

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/27/2014 02:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Topeka Public Schools -- USD 501 (U351D140074)

Reader #1: *****

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 6: 84.351D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Topeka Public Schools -- USD 501 (U351D140074)

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:

None noted

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

In support of the need for the project the applicant cites a number of factors which include the percent of the population living below the poverty level (24%), the percent of children below the age of 18 living below the poverty level (36%), the percent of children eligible for free and reduced meals (77.1%) and other related factors such as crime and suspensions. p. 2 Additionally, the target schools are performing below expectations on standardized assessments in reading and math.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

In response to gaps and weaknesses in services the applicant notes five specific concerns: (1) limited access to the arts (2) limited opportunities for professional development and training (3) a lack of district arts leadership (4) the need for arts integration across the curriculum and (5) the need for CT skills in arts curricula. The supporting information provided for each area clearly support a need for the project and the intended purposes of the grant. P.

5

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant proposes to develop classroom resources, lesson plans, training modules and other related resources that will be age appropriate. Training modules will be delivered through direct training, the Internet, conference presentations, journal publications, and an online Community of Practice. P. 8 All activities will be sported by the Arts Infusion Coach and Project Director. As outlined the strategies and their related components will have the desired impact relative to replication in other settings.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

Strengths:

None noted

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question

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

Sub Question

Strengths:

In response to up-to-date knowledge the applicant provides citations in reference to professional development, cross-curricula collaboration, arts-integrated curriculum and critical thinking. All citations as presented are relevant to supporting major elements of the applicant's project design. The supporting information reflect best practices. P. 11

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant's theory for the project has been developed based on three assumptions (teacher professional development, arts integration and critical thinking). The supporting information provided for each area denotes a sound collective theory that support major elements of the project and its benefits to students and teachers. P. 17

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant has established a complete framework relative to how the project will address improved teaching and learning and supporting rigorous academic standards for students. Noted highlights include curricula development that focus on standards, observing teachers, the development of informal assessments and the close monitoring of lesson plans. Additionally, all strategies are in alignment with supporting Common Core standards. P. 22

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

With the strong emphasis on professional development for teachers the project inherently offers sustainability. Additionally, strategies received by students will translate from grade level to grade level and will enhance increased academic achievement. The project will also establish community-based partnerships further demonstrating sustainability once federal funding ended. P. 23

Weaknesses:

None noted

Sub Question

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 identified staff for the project has the required educational background and professional experiences needed to lead and implement the day-to-day activities of the project. P. 26 The project director has earned a Phd. With over 30 years of experience in public education. She has a background in curriculum development. Dr. Johnson will serve as the principal investigator. He has earned a Phd and has an extensive vitae which outlines his many relevant research publications in the arts. Resumes are included as attachments.

Weaknesses:

None noted

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:

None noted

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 has outlined a detailed management plan as evidenced by the development of a timeline that denotes when key activities and events will take place along with staff responsibilities. The overall plan identifies key goals with supporting objectives all of which are directly aligned with addressing the needs and intended

Sub Question

purposes of the grant. P. 29

Weaknesses:

None noted

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 commitment of all key staff will effectively support the project and its intended purposes. Noted positions include the principal investigator (.25 year (1.0 summer), evaluator (.40), consulting teacher (.10) and arts infusion coach (.50). P. 34

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Through the development of a quality assurance plan the applicant has structured a plan that will allow for continuous feedback. Highlights of the plan include questions about project operations, instruments, monitoring format and feedback. The plan will have the desired impact in response to decision-making, defining the status and quality of the project. P. 35

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

Strengths:

None noted

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The evaluation design as developed by the applicant will effectively meet the needs of the project. As presented, the plan will focus on the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data all of which are directly aligned with the needs of the project. Data will be collected through pre and post tests, surveys, interviews, observations and student assessments. The evaluation will rely on a quasi-experimental design which supports data analysis. The role of staff and the external evaluator are clearly defined. P. 36

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Through the utilization of benchmarks, measures and data collection the applicant will be able to gather performance feedback information that can be used for periodic assessment specific to determining the status of established outcomes. P. 48 Additionally, all benchmarks are consistent with supporting performance feedback.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

As developed the evaluation will effectively offer potential advances to the educational literature relative to arts education and improved student achievement by focusing on the use of instructional technology and curriculum integration. P. 49

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score:**Priority Questions****Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Technology**

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

Strengths:

The applicant meets all requirements under competitive priority 2. Supporting information specific to the use and inclusion of technology is noted throughout the development of the application. Noted examples include the focus on technology and its instructional utilization, providing teachers with iPads, staff training in the utilization of technology (iPads) and providing teachers with access to online resources that reflect best practices.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/27/2014 02:02 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/19/2014 07:43 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Topeka Public Schools -- USD 501 (U351D140074)

