1. (a) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The proposal describes a project coordinator that will be hired to ensure objectives are completed on time (p. 37) and a steering committee to oversee the project as a whole (p. 37). The proposal also provides a table of project milestones, personnel responsible, and years that the milestones will be met (pp. 39-41). All primary tasks are included and the year each task will be completed is marked.

Weaknesses:

Although the table is descriptive and assists in the assessment of project management, the unit of time in the table (i.e., year) should be broken down into smaller units (e.g., quarters or months) for more specificity of task responsibilities and timelines.

Reader's Score:

- 2. (b) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and**

Sub Question

other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Table 2 in the proposal indicates that the project director will contribute .40 FTE to the project and the to-be-hired project coordinator will be 1.0 FTE. This distribution of FTE across the key personnel is appropriate to meet the goals of the project.

Weaknesses:

The key personnel section of the proposal indicates that Mr. Cahill will be a member of the project, but no FTE is described for his participation. If he is donating time, that should be noted in the proposal.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The proposal indicates that bi-weekly meetings between the project coordinator and project director will be held, as well as monthly meetings between the project director and the schools, to ensure fidelity of implementation and obstacles to implementation (p. 42). In addition, quarterly formative assessment reports will be developed and delivered by the project evaluator for use in data-based decision making.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 19

Sub Question

- 1. (a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The evaluation includes a quasi-experimental design (QED) study and will include propensity score matched comparison students to assess overall program effectiveness. School, teacher, and student-level differences are assessed on a objective measures. The proposal clearly outlines all measures or preliminary measurement approaches for each goal and subgoal on pages 45-47. For example, to assess student-level educational outcomes, the new New York academic achievement measure aligned with the Common Core will collected for each student. The proposal also provides narrative support for each proposed measure and preliminary descriptions of analyses to be used (e.g., multivariate regression models; p. 50) and significance levels (e.g., $p < .05$ and $d > .33$).

Weaknesses:

Specific details or example items of the teacher and parent surveys would assist in the assessment of alignment with program goals and objectives.

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 proposal describes monthly distribution of formative and summative data to the project director (p. 51) and quarterly reports for the project steering committee. Overall, as described the evaluation will provide consistent and regular performance feedback to ensure progress.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Assuming equivalence between the treatment and control groups, which is highly likely give the use of propensity score matching, the quasi-experimental design should result in evidence of promise.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Technology

1. **Projects that are designed to improve student achievement (as defined in the notice) or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

Technology is an integrated component of the project from the use of technology tools in the classroom (e.g., iPads) and the new teacher-oriented web platform described on page 2.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score: **5**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/06/2014 09:54 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2014 07:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Studio in a School Association, Inc. (U351D140072)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	15	15
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Technology		
1. CPP: Technology	5	4
Sub Total	5	4
Total	105	104

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 9: 84.351D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Studio in a School Association, Inc. (U351D140072)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

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

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant clearly makes the case that the four elementary, Title I, New York City Schools located in the Bronx have a significant number of 4th and 5th grade students who are academically at risk of education failure and living in poverty. The applicant provides demographic data (U. S. Census 2012) to describe the conditions of the Bronx conditions: (a) the poorest of the five NYC boroughs, (b) 38% of constituents live at or below federal poverty, (c) mean household income is \$34,915 (d) almost one out of four families fall below poverty level, and (e) the unemployment rate was 42.8%.

The applicant proposes to support four of the Title I Schools, with low academic performance and labeled Priority Schools by the State of New York. Mother Hale Academy is listed as demonstrating Persistently –Lowest Achieving and is the only NYC School with this designation. The other three schools are among the Lowest-Achieving Schools, identified as the 5% of Title I Schools in improvement, restructuring or corrective action in the state (Priority Schools).

These low performing schools demonstrate a significantly high percent 90.9% - 96.8% of students eligible for free or reduced lunch with an Economic Need Index above 1.00, demonstrating a high poverty rate. An analysis of the student NYS test data demonstrates a high number of English Language Learners and Special Education students scored above the citywide average, with an extremely low percentage of students meeting or exceeding academic standards. The project will provide services to support the needs of these students. Disparities in academic attainment and high risks of education failure are clear.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant cites the gaps and weaknesses in services and the magnitude of the impact to the infrastructure on teaching and learning. The lack of certified personnel effects access to instruction as well as the threat of academic quality of the delivery and rigor. Inadequate resources define budget limitations that exclude all students receiving art instruction which denies equal access to a quality education. Most significant is the weaknesses and extensive need for comprehensive professional development training for teachers on art education and current methodologies and strategies for teaching critical thinking and using array of technologies and electronic media. The applicant also cites academic rigor is threatened by the high teacher student ratio, if certified art teacher personnel are available. The overarching instructional weakness reduces the educational capacity of these four targeted Title I – Low Performing, State Priority Elementary Schools.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:**

