

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/20/2014 09:45 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Dorchester School District Two (U351D140056)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	15	12
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	15
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	87
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Technology</b>		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	105	92

# Technical Review Form

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

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

**Applicant:** Dorchester School District Two (U351D140056)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan to address the needs of students in the district's two lowest performing schools, and includes data that describes low academic achievement (page 4), high poverty (page 3) and a high percent of students that speak a language other than English (page 3). Details regarding the implementation of Innovative Arts Discovery Labs devoted to arts-integrated academic content are described on pages 2 and 3. The applicant describes plans to utilize hands-on learning communities of students and teachers that will engage in activities that integrate the arts into science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEAM), and language arts technology centers that will promote reading for K-3 graders (pages 2-3). The applicant provides a description of low academic achievement for sub-groups of students in the target population, and includes details regarding results of district assessments in Mathematics, English Language Arts, and Science (page 4-7).

#### Weaknesses:

Details regarding gaps and weaknesses in current services and infrastructure are limited. It is unclear what programs and services are currently in place to support professional development, parents, teachers and students.

**Reader's Score:** 12

#### Sub Question

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan to address the needs of students in the district's two lowest performing schools, and includes data that describes low academic achievement (page 4), high poverty (page 3) and a high percent of students that speak a language other than English (page 3). Details regarding the implementation of Innovative Arts Discovery Labs devoted to arts-integrated academic content are described on pages 2 and 3. The applicant describes plans to utilize hands-on learning communities of students and teachers that will engage in activities that integrate the arts into science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEAM), and language arts technology centers that will promote reading for K-3 graders (pages 2-3).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**

### Sub Question

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 provides a description of low academic achievement for sub-groups of students in the target population, and includes details regarding results of district assessments in Mathematics, English Language Arts, and Science (page 4-7).

#### **Weaknesses:**

Details regarding gaps and weaknesses in current services and infrastructure are limited. It is unclear what programs and services are currently in place to support professional development, parents, teachers and students.

#### **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 provides a plan to produce a research-based curriculum, teaching strategies, and documents that will be shared at state and national conferences, during site visits by visiting educators, and replicated at other schools in the district (page 9). Examples include the implementation of media lab where students will produce podcasts, newspapers, graphic design projects, and instructional television that will be broadcasted through a site-based network. The applicant provides evidence of a research-based approach to effective teaching and learning in the arts, academics, and technology that is based on identified International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards for teachers and students (page 8).

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant describes a project design that reflects cited research on effective practices for improving student achievement in the targeted population. Examples include research that support arts integration and arts instruction as a strategy for supporting English language learners (page 10), evidence that indicates higher doses of instructional time

improve performance in mastery learning (page 11), brain research that documents how the arts promotes neural development, and knowledge from research that indicates the use of visual representations of complex subject matter increases understanding and conceptualization of abstract ideas (page 12). The applicant provides numerous research studies that support project strategies depicted in a logic model on page 17. A representation of a strong theory of action is also provided and includes project strategies, results, and impact (page 16). The applicant includes evidence that the project activities are aligned to the elements of the logic model and theory of action. The applicant provides a cohesive plan to improve teaching and learning through the integrations of standards-based STEAM activities involving a media lab, iPads, and digital tools for teachers and students. Examples of planned professional development activities that will increase teacher effectiveness include college arts and media courses and one week summer institutes in the arts and technology (page 19). The applicant mentions the infusion of an arts integration curriculum that address the Common Core State Standards and the adoption and use of the National Core Arts Standards (page 18). The applicant describes the purpose of the project, which is to create an arts integrated curriculum that can be replicated, maintained and sustained (page 20). Details are provided regarding how the use of staff development and artistic resources will support a model program using technology.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Sub Question**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes a project design that reflects cited research on effective practices for improving student achievement in the targeted population. Examples include research that support arts integration and arts instruction as a strategy for supporting English language learners (page 10), evidence that indicates higher doses of instructional time improve performance in mastery learning (page 11), brain research that documents how the arts promotes neural development, and knowledge from research that indicates the use of visual representations of complex subject matter increases understanding and conceptualization of abstract ideas (page 12).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides numerous research studies that support project strategies depicted in a logic model on page 17. A representation of a strong theory of action is also provided and includes project strategies, results, and impact (page 16). The applicant includes evidence that the project activities are aligned to the elements of the logic model and theory of action.