Reader #3: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Need for Project | | |
| 1. Need for Project | 15 | 15 |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 10 | 10 |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Quality of Project Design | 25 | 25 |
| Quality of Project Personnel | | |
| 1. Project Personnel | 10 | 10 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 20 | 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 #6 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 6: 84.351D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Topeka Public Schools -- USD 501 (U351D140074)

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: 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:

With a 165% increase in ELL students, TAIP's strong arts education may provide a unique outlet for ELLs because of the verbal and nonverbal opportunities in the arts classroom. Arts education can help to "engage learners whose language traditions are devalued in mainstream education" (Brown et al) (p. 3) Additionally strong arts education can increase cultural relevancy of education for students from low- income and/or diverse racial backgrounds. (p 5) providing a channel for the regulation of behavior and emotion. Social-emotional learning and processing abilities addressed by TAIP curriculum goals to equip teachers with arts-infused techniques that will aide in raising expectations for students, which also impacts attendance.

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Analysis specific to the need for each program objective—and developed with evidences of promise. Limited access to the arts, and the only electives offered. TAIP expands offerings, introducing arts integration, and strengthening arts instruction through collaborative and community opportunities. (p 6) Limited opportunities for standards based professional development. TAIP offers intensive on sight cross- curriculum arts infusion tied to state standards.

Sub Question

Lack of arts leadership – TAIP will hire an Arts Infusion Coach to provide leadership, support and oversight for the schools targeted in this project. Need for CT skills in Arts Curricula. Taip provides strong CT to match the art doing with art knowing.

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

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

Strengths:

Dissemination plans are diverse and combine face to face and digital dissemination strategies. Products, including classroom resources, lesson plans, and training models planned and disseminated in direct training, internet, conference presentations, journal publications and on-line community of practice.

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 25

Sub Question

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:

Quality of assurance plan, up to date research from project Zero, Gordon, Goddard. Professional development, cross curricular collaboration, arts integrated curriculum with critical thinking infused all supported by prior models (CAPE, A+ schools, Arts for Academic Achievement) and literature. (pg. 11 – 12)

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

(pg. 1) The Critical Thinking approach, defined as a purposeful, self-regulatory judgment, which results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation, and inference” (Facione, 1990, p. 3) is the core of the theory framing this project. This aligns well with 2 goals – to strengthen integration of standards – based arts instruction by infusing CT into all aspects of instruction and assessment, and to employ CT in arts integrated reading and math standards. Kansas City Project STArts and Harvard’s Project Zero and Artful Thinking are models for the Critical Thinking (CT) goals.

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The TAIP model builds on the following 1/ Teacher professional development impacts student learning. 2/ arts integration benefit students curriculum and thus student achievement improves and 3/ critical thinking integrates with higher level thinking – together these positively impact student learning. (p 17)

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The logic model (pg. 19) illustrates development of short term outcomes to long term outcomes to secure the lessons learned. For example: external funding supports PD for 120 teachers that turn knowledge into curriculum that continues to develop in the long term by the Community of Practice independent PD. Additionally community partners and systemic change will assure the ongoing work begun with the AEMDD grant.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

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

In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor:

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

Strengths:

All staff have experience managing and evaluating USDE grants. The TAIP team will include a principal investigator, the arts infusion coach, and external evaluators. All holding doctorates and/or prior experience in the arts.

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

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: 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.**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The plan includes specific milestones, personnel, timeline aligned for each project objective and each project goal. Multiple assessments planned and evaluated with data looped back to impact implementation. (Pg. 32) Quality assurance table and monitoring format - with guiding questions, use, timeline, purpose, instruments to assure thorough, and thoughtful planning. (pg. 37)

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

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:

Table 6 on page 34 fully addresses staffing time and commitments. Highly qualified and experienced key personnel collaborate on program oversight and implementation: Cox is responsible for overall project oversight and ensuring that logistics in 501 run smoothly, Eason and Johnson will maintain oversight of their fields. (pg. 29)

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Page 36 provides Monitoring Table, which includes multiple assessment instruments such as focus groups, interviews, gathering qualitative and quantitative data. Responsible personnel assure feedback loop, and how data is to used, such as quarterly reports, refinement of courses and PD.

