

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2014 11:02 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson Parish Public School System (U351C140022)

Reader #1: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 5 | 5 |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 10 | 10 |
| Quality of Project Services | | |
| 1. Project Services | 15 | 15 |
| Quality of Project Personnel | | |
| 1. Project Personnel | 15 | 15 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 30 | 20 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 25 | 20 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 85 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| CPP-Technology | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority-Technology | | |
| 1. CPP-Technology | 20 | 20 |
| Sub Total | 20 | 20 |
| Total | 120 | 105 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Professional Development Arts Educators - 2: 84.351C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Jefferson Parish Public School System (U351C140022)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

General:

The applicant effectively demonstrates that plans and strategies are in place to publish the framework and guidelines for the training model. The proposed professional development model will use the project to document best practices and teaching strategies and maintain a directory of project products for ongoing reference by participants, external partners, and other educators.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

1. **(A) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.**

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates that the proposed project is designed to provide professional development for teachers to integrate arts education into core academic classes as a means to increase mastery of grade level standards and improve the academic performance of students in low performing elementary schools. The project will provide school-based arts integrated learning opportunities for high needs students in 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade classrooms in four of the lowest performing schools in the district. (pgs. 1-4)

The project will serve students and teachers in high needs areas, in which over 75% of the students are eligible for free or reduced lunch. The student population is 43% African American, 21% Hispanic, 28% White and 8% Asian, Indian or Multiracial. All five of the Title 1 schools targeted for the project rank persistently as the lowest-achieving 5% of the geographic area. The teachers and administrators at each of the participating schools will be closely involved in the planning and implementation of the project in order to ensure that all activities meet the needs of the student and teacher populations that they serve.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. **(B) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.**

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates that plans and strategies are in place to publish the framework and guidelines for the training model. The proposed professional development model will use the project to document best practices and teaching strategies and maintain a directory of project products for ongoing reference by

Sub Question

participants, external partners, and other educators.

The materials developed have the potential to assist other schools and districts in understanding the process and applying it to their school sites. The products available for dissemination will include practical applications for classroom use, including lesson plans and classroom activities. All materials will be available via a website.(pgs. 2-6)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

General:

The applicant effectively demonstrates that the proposed project will allow for the development of an instructional framework for classroom teachers that will promote arts integration practice that is learner-centered, evidence-based and measurably effective. The project will provide educators with innovative tools, strategies and instructional methods to create original arts integrated lessons that are aligned with the Common Core State Standards and the National Core Arts Standards. New lessons and resources will be developed to address the needs of the students involved, who below-level in their academic knowledge and skills.

Reader's Score: 10

Sub Question

1. (A) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is supported by strong theory.

Strengths:

The applicant has effectively demonstrated that the proposed project has been aligned with research-based evidence and theory relevant to arts-based educator. The applicant will partner with the Young Audiences National and Young Audiences of Louisiana to integrate high quality, standards-based arts education into the core curriculum and raise student achievement in literacy, math and the arts. The applicant will utilize the Arts for Learning (A4L) program which is an innovative, research-based literacy program that blends the creativity and discipline of the arts with learning science, to raise student achievement in literacy, mathematics and the arts.

The A4L model combines rigorous professional development, curriculum implementation and assessment strategies that are aligned by a common pedagogical framework and instructional design. Teachers and their students participate in iterative cycles of development, reflection, assessment and revision. The result is a proven program that engages students, raises their interest and achievement in literacy and the arts, and helps them build essential learning and life skills for school-to-work and life-long learning, such as creative problem-solving, critical and analytic thinking, collaboration and communication. (pgs. 7-10)

The proposed model has been adopted in other school districts literacy curriculum as the key component of the district's PDAE grant from the Department of Education during the spring 2012 semester and the 2012-2013 school year in four Title I elementary schools in the district. Findings for the second year of implementation included gains in all core subjects.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. **(B) 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 effectively demonstrates that the proposed project will allow for the development of an instructional framework for classroom teachers that will promote arts integration practice that is learner-centered, evidence-based and measurably effective. The project will provide educators with innovative tools, strategies and instructional methods to create original arts integrated lessons that are aligned with the Common Core State Standards and the National Core Arts Standards. New lessons and resources will be developed to address the needs of the students involved, who below-level in their academic knowledge and skills. (pgs. 10-14)