**Weaknesses:**

No 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.**

### Sub Question

#### Strengths:

The applicant provides a cohesive plan to improve teaching and learning through the integrations of standards-based STEAM activities involving a media lab, iPads, and digital tools for teachers and students. Examples of planned professional development activities that will increase teacher effectiveness include college arts and media courses and one week summer institutes in the arts and technology (page 19). The applicant mentions the infusion of an arts integration curriculum that address the Common Core State Standards and the adoption and use of the National Core Arts Standards (page 18).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

#### Reader's Score:

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

#### Strengths:

The applicant describes the purpose of the project, which is to create an arts integrated curriculum that can be replicated, maintained and sustained (page 20). Details are provided regarding how the use of staff development and artistic resources will support a model program using technology.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The applicant describes a non-discrimination policy that prohibits the use of race, color, national origin, age or disability in making hiring decisions. There is a plan to include broad advertising and recruitment efforts to attract a diverse candidate pool for grant-funded positions. The applicant describes details regarding the role and qualifications of project director, (page 22), the project evaluator, (page 23), a theater teacher (page 24), and an arts technologist (page 25).

#### Weaknesses:

No 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:**

The applicant provides a tables on pages 32-40 that include a timeline of grant activities, persons responsible, and evaluation/ documentation. The applicant describes a management plan that includes a table that includes two advisory boards, a full time project director, a part time principal investigator (.6), a full time arts technologist, and several other part time and full time staff (page 41). The applicant mentions conducting advisory board meetings, School Improvement Council meetings, parent nights, and parent and community information meetings (page 33) are mentioned in regard to feedback from stakeholders. Bilingual brochures about the project are mentioned on page 43. There is also a plan to post information about the project on a website, and to add survey questions about the project to an existing parent survey (page 43).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not clearly specify a plan for implementing grant funded interventions. It is unclear who will write the planned curriculum and when curriculum writing events will take place. For examples, terms such as 'ongoing' are used to describe when activities will occur. The applicant lists 'teachers' as being responsible for the development of the curriculum, creating arts integration units, (page 34), trainings, and attending summer training. However, it is unclear how the pre and post tests mentioned to test the curriculum, will be created and by whom, and if they will be validated prior to use. The applicant does not provide enough information in order to determine if these tasks will be completed on time and within budget. Details regarding project milestones are limited, as are details regarding how the applicant will use procedures to ensure continuous improvement. For example, the applicant mentions a parent survey that will be used to collect suggestions and comments on the program's effectiveness, however, it is unclear when the results of the survey will be available and how they will be reviewed or used for improving the project.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub Question**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a tables on pages 32-40 that include a timeline of grant activities, persons responsible, and evaluation/ documentation.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not clearly specify a plan for implementing grant funded interventions. It is unclear who will write the planned curriculum and when curriculum writing events will take place. For examples, terms such as 'ongoing' are used to describe when activities will occur. The applicant lists 'teachers' as being responsible for the development of the curriculum, creating arts integration units, (page 34), trainings, and attending summer training. However, it is unclear how the pre and post tests mentioned to test the curriculum, will be created and by whom, and if they will be validated prior to use. The applicant does not provide enough information in order to determine if these tasks will be completed on time and within budget. Details regarding project milestones are limited.

**Reader's Score:**

## Sub Question

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 describes a management plan that includes a table that includes two advisory boards, a full time project director, a part time principal investigator (.6), a full time arts technologist, and several other part time and full time staff (page 41).

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

### 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 mentions conducting advisory board meetings, School Improvement Council meetings, parent nights, and parent and community information meetings (page 33) are mentioned in regard to feedback from stakeholders. Bilingual brochures about the project are mentioned on page 43. There is also a plan to post information about the project on a website, and to add survey questions about the project to an existing parent survey (page 43). Support from the PTA is mentioned on page 42.