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

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:

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:

Performance measures for each objective produce quantitative and qualitative data. (p 36) using Context-input-process-product approach which address both process and product. The Quality Assurance Plan (p 35) indicates evaluation instruments, person responsible, timelines, collection methods, and feedback reports. Pre/posttests, quasi-experimental control group, checklists, rubrics student assessments, interviews, surveys, observations of teachers used. (p 37)

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Process evaluation will focus on implementation of project activities and adherence to the work plan. This part of the evaluation will be designed for continuous monitoring, feedback, and improvement, and will serve as the basis for modifications and adjustments throughout TAIP. The clarity of Table 8 (pg 39) is excellent, it outlines the benchmarks, measures, and data collection that will be used to assess progress toward objectives and implementation of TAIP activities. In addition to those measures, the Quality Assurance Plan (Table 7) outlines process evaluation measures, which will include interviews with project personnel, observations of TAIP. (pg. 50)

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Project reliability examined by school level differences using Stufflebeams transportability evaluation framework. Additionally implementation records will be analyzed to track school level differences between original plan and outcomes. (p 39)

Weaknesses:

no weakness noted

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:

Community of Practice – sharing of classroom practice for feedback and PD.
IPad will be used to connect teachers with learning apps is a resource.

Weaknesses:

Technology not developed specifically to support student achievement - such as research, inquiry, differentiated instruction etc.
Building the capacity of teachers - performance targets etc. on Community of Practice is not reflected in the program evaluation.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/19/2014 07:43 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/24/2014 02:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Topeka Public Schools -- USD 501 (U351D140074)

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 | 24 |
| 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 | 19 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 98 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2 | | |
| Technology | | |
| 1. CPP: Technology | 5 | 4 |
| Sub Total | 5 | 4 |
| Total | 105 | 102 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Development & Dissemination Grant Program - 6: 84.351D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Topeka Public Schools -- USD 501 (U351D140074)

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:

Schools that will participate in the project serve a significant number of at-risk students. Evidence offered includes school demographics (p. 4) and statements about target school status as either Focus (among the lower performing of the 10% of Title I schools) or "priority" (persistently low achieving schools).

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Lack of access to arts-based education is cited as a challenge to overall curriculum quality, including lack of opportunities to develop critical thinking skills. In addition, teacher professional development is identified as a gap in infrastructure, that the program will address via teacher-focused activities.

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted.

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 application cites the ease with which critical thinking (CT) can be integrated into existing instruction, thus increasing the utility of project products. Use of a tech-based community of practice will also ensure utility of the model across settings. Resources will be designed to be useful across class types and age groups (p.8-11).

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted.

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: 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:

Ongoing professional development, cross-curricular collaboration among teachers, and critical thinking in arts-infused curricula are cited as providing research-based warrants for TAIP promise. Each of these components is well-described and referenced (pp11-13).

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted.

Sub Question

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The logic model is very well aligned to project objectives. Project activities and outcomes described in the narrative are also clearly reflected in the logic model.

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The partner district has already identified 'arts signature schools' to encourage performance and demonstration of newly acquired skills, the proposed project aligns with this effort as well as National and Kansas Common Core standards and National Arts Standards.

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

A main strength of the proposal is the online community of practice. This is an inexpensive but powerful way to maintain collaboration, as well as repositories, after the grant period.

Weaknesses:

The extensive ongoing PD will not persist after the grant. New teachers will not have access to the same level of training despite the presence of the online community of practice.

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:

All personnel are well-qualified to conduct this work. Each team member has significant capabilities in their respective fields.

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted.

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: 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 management plan is adequate to conduct the proposed project tasks. The plan includes a series of milestones related to each project goal as well as a timeline to specify sequences of proposed project activities (p.29-30).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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:

Time commitments of all project staff are adequate and appropriate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The management plan includes formative data as part of activity monitoring as well as a Quality Assurance Plan. Plans for communication among team members (regular meetings to ensure project quality) are also identified.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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.**

Strengths:

The evaluation plan includes extensive data collection across project outcomes (for both teacher and student outcomes). Outcomes are appropriate for the project goals.

Weaknesses:

Given the importance of the community of practice (and limited use of technology), teacher use of the community should appear more significantly in the evaluation plan (beyond outcome 1.4.a which cites 'general participation rates').

Reader's Score:

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

Plan includes formative data as part of activity monitoring. A Quality Assurance Plan is also included which describes roles, responsibilities, feedback loops and timelines for project activities.

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Empirical evidence produced by related programs is cited. Similar outcome measure will be collected in this study and related to standardized achievement measures.

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Technology

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

Strengths:

Online community of practice provides an essential tool for the PD aspect of the program, including ongoing collaboration among teachers. The online community extends the program's reach.

Weaknesses:

Student use of technology is not considered as part of the project.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/24/2014 02:29 PM