The new lessons that uses the arts as a catalyst for learning in literacy, math and across the curriculum, will potentially provide a blend of strategies and learning styles that deepen student interest and engagement, deepen understanding of concepts and content through experiential applications, and make learning memorable and fun. The new curriculum alignment with art-based instruction has the potential to reach those students who have disengaged from the regular classroom setting.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

General:

The applicant adequately describes the professional development training that will be provided by the project. The trainings will be offered 2 times per year for 48 participating classroom teachers. During the training teaching artists, certified arts educators, and school leaders from across school sites will participate in a three-day professional learning institute. Additional professional development will focus on building the knowledge base of all participants regarding effective arts integration strategies, instructional methods and research. (pg. 25)

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

1. **(A) The quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

Strengths:

The applicant has adequately demonstrated that policies and practices are in place to ensure equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who have been traditionally been underrepresented. The applicant serves a culturally, and socio-economically diverse population of children and families. The applicant indicated that a non-discrimination policy has been adopted by the district and this policy guides and governs decision making at all

Sub Question

levels. (pg.23)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. **(B) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.**

Strengths:

The applicant adequately describes the professional development training that will be provided by the project. The trainings will be offered 2 times per year for 48 participating classroom teachers. During the training teaching artists, certified arts educators, and school leaders from across school sites will participate in a three-day professional learning institute. Additional professional development will focus on building the knowledge base of all participants regarding effective arts integration strategies, instructional methods and research. (pg. 25)

The year-round professional development model will include 32 hours of direct professional development instruction each year (8 hours per day for two days each semester) with an additional 20 hours of coaching and PD support that will occur through regular meetings with PLCS, mentorship and in-classroom modeling from teaching artists, and ongoing leadership from the professional development team, arts specialists, and the project TOSA.

The continuous and progressive approach to professional learning will be supported by the online digital learning platform, which will provide teachers with opportunities to share best practices, implementation successes and challenges, and allow them to easily access the most up to date resources and materials that support implementation, documentation and assessment.

The professional development will be significant because classroom teachers gradually take on increased leadership roles in planning and executing professional development workshops that align with the ongoing progress within the PLCs and respond to recent action-research findings. This learner-centered approach builds on the specific strengths, interests and needs of the teachers and empowers them to influence their own professional development

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

3. **(C) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.**

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates that the proposed project will provide educators with innovative tools, strategies and instructional methods to create original arts integrated lessons that are aligned with the Common Core State Standards and the National Core Arts Standards. New lessons and resources will be developed to address the needs of the students involved, who are typically below-level in their academic knowledge and skills, with resistant attitudes to learning and disengagement in school. The new lessons and leveraged learning that uses the arts as a catalyst for learning in literacy, math and across the curriculum, will provide a blend of strategies and learning styles that deepen student interest and engagement, deepen understanding of concepts and content through experiential applications.

Sub Question

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 following factors:**

General:

The applicant provided evidence that the project director and other key personnel have the qualification, educational background and relevant experience to administer the grant . The proposed project director is a current long-term employee. She has experience managing several large-scale projects and grants at the district.

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

- 1. (A) 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant indicated that existing policies require non-discrimination in the employment of individuals due to race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability or other non-merit factors. These policies will be enforced in the hiring of AIPD project personnel. (pg. 28

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

- 2. (B) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.**

Strengths:

The applicant provided evidence that the project director and other key personnel have the qualification, educational background and relevant experience to administer the grant . The proposed project director is a current long-term employee. She has experience managing several large-scale projects and grants at the district.(pgs. 29-30)

The Project Coordinator (PC) will oversees the day-to-day implementation of the project and will serve as a liaison between the project's professional development and evaluation.

