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Applicant: Community Unit School District 60 (U351C140055)

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 states that they will target three targeted schools where students are performing below grade level in reading and there are limited Arts education programs due to budget cuts. Weaknesses-More information is needed regarding the Arts education programs currently in place in order to gain more insight regarding the needs to be addressed.

Reader’s Score:  4

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 presents some reasonable information to show that the project is needed and will bring about opportunities to improve and expand services to the targeted areas. According to the applicant, the need exist because currently there is a lack of Arts education within the school systems due to budget cuts. The three targeted schools are discussed and students are performing below grade level in reading. The Arts education program has been reduced by 50% which amounts to less than 2% per year. There is sufficient evidence to show that there are little or no professional development opportunities for teachers (pgs. 6-8).

   Weaknesses:
   The applicant does not include any information regarding the specific Arts education programs for the targeted schools; only that there have been budget cuts. Therefore, it is difficult to ascertain the significance of the project as related to the targeted populations needs.

   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 proposes to provide a variety of effective ways to disseminate project information and strategies. The applicant proposes to post a variety of resources on the district’s website that will include a program manual, evaluation guide to describe the experimental design and reports, a description of the Arts and technology process and more. There will be opportunities for program participants to have access to training videos, online support,
videos and recordings, program curriculum and a lesson plan database will all be made available. Additionally, teacher presentations, workshops, roundtables and professional conferences will also be used to disseminate project information (pgs. 9-11).

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 theory presented by the applicant offered indicated that teaching skills improve when teachers are engaged in planning their professional development training and instruction. The logic model presented is detailed including input/outputs and outcomes that are directly related to the programs activities (pg. 10-16). Weaknesses-There were 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 provides extensive information to show that the project model is rooted in strong theory. The applicant presents three theories that were used to create the program model presented. One such theory presented indicates that through the integration of an Arts education program students will be more prepared to succeed academically, become motivated and engaged in learning. Additionally, theory offered also indicated that teaching skills improve when they are engaged in planning their professional development training and instruction using cultural heritage, digital media and content-rich text which is also a factor in student achievement. The logic model presented is detailed including input/outputs and outcomes that are directly related to the programs activities (pg. 10-16).

   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.
There are specific strategies the applicant proposes to implement to ensure the work is ongoing after the grant has ended. The applicant proposes to use on-going teacher cohorts who will build capacity amongst teacher by using the train the trainer approach and ongoing professional development collaboration with local Art organizations and partners. Additionally, the creation of curriculum resources will be made available and the project governance council and district administrators will create a strategic plan for sustainability that will identify school funds, private and public grants to further support the project (pgs. 16-18).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses noted.

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 information to show the professional development services are of high quality by providing the intensity and duration for each activity. Ongoing training with be provided with the Arts Integration Team and project artist will work closely with teachers in the classroom which will lead to improvements in practice and services (pgs. 18-21). Weaknesses-There were no weaknesses noted.

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 presents evidence to show there is a policy in place by which they will ensure equal access to the project. Teachers will have access to the project and will be made aware of the project through faculty meetings, newsletters and school websites. Other considerations for entrance include teacher backgrounds, content area, instructional skill levels and school location. It is further noted by the applicant that the majority of the student population are minority students; i.e. 95% Latino/African American and 85% are from low income homes (pgs. 18-19).

   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.
Sub Question

Strengths:
The applicant provides sufficient evidence to ensure professional development services are of high quality by providing the intensity and duration for each activity. Teachers will receive 60 hours of professional development including workshops and follow-up coaching throughout the duration of the four-year grant proposal. Ongoing bi-weekly training with the Arts Integration Team and project artist who will work closely with teachers in the classroom which will lead to improvements in practice and services (pgs. 18-21).

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 has provided strategies that will focus on the need of students who will need a specific support. For example, to address the need of low achieving students, teachers will be taught to focus on helping students to improve in subject matter areas by linking standards based Art education with Common Core State Standards. Additionally, teachers will be taught how to improve their skill through the use of technology, academics and culturally based activities (pgs. 18-21)

Weaknesses:
This criterion was thoroughly discussed with my fellow peer reviewers and no weaknesses were noted.