### Weaknesses:

Details regarding how the applicant will use procedures to ensure continuous improvement are limited. For example, the applicant mentions a parent survey that will be used to collect suggestions and comments on the program's effectiveness, however, it is unclear when the results of the survey will be available and how they will be reviewed or used for improving the project.

### Reader's Score:

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

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

### Strengths:

The applicant proposes a plan to test a new curriculum for arts integration using a comprehensive quasi-experimental design. Data collection includes the use of standardized test scores, stakeholder surveys, discipline rates (page45), and attendance rates. The applicant provides a table on page 46 that describes evaluation methods that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Data collection includes standardized test scores, surveys on student motivation, teacher focus group, school staff interviews and a review of lesson plans. The applicant describes multiple methods of evaluation that will be used to evaluate grant funded activities.

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear how some of the data collection activities relate to the need for the project or how they will be impacted by project activities. For example, the applicant did not mention discipline issues or school climate problems in regard to a need for funding, but provides a plan to collect multiple indicators related to this issue as a measure of project success. It is unclear how the methods of evaluation will be compiled, synthesized, and reviewed. For example, the applicant states that standardized test data will be compared to the previous year's data, but does not say by whom or how they will be reported. It is also unclear who will develop, administer and analyze the disaggregated results of the locally developed pre and post tests mentioned on page 45. It is unclear if some of the methods of evaluation mentioned by the applicant are reasonable or feasible for measuring outcomes. For example, the applicant does not specify how some of the measures will be validated before being used. The applicant describes a method for testing a new curriculum using matched schools, but does not provide enough information to determine if this matching process will be reliable.

**Reader's Score: 15****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 proposes a plan to test a new curriculum for arts integration using a comprehensive quasi-experimental design.

Data collection includes the use of standardized test scores, stakeholder surveys, discipline rates (page45), and attendance rates.

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear how some of the data collection activities relate to the need for the project or how they will be impacted by project activities. For example, the applicant did not mention discipline issues or school climate problems in regard to a need for funding, but provides a plan to collect multiple indicators related to this issue as a measure of project success.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a table on page 46 that describes evaluation methods that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. Data collection includes standardized test scores, surveys on student motivation, teacher focus group, school staff interviews and a review of lesson plans.

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear how the methods of evaluation will be compiled, synthesized, and reviewed. For example, the applicant states that standardized test data will be compared to the previous year's data, but does not say by whom or how they will be reported. It is also unclear who will develop, administer and analyze the disaggregated results of the locally developed pre and post tests mentioned on page 45.

**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.)**

**Sub Question**

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes multiple methods of evaluation that will be used to evaluate grant funded activities.

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear if some of the methods of evaluation mentioned by the applicant are reasonable or feasible for measuring outcomes. For example, the applicant does not specify how some of the measures will be validated before being used. The applicant describes a method for testing a new curriculum using matched schools, but does not provide enough information to determine if this matching process will be reliable.

**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 mentions a plan to implement a convergence media lab, where students will use all their STEAM talents to produce pod-casts, newspapers, graphic design projects, and instructional television shows that will be broadcast to both of the target schools through a site based network. Details regarding the use of streaming videos of arts-integrated student projects, productions, and newscasts are mentioned. The applicant states that classroom sets of iPads will permit students and teachers to extend the lessons from the Arts Discovery Labs and to express and document what they are learning in innovative and creative ways.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 06/20/2014 09:45 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/07/2014 07:21 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Dorchester School District Two (U351D140056)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	15	13
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	18
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	96
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Technology</b>		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	105	101

# Technical Review Form

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

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Dorchester School District Two (U351D140056)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Need for Project

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

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

#### Strengths:

This section is well developed.

#### Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: 13

#### Sub Question

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

#### Strengths:

Dorchester District (DD2) services students from culturally diverse families. It is noted within the grant application that the districts has students that speak over 23 languages and are represented from over 50 countries. The district has created a feasible Science, Technology, Arts, and Reading (STAR) K-3rd grade project to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEAM) 4th – 8th grade project plan that will integrate National Core Arts into Common Core State Standards for ELA and Math while closing the achievement gap, increasing student achievement, and increasing academic motivation of 1,800 students a year.

The schools (one elementary and one middle school) selected to participate in the project are composed of highly transient, mostly low-income, mostly academically at-risk, non-English speaking students. The applicant's detailed description notes that the selected are the only two schools that did not make progress in closing achievement gaps among disaggregated student groups.

#### Weaknesses:

Strong evidence of a need for grant funding to enhance professional development to support a need to assist students with reaching academic goals is limited in this grant application.

#### Reader's Score:

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

**Sub Question**

**Strengths:**

There is convincing evidence that there are gaps in gender performance on academic assessments and gaps in ethnicity sub group performance on academic assessments. A clear rationale on why up to date research and materials are needed in these two schools presented in the project.

**Weaknesses:**

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

**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:**

Products utilized in this project include convergence digital media, discover lab and professional development products. Dorchester's desire to provide up to date research and expose students and teachers to 21st century technology is understood. With grant funding, it is feasible for the school district to create a new model for teaching and learning within the schools. AEMDD funding will also provide an opportunity for the grant applicant to share the findings from the quality project at state a national conferences and through site visits.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

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

**Strengths:**

Full points have been assigned.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 25**

**Sub Question**

## 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:

Evidence that district utilized research and effective practices from across the country is provided. Research is presented that arts transcends language and culture. Also, evidence is presented that students who participate in the arts have higher math scores, that drama provides a window for at-risk students to learn to read, and art teaches critical thinking and problem solving.

The district has quoted research that instructional time has more of an influence on student learning than class size. As a result of this research, there will be an increase in the instructional time in the two project schools. This increase in instructional time demonstrates a clear understanding to this notice that an increase in student achievement is an utmost priority.

The district has done an excellent job throughout the grant application of providing a mental visual of what the Arts Discovery Labs will look like for learners, instructors, as well as parents. In the labs, student will be exposed to quality technology. The labs are also described to be engaging and will be created with a goal to peak students' interest in the arts and STEM content areas.

#### Weaknesses:

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

#### Reader's Score:

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

#### Strengths:

The district has provided a logic model on page 17 of the grant application. It is understood that the projects goal is to integrate arts curriculum, technology, and professional development while increasing instructional time. It is understood from review of the logic model that Dorchester aims to have increased student achievement, lowered achievement gaps and better school climates after project implementation.

#### Weaknesses:

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

#### Reader's Score:

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

#### Strengths:

The district's desire to provide the opportunity for teachers in the targeted schools to take one graduate course and to attend two Curriculum Leadership in the Arts (CLIA) or SC Educational Television (SCETV) summer training sessions during the four-year funding period is innovative and exposes teachers to high quality professional development. These professional development courses are clear efforts to ensure that the staff enrichment/development are aligned with project goals and it also provides teachers with time to collaborate and effectively plan lessons.

#### Weaknesses:

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

**Sub Question**

**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 notes that after initial implementation, there will be minimal need to train and produce policy and procedures. The district has effectively written that the all grant funded positions will be maintained through district funds upon completion of the grant cycle.

**Weaknesses:**

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

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

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

**In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor:**

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

**Strengths:**

Listed in the grant application is a non discrimination policy to hire underrepresented personnel. Qualifications of key personnel are listed in the grant application. All listed personnel holds vast experience in arts education and arts educational research. In addition, the applicant has provided resumes in the appendix for all key personnel.

Project Director – Mr. Larry Barnfield has experience serving on the board of directors and as vice president of the National Art Education Association, president-elect of the SC Alliance for Arts, and vice-chair of the National Art Education Foundation. He is recipient of the Disney American Teacher Award.

Evaluator – has served as project evaluator for several federal grants including the prior AEMDD grant award and is the key grant writer for the proposed project.