A TOSA (teacher on special assignment) will be identified and hired to provide ongoing support for the project and serve as the primary liaison between the teachers and the project team leadership. The TOSA will be selected as a part time position and will be filled by a qualified individual with at least 15 years of teaching experience in JPPSS with a background in arts education.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub Question

Reader's Score:

3. (C) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

Strengths:

The applicant adequately describes the qualifications and experiences of the Principal Investigator. She is a Project Director at WestEd. She lead the overseeing of the summative evaluation. She has more than 20 years of experience designing and directing evaluations of local, state, and national projects in several substantive areas, including a national evaluation of A4L Lessons curriculum. An additional consultant will serve as the Formative Evaluator and Lead Researcher for the project overseeing the collection, analysis and summary of student academic achievement and behavioral data, teacher surveys, and classroom observations. (pg. 34)

Both consultants are qualified and have the relevant experience and educational background to effectively implement the evaluation.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

General:

The applicant adequately describes a management plan that has the potential for ensuring all the project goals and objectives are met on time. The management plan fully outlines the job responsibilities and milestones for completing tasks and activities. (pgs. 30-32)

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 adequately describes a management plan that has the potential for ensuring all the project goals and objectives are met on time. The management plan fully outlines the job responsibilities and milestones for completing tasks and activities. (pgs. 30-32)

The Project Director (PD) will have supervisory responsibility for the project and to ensure the project timeline and milestones are met. The PD will supervise the project coordinator and the teacher on special assignment (TOSA), oversees dissemination of information and strategies, and implements processes for sustaining project activities beyond the grant period.

Based on the comprehensive timeline all the management plan will provide a thorough blueprint to guide all project activities and tasks.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 applicant effectively demonstrates that the key project personnel time commitments to the project is appropriate to administer and oversee the project tasks and activities. (pg. 28)

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 effectively describes four basic methods that will be employed to ensure effective communication and coordination of the partners, such as: (1) monthly webinar meetings involving the Project Director and key personnel to address recent developments by task, and any issues requiring attention from the project management team, (2) frequent and regular feedback via e-mail or phone contact, (3) cohort engagement through periodic reporting and recognition , and(4) required attendance at regular meetings or special activities, such as national professional development conferences.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

General:

The applicant has clearly demonstrated that an evaluation plan is in development to evaluate the project. The applicant will partner with Evaluation Research Program (ERP) at WestEd, an educational research, development and service organization to conduct the evaluation. The proposed evaluation will consist of both formative and summative components and will employ a multi-method approach, collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data.

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**

Sub Question

quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

Strengths:

The applicant has clearly demonstrated that an evaluation plan is in development to evaluate the project. The applicant will partner with Evaluation Research Program (ERP) at WestEd, an educational research, development and service organization to conduct the evaluation. The proposed evaluation will consist of both formative and summative components and will employ a multi-method approach, collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data.

The quasi-experimental study will consist of formative evaluations to inform and enable program development, improve service delivery, and/or enhance program outcomes. The formative evaluation will provide feedback, describing the implementation of AIPD and assess how well the program is moving toward meeting its key objectives based on project benchmarks. The formative evaluation will include the collection, analysis and summary of student academic achievement and behavior data such as attendance, classroom observations to assess implementation fidelity and an online teacher survey to further examine factors influencing the use of arts-integrated instructional practices, student engagement, and classroom management, as well as explore potential barriers and buttresses to the implementation of the program.

The summative evaluation will employ a rigorous quasi-experimental design (QED), a matched comparison study, to assess the effectiveness of the A4L Plus program on teacher content knowledge in the arts and on student literacy (reading) and mathematics achievement in grades 3 through 5. The summative evaluation will be guided by the research questions.

The evaluation is comprehensively aligned with effective research methods to evaluate program implementation and impacts.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide information on the evaluation instruments. This information is needed to determine the effectiveness of the evaluation process, as well as validity of the instruments.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant effectively describes four basic methods that will be employed to ensure effective communication and coordination of the partners, such as: (1) monthly webinar meetings involving the Project Director and key personnel to address recent developments by task, and any issues requiring attention from the project management team, (2) frequent and regular feedback via e-mail or phone contact, (3) cohort engagement through periodic reporting and recognition , and(4) required attendance at regular meetings or special activities, such as national professional development conferences. (pgs. 40-41)

The formative evaluators will provide timely feedback on effectiveness of the project implementation and assess how well the program is moving toward meeting its key objectives based on project benchmarks. The feedback will include collecting, analyzing, and reporting data on the impacts of the program at the levels of professional development for program teachers and teaching artists and the levels of student engagement and achievement at the classroom level.