Reader’s Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

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 qualifications and training of the project consultants are clearly defined by the applicant and show they are qualified to support the projects goals and objectives. For example, the Media Technology consultant has an Ed.D in Curriculum and Instruction, twenty-three years of experience teaching at elementary and university levels (pgs. 29-30). Weaknesses-The applicant does not provide a job description for the Project Director position.

Reader’s Score: 12

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,
Sub Question

national origin, gender, age, or disability.

Strengths:
The applicant describes in detail the plan to ensure equal employment opportunities for potential employees. The plan includes an applicant search and screening process through the use of a search committee and positions will be advertised in minority newspapers, journals and publications. Additionally, the applicant states there is a written policy from the school district which states that they prohibit the discrimination of employment on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability (pgs. 25-26).

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses noted.

Reader’s Score:

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

Strengths:
The key personnel qualifications, experiences and trainings are presented by the applicant in detail and show they are qualified to implement and oversee the project. The educational experience is also defined and indicates that their staff are capable of providing the support needed to assist the target population. Although, the Project Director has not been hired, the applicant provides the education and work experience requirements for the position. For example, the Project Director must have a Master's degree and at least 10 years of experience in teaching, Arts education and administration. It is further noted that the Principal Investigator will provide overall guidance, implementation of the project and supervise the Evaluation Team, and work with the Project Director to support the project activities (pgs. 26-27).

Weaknesses:
The applicant does not provide a job description for the Project Director position.

Reader’s Score:

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

Strengths:
The qualifications and training of the project consultants are clearly defined by the applicant and show they are qualified to support the projects goals and objectives. The plan to support student instruction through the use of cultural organizations is presented and will support program goals and the integration of Arts education instruction. For example, the Media Technology consultant has an Ed.D in Curriculum and Instruction, twenty-three years of experience teaching at elementary and university levels (pgs. 29-30).
Sub Question

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 evidence to show that the time commitment of the key personnel associated with the project is appropriate to support the goals and objectives. For example, the Project Director will commit 100% of his/her time to the project and will be responsible for overseeing the day-to-day operations. Weaknesses-The time commitments of the majority of the contractors are in-kind and there are no MOU's presented to ensure the time commitment will be honored.

Reader’s Score: 29

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 timelines, and milestones presented are appropriate for the project and the information provided is specific to each project activity. The person/persons responsible for implementation and oversight of each activity is identified and the budget is logical to support the project. Timelines and milestones are presented for each project activity and the goals and objectives are presented in measurable terms. For example, the applicant proposes to establish school-based professional development and intensive follow-up coaching to strengthen the teaching of standards-based Arts education using technology by 2018. The applicant further indicates that 85% of the 30 teachers enrolled in the project will have increased their Arts content knowledge and their ability to integrate standards-based Arts education.

   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.
Sub Question

Strengths:
The applicant provides evidence to show that the time commitment of the key personnel associated with the project is appropriate to support the goals and objectives. For example, the Project Director will commit 100% of his/her time to the project and will be responsible for overseeing the day-to-day operations. Additionally, the Principal Investigator will also devote 100% of his/her time to the project and will lead the Evaluation Team and assist with the implementation of the project (pgs. 36-37).

Weaknesses:
The time commitments of the majority of the contractors are in-kind and there are no MOU’s presented to ensure the time commitment will be honored.

Reader’s Score:

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

Strengths:
There is a logical plan to oversee project procedures to ensure program feedback is provided by the applicant. The plan includes the use of an evaluation team who will monitor the project to ensure there is continuous improvement. Some of the ways by which feedback will be provided include a teacher's blog for personal reflection, mentorship opportunities with Artist, ongoing teacher assessment, surveys, pre-posttest, questionnaires, teacher observations, focus groups, interviews, videos and more (pgs. 36-37).