Principal – currently is a first year principal at Eagle Nest elementary School and is a former performing arts teacher.

Principal – has been a building principal since 200 6 and is a second year at River Oaks Middle School. and holds over ten years experience as director of bands.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

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

**Strengths:**

This section is fully developed.

**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:**

Dorchester has made provisions to create an elementary and middle school advisory board to provide guidance, assistance, and oversight to project activities. The thoroughly designed plan includes the principal, arts technologist, members of the arts faculty, content area instructional interventionist, principal investigator, grade level representatives and a member of the School Improvement Council.

Descriptive goals for yearly activities are included in the proposal. Page twenty-eight of the grant application includes a nine-week management plan example for 3rd grade teachers. The applicant decision to ensure that all teachers are instructionally aligned is sound. Also included is a well written curriculum testing and implementation schedule. It is unique that the school district will provide monetary incentives each nine week period to teachers that conduct pre-and post test in addition to submitting classroom data. This ensures that teachers are vested in the project design, delivery, and evaluation.

The four year timeline on pages thirty two through forty of major grant activities is well documented. The descriptions of activities, responsibilities of key personnel are provided and leave no questions of how project goals will be accomplished.

**Weaknesses:**

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

**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 goals to ensure that the STAR to STEAM project is effectively implement is evident. It is appropriate that the school district will hire a fulltime project director and that the principal investigator will spend three days a week on grant evaluation and assessment. Table 8 on page forty-one one the grant application describes key personnel, level of effort, and district funding sources for the created positions.

**Sub Question**

**Weaknesses:**

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

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

Feedback and continuous improvement plans are included in the grant application. Dorchester has done a good job describing how the two advisory board and parent teacher associations will be utilized to gather feedback to assist with conducting annual surveys and gathering community input. Also, the decision to make translated materials available for bilingual families is sound.

**Weaknesses:**

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

**Reader's Score:**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

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

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

**Strengths:**

This section is well developed.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 18**

**Sub Question**

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

**Strengths:**

Dorchester Table 9 located on page forty-four, and Table 10 located on page forty-six, includes a partial list of quantitative performance measures, timelines, and outcomes. Included are project objectives and ambitious goals to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps and improve school climate. The plan to yearly increase student improvement by 10% from the previous year is ambitious.

**Weaknesses:**

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

## Sub Question

### Reader's Score:

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

#### Strengths:

Devices and procedures used to gather feedback include rubrics; Likert scales; teacher observation documents; checklists; surveys from parents, teachers and students; notes and recommendations from advisory and school improvement meetings. These listed documents are appropriate tools to assess the progress of the STAR to STEAM goals.

#### Weaknesses:

It is unclear how the grant applicant will establish validity for surveys that will be used.

### 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 district has noted that the grant project are aligned with the What Works Clearinghouse: strategies that increase students' learning of science content, processes and skills, and determining if particular interventions are more effective for particular student groups. Convincing documentation of current project goals and past success from the school district make it believable that the evaluation of the STAR to STEAM project will produce evidence of promise.

#### Weaknesses:

Although project goals are thoroughly mentioned, the applicant has not established how methods to improve school climate is aligned with the need of the project or the project overarching goals.

### 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 school district desires to create Innovative Arts Discovery Labs, with current arts technology and electronic instructional centers devoted to arts-integrated content is innovative. The plan to ensure that the labs integrate curriculum and the proposal to ensure that the labs are considered challenging learning labs with hands-on activities for both teachers and students is ambitious.