All of the communication, meetings and data analysis will allow the implementation of performance feedback and periodic assessment towards achieving intended outcomes.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant effectively demonstrates that the proposed evaluation has the potential to produce evidence of promise. The applicant effectively demonstrates that the proposed project will allow for the development of an instructional framework for classroom teachers that will promote arts integration practice that is learner-centered, evidence-based and measurably effective. The project will provide educators with innovative tools, strategies and instructional methods to create original arts integrated lessons that are aligned with the Common Core State Standards and the National Core Arts Standards. New lessons and resources will be developed to address the needs of the students involved, who below-level in their academic knowledge and skills. (pgs. 45)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP-Technology - Competitive Preference Priority-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 is effectively proposing to develop an instructional framework for building educator capacity that includes: (1) training in arts integrated curriculum design, (2) teaching for transfer strategies, (3) action research methodology, (3) documentation of student work in a digital portfolio, and (4) assessment of student learning in the arts. (pg. 6)

The proposed project will publish the framework and guidelines for the AIPD model; prepare documentation of best practices and teaching strategies; and maintain a directory of project products for ongoing reference by participants, external partners, and other educators. These items will assist other schools and districts in understanding the AIPD model and applying it to their sites in the future. Practical applications for classroom use will be emphasized in order to ensure high levels of utility and effectiveness at other sites.

All products will be written and designed in user-friendly form and available on an A4L dedicated website. These products, information, and other materials will be disseminated through an A4L link throughout the district. (pg. 7)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2014 11:02 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2014 05:31 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson Parish Public School System (U351C140022)

Reader #3: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 5 | 5 |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 10 | 10 |
| Quality of Project Services | | |
| 1. Project Services | 15 | 13 |
| Quality of Project Personnel | | |
| 1. Project Personnel | 15 | 15 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 30 | 22 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 25 | 20 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 85 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| CPP-Technology | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority-Technology | | |
| 1. CPP-Technology | 20 | 20 |
| Sub Total | 20 | 20 |
| Total | 120 | 105 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Professional Development Arts Educators - 2: 84.351C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Jefferson Parish Public School System (U351C140022)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

General:

Strengths:

The applicant describes literacy program a plan to build capacity in a high need area by implementing a research-based integrated program that blends literacy, math and the arts (page 8). Details are provided regarding a three day professional development learning institute conducted twice per year, the use of professional learning communities, and mentoring from art experts (page 17). There is also a plan to utilize technology to share best practices.

The applicant describes an online portal that will be used to share full curriculum units, assessment tools and professional development resources (page 17). There is also a plan to utilize a secure website to post videos, student work samples and evaluation tools that can be shared with educators and teaching artists (page 18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Sub Question

1. (A) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

Strengths:

The applicant describes literacy program a plan to build capacity in a high need area by implementing a research-based integrated program that blends literacy, math and the arts (page 8). Details are provided regarding a three day professional development learning institute conducted twice per year, the use of professional learning communities, and mentoring from art experts (page 17). There is also a plan to utilize technology to share best practices.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (B) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Sub Question**Strengths:**

The applicant describes an online portal that will be used to share full curriculum units, assessment tools and professional development resources (page 17). There is also a plan to utilize a secure website to post videos, student work samples and evaluation tools that can be shared with educators and teaching artists (page 18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design****1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project by considering the following factors:****General:****Strengths:**

The applicant describes research that supports a logic model (appendix) that includes inputs, outputs and short, medium and long term outcomes. A framework for developing a learning environment is also provided (page 11). Evidence of increases in student achievement as a result of the selected model is also provided.