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:
Strengths-The evaluation plan has a reasonable and logical approach for evaluating program progress. The external evaluator and project director will work together to use a quasi-experimental design approach to evaluate the project. The use of baseline data to measure progress will be used at the beginning of the project and throughout implementation to measure program progress.
Weaknesses-The applicant does not describe the process by which they will choose the schools or teachers who will be a part of the study.

Reader’s Score: 22

Sub Question

1. (A) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance
Sub Question

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 has a reasonable and logical approach for evaluating program progress. The external evaluator and project director will work together to use a quasi-experimental design approach to evaluate the project. The use of baseline data to measure progress will be used at the beginning of the project and throughout implementation to measure program progress. The evaluation will specifically target access teacher impact on teacher leaning through a variety of measurement tools that include the use of surveys, interviews, attendance, enrollment data, observations and other quantitative/qualitative data which will further lend to the viability of the project. The project evaluation will also use treatment groups randomly assigned to control groups to gauge the level of content knowledge and skills teachers need to support student achievement (pgs. 42-44). To further gauge program success, the applicant indicates that the Evaluation Team will report on the GPRA evaluation requirements for the project (pgs. 43-47).

Weaknesses:
The process for the random selection of teachers is not presented by the applicant.

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 to ensure performance feedback will include dissemination of program progress to stakeholders. The applicant proposes to use formative evaluation methods to access program outcomes. The goal is to have the Management Team receive monthly feedback from the Evaluation Team to determine the effectiveness of the professional development and follow-up coaching. More specifically, the methods will include quarterly focus groups to discuss Arts integration strategies, teacher interviews, observations and survey data (pgs. 46-48).

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 provides a good plan of action by which they will produce evidence of promise. The plan proposes to implement an experimental design by which teachers in three focus schools will be surveyed to determine years of teaching experience, Art instruction experience, and project interest in addition to Arts Education Teaching Practices (AETP) instruments to measure knowledge and skills of Arts instruction. The applicant proposes to use a random selection process for teachers who will be chosen from three schools to participate in the project. The use of a logic model which will help to determine what has been essential in determining what factors have been vital in
Sub Question
improving student achievement (pgs.48-50).

Weaknesses:
The applicant does not describe the process by which they will choose the schools or teachers who will be a part of the study.

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 project is designed to improve student achievement and teacher effectiveness through the use of technology. For example, the applicant proposes to have students that will actively engages in the use of multi-modal digital composition, iPads, laptops, websites, blogging, video production, photo shop, journaling, music and more (pg. 2, 10-16).

Weaknesses:
The applicant does not describe the current status of technology in the targeted schools; therefore, it is difficult to ascertain whether the addition of technology and digital media will enhance the project and ensure goals and objectives are met.

Reader’s Score: 19
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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 4-year project is requesting $1,397,504 for a professional development/arts integration project serving 1st-5th grade students at 3 low-income elementary schools (45 teachers and 1,125 students each year).
   Note: The appropriateness for the time commitment of 30% and 20% for two evaluators for a project serving 3 schools is not fully explained. Furthermore, the budget line of $23,000 for both evaluators at the time commitment of 30% and 20% seems low for two highly qualified and experienced University Professionals to serve as evaluators.

   Reader’s Score: 4

   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 project design is informed by a research-based theory. The applicant includes a reasonable logic model to align project goals, activities, and outcomes (p14/103). The applicant provides specific data for each of the schools to be served (p36/103).

      The applicant provides sufficient data and information to demonstrate the need criteria. It provides data to substantiate the low-income backgrounds at each of the schools (78-97%) (p16/103). Also, the State has designated the district schools as persistently lowest achieving and in need of corrective action.

      The applicant demonstrates a strong commitment and foundation for building local capacity. For example, the applicant has gathered preplanning feedback to identify the critical needs and supports them with direct feedback from the educators to be involved (p21/103). The applicant proceeds with an explicit discussion of each need area, describing how this project will address those needs with sustainable solution (p21/103).

      Weaknesses:
      While the district letter of support mentions that the district already has fine arts teachers, the narrative lacks a description for what arts instruction might be in place at the schools to be served, or how this project will be aligned to existing services (p 67).