The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

Strengths:

The applicant describes the historical significance of the existing partnership with the NYC Schools. Studio has provided key leadership of the Blueprint Committee of Standards for implementation of art education. Also, Studio has provided an external resource for human capital and assessment to enrich learning in NYC Schools. Acquiring several grants, specifically the AEMDD award allowed for art education professional development and practice to establish benchmarks for assessment and product development. Studio has demonstrated results with the district to produce deliverables. The applicant identifies products and utility for teachers, students and community as a priority. The deliverables include teacher professional development trainings, lesson plans, student products, and electronic access to I pads and other digital media for art integration to strengthen math performance for low performing schools.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

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:

Strength: The applicant cites current and relevant research to undergird the Expanding the Frame theoretical rationale for the project design. The applicant also cites evidence to link the participation of critical thinking skills and the transfer to other subjects as the foundation for project implementation. The applicant cites scholarly research on recent studies and scientific findings.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides the reader with a tangible ideology and visual perspective of the manifestation of the project. Citing examples of the interaction of several scholarly theories, the applicant cites the student performance or teacher training in alignment with the National Common Core Standards, National Visual Arts Standards, and the procedures for implementation.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant incorporates the Expanding the Frame concept through a comprehensive design with relevant leadership in teacher education. Through the hands-on, direct approach and intrusive individualize and small groups professional development training teachers will demonstrate evidence to support a rigorous academic plan for realistic outcomes.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Studio and the New York City Schools have demonstrated a long-term commitment to the integration of art within the curriculum. The applicant cites commitment to sustain resources, although limited in nature for the integration of art instruction and the project model beyond the termination date of the grant. The applicant provides a framework to ensure teachers will continue engagement in professional development to narrow the gap and increase student performance. Immediate access to websites with teaching tools and diverse electronic media for the integration of art education into lesson plans, assessments, professional development through multi-media platforms to continue to train teachers.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

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

In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor:

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

Strengths:

The applicant cited a current and all inclusive policy for ensuring equal opportunity and nondiscrimination policy and practice. The applicant cites an excellent plan to advertise and actively encourage diversity in the employment pool to ensure awareness of vacancies within the artistic communities.

The applicant submitted a profile of administrators of the Studio with credentials to provide quality program leadership and financial oversight. Proposed personnel were appropriate and the professional experiences were relevant to the goals and objectives.

Weaknesses:

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

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:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 20

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 demonstrated a chart of the art integration curriculum for teacher development and training. Also, the applicant cited a comprehensive management plan, identifying activities, timelines, milestones for accomplishments, responsibilities and roles of stakeholders and personnel. The structure is clear and relative to the success of the project, additionally the technology and the monitoring component add integrity to the data collection process and evaluation process for realistic feedback for program modification and improvement. Goals, objectives and anticipated outcomes are related to the assigned duties of the personnel. Timelines, milestones and responsibilities are clearly defined and outlined for project implementation.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

- 2. (b) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a description of the task, roles, responsibilities and time and effort of the key personnel. The number of specialized personnel and the distribution of time to the project are appropriate for strengthening the

Sub Question

capacity of teacher training and student performance. Commitment to the project is clearly defined and aligned with the goals of the project.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan of program assessment and real-time feedback for modification to strengthen improvement and implementation. The applicant cites Meetings with teachers and staff, in addition to Quarterly Meetings with principals, teachers and staff to improve the professional development component. The communication mechanisms for continuous improvement are operable to the effective execution of the project.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 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 includes an extensive quasi-experimental design to support the project goal of increasing proficiency in student performance. Data will be collected to compare a controlled group. Measurement will include qualitative and quantitative measures of outcomes. An evaluation schedule is included to connect objectives and outcomes, in

Sub Question

addition to the description of the diverse types of assessment instruments. The evaluation methods are comprehensive and intentionally structured to ascertain relevant data to transmit to stakeholders.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

2. **(b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

The evaluation plan provides data with frequency, multiple formats and opportunities for adjustments for improvements. The data process is continuous and on-going including progress reports using varied types of instrumentation for assessments to build on existing knowledge and experience.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant cites a rational plan to gather relevant information to produce data with relative validity for publication and project model replication.

Weaknesses:

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

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Technology

1. **Projects that are designed to improve student achievement (as defined in the notice) or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

Strengths:

The project includes the integration of technology in the project design to train teachers to deliver technology based instruction to increase student performance. The electronic format and other digital media modalities will be used to provide immediate access and a wide span of professional development training. Students and teachers will demonstrate growth in the utility of the products with tangible and intangible significance to impact student performance.

Weaknesses:

The project design is poised to achieve high impact with maximum utility of technology; however the applicant does not present existing supportive data. The evidence of outcome is undetermined.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/17/2014 07:35 PM