The applicant describes several benefits of using an online curriculum model on page 18 and includes details regarding incorporating action research into the project as a strategy for improving professional practice (pages 18-19). The applicant mentions that collaboration through professional learning communities will increase effective teaching. There is a plan to pursue additional funding to help build and sustain efforts beyond the end of the grant (page 15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10**Sub Question****1. (A) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is supported by strong theory.****Strengths:**

The applicant describes research that supports a logic model (appendix) that includes inputs, outputs and short, medium and long term outcomes. A framework for developing a learning environment is also provided (page 11). Evidence of increases in student achievement as a result of the selected model is also provided.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:**2. (B) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant describes several benefits of using an online curriculum model on page 18 and includes details regarding incorporating action research into the project as a strategy for improving professional practice (pages 18-19). The applicant mentions that collaboration through professional learning communities will increase effective teaching. There is a plan to pursue additional funding to help build and sustain efforts beyond the end of the grant (page 15).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan to ensure equal access and treatment for eligible project participants (page ii). Strategies include offering multi-lingual services, arranging for assistive technologies, and offering transportation vouchers.

The applicant describes professional development services that are likely to lead to improvements in instructional practice. Examples include two training institutes per year, 32 hours of direct professional development instruction, and 20 hours of coaching and support that will occur through regular meetings with PLCs and mentoring with teaching artists (page 17).

The applicant provides evidence of effectiveness of the selected model and describes strategies that are likely to improve student achievement. Examples include the use of Common Core aligned lessons, assessments, and professional development resources such as videos.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how teachers will learn about and apply action research.

Reader's Score: 13

Sub Question

- 1. (A) The quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan to ensure equal access and treatment for eligible project participants (page ii). Strategies include offering multi-lingual services, arranging for assistive technologies, and offering transportation vouchers.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Sub Question

Reader's Score:

- 2. (B) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.**

Strengths:

The applicant describes professional development services that are likely to lead to improvements in instructional practice. Examples include two training institutes per year, 32 hours of direct professional development instruction, and 20 hours of coaching and support that will occur through regular meetings with PLCs and mentoring with teaching artists (page 17).

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how teachers will learn about and apply action research.

Reader's Score:

- 3. (C) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides evidence of effectiveness of the selected model and describes strategies that are likely to improve student achievement. Examples include the use of Common Core aligned lessons, assessments, and professional development resources such as videos.

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 following factors:**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant states that they will recruit and hire members from under represented groups (page ii), and mentions a non-discrimination policy that will be supported through efforts to build on principals such as valuing cultural diversity.

The applicant describes the qualifications of an experienced project director, senior project manager, project coordinator, an arts integration specialist and two project evaluators. A job description for a teacher on special assignment is also mentioned. Resumes for key staff are provided in the appendix.

The qualifications of a principal investigator and a formative evaluator and lead researcher are provided. Resumes are included in the appendix. The evaluators have experience in evaluating the implementation of arts models.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

1. (A) 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.

Strengths:

The applicant states that they will recruit and hire members from under represented groups (page ii), and mentions a non-discrimination policy that will be supported through efforts to build on principals such as valuing cultural diversity.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

2. (B) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

The applicant describes the qualifications of an experienced project director, senior project manager, project coordinator, an arts integration specialist and two project evaluators. A job description for a teacher on special assignment is also mentioned. Resumes for key staff are provided in the appendix.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

3. (C) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

Strengths:

The qualifications of a principal investigator and a formative evaluator and lead researcher are provided. Resumes are included in the appendix. The evaluators have experience in evaluating the implementation of arts models.

Weaknesses:

Details regarding the qualifications of the consultants are limited.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a timeline that includes major activities, benchmarks dates and lead partners. The timeline specifies key activities involving professional development, evaluation, and implementation.

The applicant provides time commitments for the senior project manager (25%), the project coordinator (33%), and the

arts integration specialist (page 20).

Weakness:

Details for the time commitments of project staff are limited. For example, the time commitments of the project director and principal directors are not clearly specified.

Reader's Score: 22

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 timeline that includes major activities, benchmarks dates and lead partners. The timeline specifies key activities involving professional development, evaluation, and implementation.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear how some activities will be accomplished and by whom. For example, details regarding who will accomplish several of the responsibilities in the timeline are unclear.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides time commitments for the senior project manager (25%), the project coordinator (33%), and the arts integration specialist (page 20).