      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 application describes a convincing range of products and methods it will develop to facilitate dissemination of this project model and discusses them in specific detail. For example, project evaluation results will be disseminated through the project webpage to enable other schools to apply the information and strategies to be developed. The application includes multiple examples of the types of information that would be shared (p25/103). Furthermore, the applicant provides a description for how the project will use clear strategies for disseminating the various products to be developed. It also provides a detailed descriptions for the different types of products, how they will be implemented, and how they will strengthen standards-based art education (p25/103).

Weaknesses:
None noted. This criterion was thoroughly discussed in our panel and I did not find any notable weakness in this section.

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 application addresses this criterion very well. Please see the comments for details.

   Reader's Score: 9

Sub Question

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

   Strengths:
The applicant demonstrates the project draws upon an extensive body of research on the key components of the project, such as arts education, organizational systems for improving teaching, professional development and best practice teaching plus strategies for engaging students to improve learning (p27/103). The application clearly explains how the applicant carried out an analysis of this research to determine the theories and their relevance to this project. The applicant includes a table clearly aligning the project objectives with corresponding key components to achieve project outcomes (p29/103).

   Weaknesses:
   None 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 provides a detailed description of its strategies to continue the project after funding ends. For example, aspects of the project are integrated with the current school improvement efforts; and therefore, will continue as part of the district's most successful and prioritized initiatives (p33/103).

   The applicant states that the Governance Council will design a strategic plan for sustainability, which will address how the project model strategies and activities can be sustained through appropriated school funds, private grants,
Sub Question

and support from community organizations.

Weaknesses:
The letters of support do not include statements from the project partners to demonstrate that they will help to sustain the project efforts and activities beyond the grant period.

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 application addresses this criterion fully. Please see the comments for details.

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 describes a variety of strategies the project will use to ensure that no eligible participant is denied equal access. For example, the district provides translation and interpretation services where needed; it also provides program materials in alternative formats and makes accommodation for varied learning styles and inclusion activities for students with Individual Education Plans. This project is open to all teachers (p32/109).

The applicant provides additional data to demonstrate it already serves a diverse population at the schools and has multiple approaches, resources, and tools in place to ensure no one is denied equal access or treatment (p33/109).

Weaknesses:
None 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 verifies that the professional development services are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. For example, its comprehensive research-based approach focuses on deeper, sustained PD learning opportunities for teachers (p34/103).

The applicant demonstrates the planned professional development (PD) will have sufficient intensity by describing the 60 hours of PD (30 hours of workshops and 30 hours follow-up coaching) teachers will receive each year. Also,
Sub Question
lead teachers will participate in 10 additional hours of training each year.

The applicant describes additional support to be provided by the project. For example, a PD support team will provide ongoing leadership and support for the Arts Integration Teams who will meet biweekly to plan, review, monitor and makes changes to arts integration project activities. Other supports include an artist that will spend 36 hours working side by side with classroom teachers and additional workshops (p36/103).

Weaknesses:
None 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 Project's curriculum and activities are planned in specific and comprehensive detail to meet the needs of all students. The applicant intends for Culturally based arts activities and technology approaches as described to effectively serve those with limited English proficiency and special needs (p 38/103).

The applicant discusses the at-risk factors for students (low-income, low reading and math scores, limited English proficiency) in order to effectively address the need factors with interconnected, coherent strategies (p36/103).

The applicant provides examples of the types of teaching/learning activities teachers could use to effectively integrate standards into their teaching. Also, the project is aligned with ongoing school improvement programs and practices that are identified by name (p40/103).

Weaknesses:
None 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 application addresses this criterion adequately. Please see the comments for details.

Reader's Score: 10

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.
Sub Question

Strengths:
The applicant provides clear descriptions and explanations of how the project will actively encourage applications from underrepresented groups (p40/103). For example, the position is advertised in both minority and industry publications. Furthermore, both the selection committee and project's identified key personnel are made up of individuals from diverse backgrounds (p40/103).