The plan to provide students and teachers with classroom i-pads and the district's desire to infuse podcast, graphic design projects, and instructional television shows to both selected project sites demonstrates a desire by the school district to expose educational stakeholders and the community to high-quality digital tools and materials.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses with section.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 07/07/2014 07:21 AM

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Dorchester School District Two (U351D140056)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for Project</b>		
1. Need for Project	15	12
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	10	8
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	25
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	10	10
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	20	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	89
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Technology</b>		
1. CPP: Technology	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	105	94

# Technical Review Form

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

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Dorchester School District Two (U351D140056)

## 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: 12

#### Sub Question

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

#### Strengths:

Dorchester District Two will partner with the College of Charleston to offer services to two lowest performing schools in the district. The two participating schools are the newest schools in the district and have the highest number of at risk students in the district. The two schools share a common campus thus allowing for sharing of resources. The services proposed include infusing arts integrated curriculum into science, technology, engineering and mathematics. The K-8 curriculum integrates the National Core Arts Standards into the National Common Core Standards is a novel idea. The applicants refer to this unique model as STAR to STEAM. The applicants thoroughly explain their plan to provide other services such as the development the Arts Discovery labs which will be involve cutting edge technology for teachers use in curriculum development and training. The multitude of services offered will increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gap, and increase academic motivation for the approximately 1800 at risk students at the middle and elementary schools selected is discussed on pages 2-7.

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

- (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 applicants fully describe the needs of the students at risk of failing in the two schools selected by provided school demographic and student performance level data. The data was very detailed and included details such as

### Sub Question

Enrollment data, percent ESOL, per pupil expenditure, percentages of subsidized meals, ELA, mathematics, and science performance data, percentages by gender profile, and percentage by racial background. The applicants clearly articulate the gaps and weaknesses of the two schools selected to include their technological limitations and how this project by creating the Arts Discover Lab will address many of those gaps and weaknesses. The arts lab creates an infrastructure to provide the needed services and uniquely the lab can be shared by the two schools which serve for more collaboration and sharing of resources as intended by the applicant.

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

#### Reader's Score:

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

#### Strengths:

The applicants fully describe the needs of the students at risk of failing in the two schools selected by provided school demographic and student performance level data. The data was very detailed and included details such as Enrollment data, percent ESOL, per pupil expenditure, percentages of subsidized meals, ELA, mathematics, and science performance data, percentages by gender profile, and percentage by racial background. The applicants clearly articulate the gaps and weaknesses of the two schools selected to include their technological limitations and how this project by creating the Arts Discover Lab will address many of those gaps and weaknesses. The arts lab creates an infrastructure to provide the needed services and uniquely the lab can be shared by the two schools which serve for more collaboration and sharing of resources as intended by the applicant.

#### Weaknesses:

This application would have been strengthened if there were more examples provided that describe exactly which gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructures, and opportunities will be addressed by this proposed arts project.

#### 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 applicants provide an adequate summary of the products that will likely result by the implementation of the proposed project on pages 7 and 8. The products include print, television radio, internet, curriculum, interactive technologies, and partnerships. The applicants also demonstrate how the proposed project will align the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards for students and teachers into this arts integration project.

**Weaknesses:**

The weaknesses noted in this section of the grant is that the applicants failed to identify and explain which materials and processes is more likely to be highly effective in other settings. There other settings discussed on page 9 such as national and state conferences, sharing with other district, hosting site visits etc. clearly demonstrate dissemination and sharing but that does not address the potential effectiveness in a variety of other setting.

**Reader's Score:** 8

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

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

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:** 25

**Sub Question**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicants cite current research to support the design of the proposed project in arts integration. The research cited throughout the grant proposal validates and supports the design if the STAR to STEAM project in arts integration. The current research cited on teacher effectiveness includes instruction time, arts and personalized learning time in technology integrated arts curriculum, and visual learning theories, arts transcend language and culture. The applicants cite have thoroughly shown the extent to which the proposed project reflects current research on teacher effectiveness.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses noted in this section of the grant proposal.

**Reader's Score:**

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

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

The applicant's theory of change draws from four research-based theories on page 10: 1) the reading ability in STEM education is basic, 2) greater time on task yields higher achievement, 3) arts transcend language and culture fosters cross-cultural understanding, and 4) Arts is a key subject/skill to acquire compared to science, technology, and engineering. The theories are validated and well explained. The theories extend quite well to the underpinnings and philosophy of the STAR to STEM project design.

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses noted in this section of the grant proposal.