Weaknesses:

Details for the time commitments of project staff are limited. For example, the time commitments of the project director and principal directors are not clearly specified.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement on page 36. Examples include annual reports, formative evaluation data on the impacts of the program, and feedback on the efficacy of different aspects of the intervention such as those related to how teachers are integrating professional development into the curriculum.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

General:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan that includes evaluation and data collection methods, such as surveys, classroom observations, and participant surveys and observations/ratings of professional development sessions (page 38). An assessment of teacher knowledge of arts-integrated instruction and arts standards will also be administered (page 45).

The applicant describes methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress at regular intervals throughout the year (page 46). Examples include reports to program staff regarding formative evaluation of student behavior data (such as attendance), and teacher survey information. The applicant states that the evaluator will communicate regularly with project staff via meetings, email and conference calls (page 47).

The applicant describes methods of evaluation that have the potential to produce evidence of promise. There is a plan to implement an matched comparison evaluation design using a cluster analysis to select schools in the comparison condition (page 40). Research questions are provided for the summative evaluation activities. There is also a plan to measure student achievement using multi-level Analysis of Covariance modeling techniques (page 44).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly describe student achievement indicators that will be transmitted to the evaluator annually for analysis (page 46).

Details regarding how evaluation information will be used to improve the project are limited. For example, the applicant indicates that it will revise formative assessment tools and protocols, but does not provide information regarding how decisions about this will be made, who will make them or who will revise the tools.

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan that includes evaluation and data collection methods, such as surveys, classroom observations, and participant surveys and observations/ratings of professional development sessions (page 38). An assessment of teacher knowledge of arts-integrated instruction and arts standards will also be administered (page 45).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly describe student achievement indicators that will be transmitted to the evaluator annually for analysis (page 46).

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:

The applicant describes methods of evaluation that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress at regular intervals throughout the year (page 46). Examples include reports to program staff regarding formative evaluation of student behavior data (such as attendance), and teacher survey information. The applicant states that the evaluator will communicate regularly with project staff via meetings, email and conference calls (page 47).

Weaknesses:

Details regarding how evaluation information will be used to improve the project are limited. For example, the applicant indicates that it will revise formative assessment tools and protocols, but does not provide information regarding how decisions about this will be made, who will make them or who will revise the tools.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant describes methods of evaluation that have the potential to produce evidence of promise. There is a plan to implement a matched comparison evaluation design using a cluster analysis to select schools in the comparison condition (page 40). Research questions are provided for the summative evaluation activities. There is also a plan to measure student achievement using multi-level Analysis of Covariance modeling techniques (page 44).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP-Technology - Competitive Preference Priority-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 provides a plan to use technology to improve teacher effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2014 05:31 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2014 01:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jefferson Parish Public School System (U351C140022)

Reader #2: *****

| | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Questions | | |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| Significance | | |
| 1. Significance | 5 | 3 |
| Quality of Project Design | | |
| 1. Project Design | 10 | 8 |
| Quality of Project Services | | |
| 1. Project Services | 15 | 13 |
| Quality of Project Personnel | | |
| 1. Project Personnel | 15 | 13 |
| Quality of the Management Plan | | |
| 1. Management Plan | 30 | 22 |
| Quality of the Project Evaluation | | |
| 1. Project Evaluation | 25 | 21 |
| Sub Total | 100 | 80 |
| Priority Questions | | |
| CPP-Technology | | |
| Competitive Preference Priority-Technology | | |
| 1. CPP-Technology | 20 | 20 |
| Sub Total | 20 | 20 |
| Total | 120 | 100 |

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Professional Development Arts Educators - 2: 84.351C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Jefferson Parish Public School System (U351C140022)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

General:

This proposal cites multiple examples of research related to the project that show arts integration supporting student achievement provided by YALA. The project also includes parent engagement tools and activities. The national YA will disseminate the products of the project.

Only participating project schools and YA affiliates will have access to the A4L link.