Weaknesses:
None noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:
The applicant describes the key personnel, by role and responsibilities in the project, plus their background and expertise where available. Where personnel have been identified, the application identifies them by name and supports their relevant training and experience with attached resumes (p17-19).

Weaknesses:
None noted. This criterion was thoroughly discussed in our panel and I did not find any notable weakness in this section.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:
The applicant states that the project partners can ensure success of the project because they have worked on previous arts projects before. The PI and External Evaluator have 30 years of teaching experience with the University Partner (18/103).

Weaknesses:
The applicant does not fully explain the qualifications and time commitments for the two external evaluators. The qualifications of the external evaluators are not supported with letters of support or resumes.

The applicant states that the project will be strengthened by the support of 10 community arts organizations; however, the application lacks letters of support or other evidence to indicate these organizations are involved in the project (p35).

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

General:
The application addresses this criterion very well. Please see the comments for details.
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 application clearly explains how the management plan is designed to ensure that program objectives will be achieved in a timely manner and within budget. For example, the project includes two administrative units to ensure that objectives are fulfilled in a timely and cost effective manner. The applicant describes the meeting schedule and management duties for both the Management Team and the Project Governance Council in clear operational detail (p44/103).

   The applicant has included a detailed management plan that aligns project objectives, milestones and key tasks within a specific timeline. Furthermore, the various components are described in measurable terms (p45/103).

   **Weaknesses:**
   None noted

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

   **Strengths:**
   The applicant provides a very clear and appropriate description for the time commitments of the key personnel. (p 36). The time commitments are further supported by and consistent with other descriptions of the responsibilities of project personnel elsewhere in the application.

   **Weaknesses:**
   The applicant does not fully explain the time commitments for the two external evaluators. For example, appropriateness for the time commitment of 30% and 20% for two evaluators for a project serving 3 schools is not fully explained.

   The application lacks a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to confirm the in-kind time contribution as described for various personnel.

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

   **Strengths:**
   The project is designed to ensure continuous feedback for the improvement of the project to be shared and utilized in a timely manner. For example, The teams are scheduled to share information on a regular basis, the teachers will engage in reflective practices through their personal reflection blog, mentoring with teachers and documenting student learning on a continuous basis will occur. Furthermore, the applicant provides a step by step (p52/103) description of the feedback procedures and tools to be used to manage progress towards the project's goals and objectives as well as a summary work plan for the project (53-55/103).
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 application addresses this criterion well. Please see the comments for details.

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 applicant provides a clear and detailed description for how the evaluation plan will be effectively designed and implemented. The project evaluation uses an experimental design to assess the effectiveness of the project, applying both quantitative and qualitative performance measures to analyze the extent to which key components of the model are effective in improving teaching and learning (p57/103). The applicant has designed its choice of a randomized controlled trial design to meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards.

The project will evaluate the effectiveness of the professional development model, using strong theory and a logic mode aligned with the project’s goals and outcomes (p17/103).

The project evaluation is designed to produce evidence on effective strategies suitable for replication in a variety of classroom and school settings. (p26/103). The applicant includes a detailed discussion for the planned strategies, key components and procedures and discusses how they will be shared (p26/103).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe how the control group of teachers and classrooms will be qualified or selected.

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 has selected formative evaluation methods that will serve to assess progress towards achieving intended outcomes. The applicant includes a detailed discussion for how these methods will be applied for continuous improvements.

The applicant describes specific assessment methods, in detail, which will be used to give performance feedback, such as focus groups, interviews, rubrics among others. It also describes how they will be applied to manage progress towards the project’s stated objectives (p62/103).
Sub Question

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader’s Score:**

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

**Strengths:**

The evaluation methods are designed to produce evidence of promise assessing the impact of the project and intended outcomes as supported by the project logic model (p63/103). For example, the project evaluation uses an experimental design to assess the linkages between project inputs (process, product, strategy and practices) with the intended outcomes such as improving teacher performance and student academic achievement. Also, the stated objectives are described in measurable terms, so progress can be assessed (p 63/103).