### 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 applicants propose teaching and learning goals that will support rigorous academic standards for students in the two selected schools in Dorchester school district. The current research cited, the logic map on page 16, the arts labs, the professional development opportunities, the technological tools created, the partnerships, the alignment of the national Common Core Standards are all part of the comprehensive efforts of the applicants to improve teaching and learning.

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

### Reader's Score:

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

### Strengths:

The applicant fully describe how the proposed STAR to STEAM project results will be sustained after the grant cycle ends on pages 20 and 21. The sound conclusion drawn include is that the funding provided by this grant to purchase major equipment, train personnel to be proficient, develop and test curriculum, implement the project will facilitate minimize the project sustainability needs. For example, since the major equipment would have been purchased the sustainability focus would be geared toward maintenance and upkeep. Another example would be that the teachers have already been trained so only new teachers would need training to sustain the project. The district will fund the grant personnel beyond the cycle of the grant

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

**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 applicant includes rich discussions on recruiting and retaining traditionally underrepresented groups in the proposed project on page 22. The applicant has highly qualified key personnel to execute the proposed project as designed including the theater arts teacher and the arts technologist.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

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

**The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project by considering the following factors:**

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 17**

**Sub Question**

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

**Sub Question**

**Strengths:**

The management plan includes several charts and tables describing the project activities, personnel and the roles and responsibilities of those funded by the project. The project timelines are also detailed in the charts. The applicant highlights that the project director will have an advisory board at each school. The advisory board will serve the purpose of program oversight, guidance, and assistance to support the project task and the assigned responsibilities of the project personnel.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The project director, principal investigator, arts technologists, district testing coordinator, arts instructors and other key personnel and their time commitment to this grant proposal are outlined in a comprehensive chart on page 41. The applicant highlighted the complete funding source for each of the project personnel listed by including that detailed information in the chart. There is a strong team of highly experienced and qualified staff on the project.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

There are no strengths in this section of the grant proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicants failed to provide sufficient details in the proposed project to ensure feedback and continuous improvement. There is limited information on the feedback loop between the partners, stakeholders, teachers, and students.

**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:** 17

**Sub Question**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicants provide a well designed quasi-experimental evaluation design in which they describe how the proposed project will be assessed. They include evaluation formative and summative assessment, questions, evaluation goals and objectives, evaluation survey instrumentation plans, and in-depth discussions of evaluation instrument development, data collection, and data analysis procedures. For example, evaluation methods include surveys and interviews. The evaluation activities are embedded in the project timelines table. The applicants explicitly state replication and generalizability of project findings.

The applicants propose a sound evaluation plan. The use of robust and rigorous evaluation methodological tools imply the applicants have designed a highly effective evaluation. The power analysis, the use of multilevel modeling, program logic models, and differential impact analysis are among some of the additional evaluation methodological tools that enhance this evaluation plan. The expertise and experience of the independent evaluator proposed is encouraging. The applicants discuss longitudinal impact and a detailed evaluation budget that outlines the evaluation activities and associated cost. The applicants include a well thought and defined logic map. The evaluation log map included contains inputs, outputs, outcomes, and long and short term evaluation goals which also strengthens this grant proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses in the section of the grant.

**Reader's Score:**

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

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

This is a well-designed evaluation plan that also includes a detailed discussion of the feedback and continuous improvement plan for the performance measures and overall development of the evaluation plan.

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

### Reader's Score:

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

### Strengths:

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

The investigators propose a quasi-experimental research design using a mixed methods evaluation approach which adds rigor to the study. The triangulation of data, validity and reliability is more evidence of a strong methodological plan appropriate for the evaluation of the proposed project. The applicants thoroughly discuss fidelity of implementation and coupled with the extensive comprehensive evaluation efforts provides promising evidence of the extent to which implementation is likely to be achieved.

### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses identified.

### 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 addresses the technology competitive priority preference on page 2 as evident by the use of year-long digital art portfolios and Microsoft One Note.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score:**     **5**

---

**Status:**           Submitted  
**Last Updated:**   07/15/2014 09:50 AM