Reader's Score: 3

Sub Question

1. (A) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

Strengths:

This proposal cites multiple examples of research related to the project that show arts integration supporting student achievement. YALA data (p. 3) provides a local research example of arts impact on student achievement. The project also includes parent engagement tools, activities and workshops (p. 6). This component should assist the program in strengthening its impact through parent/family support and reinforcement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score:

2. (B) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The national YA will disseminate the products of the project. This will be done through the A4L link on the YA website (p. 7).

Weaknesses:

Only participating project schools and YA affiliates will have access to the A4L link. This will limit the dissemination reach of the products of the project to those with a proprietary link to YA.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

General:

A4L research cited shows gains in literacy and other subjects cited in a variety of settings, especially when high fidelity implementation is practiced. The proposal calls for a two year continuation of professional development in the district.

The project does not include detailed sustainability planning or plans for becoming self-sustaining.

Reader's Score: 8

Sub Question

1. **(A) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is supported by strong theory.**

Strengths:

A4L research cited shows gains in literacy and other subjects cited in a variety of settings, especially when high fidelity implementation is practiced (pp, 8-10). This model is promising and if replicated could produce improved instruction and student achievement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score:

2. **(B) 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 proposal calls for a two year continuation of professional development in the district. This effort will be supported by access to online A4L resources. Planning for two years after the conclusion of the grant and including all teachers in grades PK-5 is an ambitious goal and even if only partially achieved would enhance the impact of the project.

Weaknesses:

The project does not include detailed sustainability planning or plans for becoming self-sustaining for the two year continuation described. This decreases the likelihood that the project will be fiscally capable of continuing. Covering costs of resources and materials not provided (p. 15).

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

General:

The proposal provides for steps to assure access for underrepresented groups. The project will provide 48 teachers six days of professional development per year. Teachers will have access to the A4L curriculum and assessment database. In similar settings this PD model has been shown to have a positive impact on student academic achievement.

The "action research" component of the plan is not sufficiently defined. The proposal does not detail how they intend to assure fidelity in this project.

Reader's Score: 13

Sub Question

1. **(A) The quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

Strengths:

The proposal provides for steps to assure access for underrepresented groups on page e12.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score:

2. **(B) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.**

Strengths:

The project will provide 48 teachers six days of professional development per year (p. 16). In addition, teachers will receive 32 hours of direct instruction and 20 hours of coaching per year. Teachers will have access to the A4L curriculum and assessment database.

Weaknesses:

The "action research" component of the plan is not sufficiently defined in scope or level of teacher participation such that a judgment of its impact on practice can be made.

Reader's Score:

3. **(C) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.**

Strengths:

The project provides for intensive and sustained professional development. In similar settings this model has been shown to have a positive impact on student academic achievement.

Weaknesses:

The critical component in determining impact as demonstrated by previous research reports cited is model fidelity. The proposal does not detail how similar to models that have produced positive findings this proposal is or how they intend to assure fidelity in this project.

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 following factors:

General:

The proposal cites existing non-discrimination policies and outlines efforts to hire in underrepresented groups. Ms. Koehler is well qualified to oversee the implementation of the proposed project. The YA and YALA staff assigned to the project are experienced in implanting this type of project. Sobolew-Shublin and Miron are a qualified evaluation researchers.

The Teacher on Special Assignment job description is not sufficient to assure that this position will meet the needs of the grant. Lead Teachers are assigned observation and communications responsibilities for which there appears to be no time or training provision.

Reader's Score: 13

Sub Question

1. (A) 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.

Strengths:

The proposal cites existing non-discrimination policies. The plan on p. e15 outlines efforts to hire in underrepresented groups.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score:

2. (B) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

Strengths:

Ms. Koehler is well qualified to oversee the implementation of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

The Teacher on Special Assignment responsibilities and requirements provided in the proposal are not sufficient to assure that this position will meet the needs of the grant. No formal job description is provided for this position. Lead Teachers (p. 23) are assigned observation and communications responsibilities for which there appears to be no time provision made or training provision.