The applicant describes the step-by-step process to implementing the experimental design and the rationale behind each step (p63/103). For example, it provides examples of baseline data to be collected on the teachers so that the treatment and control teachers can be matched more effectively.

The applicant explains how the logic model for the project shows the theoretical, research-based linkages for the key components and the intended outcomes (p65/103).

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation design lacks a clear description for how the selection of control participants will be randomized. It does not discuss how it will control for contamination within the school, from control classroom to treatment classroom.

**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 specific and detailed description for how digital tools and technology will be used by teachers and students to improve teaching and learning. It also explains how teachers will be trained to effectively integrate technology into their teaching practices (20/103). The budget provides for sufficient personal and resources to implement the digital tools and technology elements.

It provides a clear description for how the online resources will be integrated into the program activities. For example, technology goals are embedded in each of the 3 project objectives and throughout the project design (p18/103).

The applicant provides research citations to support its rationale and rich discussion for how digital tools and media arts will be integrated with a standards-based approach to motivate and improve student learning (p19/103).
Weaknesses:
The application does not clearly describe the state of technology at the schools to be served or the level of technology skills among the teachers to be trained.

Reader’s Score: 19
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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:
   
   N/A

   Reader’s Score: 4

   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 three target schools are very diverse, with approximately 80% of students being Hispanic and 50% limited English proficient. The schools demonstrate a significant need for improved academic achievement as demonstrated on page e6, with over 70% of students not reading on grade level.

   The applicant indicate that focus groups were conducted in 2013 and teachers requested help in both arts and technology integration (p. 8).

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

   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 proposal indicates that both products and results from the project will be disseminated via the project website, including a comprehensive evaluation report (p. 11), a project manual (p. 10), and video recordings of project performances (p. 11).

   Weaknesses:
   
   No plans were described for disseminating results at practitioner and research conferences, or in peer-reviewed research journals.

   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:
   
   N/A

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 project is directly linked to three theories of change that are supported by sound research. Appropriate citations were provided and the table of linkages to the project (p. 15) connected the theoretical base of the project to the project design.

   The logic model on page 16 provided a clear description of inputs, outputs and outcomes. For example, the professional development and follow-up coaching will lead to improved teaching of integrated arts that will result in increased use of best practices by teachers.

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

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:
   A comprehensive plan for incorporating project activities into Waukegan Schools is provided on page 17, including the development of a network of community arts organizations that will have an established relationship with the school district, as well as a plan for sustaining program activities beyond the end of the grant.

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

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:
   
   N/A

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

1. (A) The quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible
Sub Question

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 described a number of strategies to ensure equal access to all project activities, including translation of products for students whose first language is not English and inclusion efforts for students receiving special education services (p. 18)

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

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 include professional learning communities at each school (p. 19) and provide both workshops and follow-up coaching (pp. 20-21).

Experts in art (participation by artists from 10 arts organizations), arts education, and technology (p. 20) will support project implementation.

Teachers will receive 60 hours of professional development (p. 20), including 30 hours of coaching, over 4-years, which constitutes sufficient intensity and duration.

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

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:
Based on cited research and the cumulative professional development received by teachers, students in the three participating schools should demonstrate increased academic achievement (pp. 22-23). Students' academic achievement will be measured using the Illinois Standard Achievement Test, which is aligned with state academic standards, and the project is guided by the Consortium of National Arts Education Association, the Common Core State Standards, and the National Education Technology Standards (p. 24).

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

Reader’s Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

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:
N/A

Reader's Score: 11

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 indicates that Waukegan Public Schools is an Equal Opportunity employer (p. 26), and that the district has a plan for encouraging diverse applicants (i.e., the opportunity diversity planning process) (p. 24).

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

Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:
   The project administration team appears to have adequate experience and training to lead the project activities. The Associate Superintendent has significant experience as an administrator, including principal, and has experience garnering and administering grants.

   The principal investigator has extensive experience evaluating large grant projects (p. 27) and has all necessary training and experience.

   Weaknesses:
   A job description for the Project Director would provide the additional detail necessary to adequately judge the proposed hire’s training and experience.