Reader's Score:

3. (C) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

Strengths:

The YA and YALA staff assigned to the project are experienced in implanting this type of project. Sobolew-Shublin and Miron are a qualified evaluation researchers with credentials that well qualify them for the tasks defined in this proposal.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

General:

The timeline provides an overview of proposed activities, project benchmarks, and individuals responsible for implementation of the project. YALA personnel maintain control over implementation of most program components and centrally administer the project. Formative evaluators are tasked with providing continuous data feedback to implementers on student and teacher growth.

The personnel titles do not match with those presented in the personnel section. This makes understanding the plan and its potential for managing the tasks difficult. Fiscal control resides in YA which will determine if services have been delivered. This management loop excludes the schools from fiscal oversight. Issues related to the management and budget include: 1) The evaluation budget for this project is approximately 24% of total project costs. 2) There is what appears to be a substantial error (\$36,000) in the budget. 3) The purpose of the YAI management funding (14%-20% of annual funding) is not specific.

Reader's Score: 22

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The timeline provided on pp. 25-36 provides an overview of proposed activities, project benchmarks, and individuals responsible for implementation over the life of the project.

Weaknesses:

The personnel titles presented in this section do not match with those presented in the personnel section (e.g., evaluation task leader (p. 24)/principal investigator/formative evaluator and lead researcher; project director/senior project director/senior project manager (p. 24). This makes understanding the plan and its potential for managing the tasks difficult to interpret. Fiscal control resides in YA which will determine if services have been delivered and manage all expenditures. This management loop excludes the schools from fiscal oversight.

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:

YALA personnel maintain control over implementation of most program components and centrally administer the project. This should provide for simplified communication.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

There are several issues related to the management and budget for this project that deserve attention. 1) The evaluation budget for this project is approximately 24% of total project costs (pp. e124-e125). This cost is a high percentage for this type of project where the primary objective is improvement in student achievement and teacher capacity. A part of this increase in cost may be attributed to having two, possibly redundant, evaluation entities on the project (WestEd, Loyola). 2) There is what appears to be a substantial error in the budget on p. e125. In year two teaching artists are funded at \$4,000 not \$40,000. The budget narrative indicates four teachers @ \$10,000 /year. This error is carried over into the contractual budget on e129 leaving \$36,000 gap in budgeting. 3) The purpose of the YA management funding (14%-20% of annual funding) is not specific in terms of frequency, means or intensity of the advice and assistance provided that is over and above that provided by YALA.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Formative evaluators are tasked with providing continuous data feedback to implementers on student and teacher growth. Focus group, observation, and survey feedback will be used to provide information on the effects of the PD programs.

Weaknesses:

The reporting responsibilities of WestEd versus Loyola are not clearly delineated in this section.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

General:

The evaluation plan intends to us direct classroom observation to assess project fidelity of implementation. The plan calls for formative evaluation information to be provided to stakeholders continuously throughout the project. The comparison matching procedure with HLM statistical analysis described for data analysis should produce statistics that will measure the proposed projects impact.

While classroom observations are planned we do not know the nature of the observations. Survey instruments and reports will need to be carefully vetted to omit personally identifying information.

Reader's Score: 21

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 intends to us direct classroom observation to assess project fidelity of implementation. For this project and its related research this is a critical activity.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

While direct biannual classroom observations the proposal does not state the nature of the observations (instrumentation, duration), by whom the observations will be done, or the training that will be required of the observers. Without knowing these attributes it is not possible to assess the validity/reliability of any observations conducted.

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 plan calls for formative evaluation information to be provided to stakeholders continuously throughout the project. Surveys, observations and focus group reports will be provided to program staff for review and program staff.

Weaknesses:

Survey instruments and reports will need to be carefully vetted to omit personally identifying information in this small population of teacher participants to avoid violating research participation protocols. These are not mentioned in developing the evaluation procedures and should be given careful consideration to avoid violating confidentiality.

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 comparison matching procedure with HLM statistical analysis described for data analysis should produce statistics that will measure the proposed projects impact.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP-Technology - Competitive Preference Priority-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 proposal contains information regarding the development of a digital portfolio for students (p.6) and the utilization of a A4L online digital learning platform (p. 17).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

Reader's Score: **20**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/22/2014 01:32 PM