   The Enrichment Coordinator tasked with supervising the eventual Project Director (p. 26) has no direct experience supervising or working on a large ($1 million plus) grant project.

Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:
   Overall, the consultants have relevant training and experience to successfully complete the project. For example, the external evaluator has 30 years of experience as an evaluator and worked on over 25 arts and school improvement grants (p. 28)

   Weaknesses:
   The distinction between the Principal Investigator (PI) and the External Evaluator is unclear. On page 27, the proposal indicates that the PI will evaluate the professional development, while on page 28 the External Evaluator will provide advice on all evaluation activities. A more complete description should be provided for why these two
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:
   N/A

   Reader’s Score: 28

   Sub Question

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

      Strengths:
      The management team will meet weekly and the governance council will meet bi-monthly (p. 29). The governance council will also meet quarterly with both evaluator and management team.

      Project objectives, milestones and activities are clearly outlined on pages 31 to 36. Milestones are measurable indicators of success, for example on page 35 the proposal indicates that 85% of students will develop two arts projects each year.

      A complete table of objectives, timelines and persons responsible is provided on Table 4 on pages 38 to 40.

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

      Reader’s Score:

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

      Strengths:
      The time commitments as described on page 36 and the budget narrative are appropriate to meet the needs of the project. The proposal includes a 1.0FTE project director and 1.0FTE principal investigator, along with all other described staff.

      Weaknesses:
      The proposal is predicated on a significant amount of in-kind donation of time, including .25FTE from the principal investigator. Overall, there is no memorandum of agreement or discussion in the letters confirming the in-kind donations are acceptable to the partnering organizations.

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

Strengths:
Evaluation results will be presented to both the management team and the governance council quarterly. Results will be presented for each measurable milestone as described in the management plan (p. 37). Any recommendations for changes to the program will then be shared with the Arts Integration Team to ensure compatibility of proposed changes. Overall, a clear plan is presented and should ensure continual feedback.

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

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:
N/A

Reader’s Score: 20

Sub Question

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

Strengths:
The proposal describes a series of qualitative and quantitative measures (as described on pages 41 and 42) and connects the measures directly to each objective and milestone described in the management plan (pp. 43-46). The use of both Illinois achievement test data and progress monitoring data (i.e., RtI data) will provide objective measures of experimental impacts.

Weaknesses:
Although a series of measures is provided, more detail about their alignment with the project objectives is necessary. For example, on page 41 the applicant describe the School Wide Information System (SWIS) to assess student behavior. SWIS is not a measure of student behavior, it is a database system for users to track office discipline referrals, suspensions, and other administrative decisions related to problem behavior. All measures should be described with detail and be linked with the project goals.

Reader’s Score:

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

Strengths:
The proposal includes a number of approaches to ensure feedback, including quarterly focus groups, teacher interviews, and assessment of teacher and student results on primary outcomes measures (p. 47). Overall, the methods will provide adequate performance feedback to permit assessment of project progress.
Sub Question

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

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:
The evaluation describes the differences between 30 teachers randomized to the treatment group and 30 teachers randomized to the control group. Intervention impacts will be analyzed using MANCOVA to control for baseline differences. If a project is implemented as described on page 42, it should result in evidence of promise assuming appropriate statistical adjustments for the nested structure of the data.

Weaknesses:
The evaluation design is not fully described and does not match the project design described in the rest of the narrative. For example, on page 1, the proposal indicates that 45 teachers will be impacted by the project. Overall, much more detail is necessary to judge the quality of the research design. It is unclear if the teachers will be randomly assigned within schools or from comparison schools; and how the project would control for contamination if within the schools. In addition, because the intervention is delivered at the teacher level, all analyses of student results will need to be controlled for nesting (e.g., HLM models). Overall, much more detail is necessary.

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 includes technology as a central component throughout all objectives and activities. As outlined on page 5, the proposal includes the use of myriad digital tools and Google products as key components of the professional development.

Weaknesses:
No description of current technology in place to ascertain how the project will increase technology integration.

Reader's Score: 19