

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/28/2010 1:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	23
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	23
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	9
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 38: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

This project provides a strongly supported effort to create high-quality arts assessments and a community of support around them to not only improved the arts education experiences for students involved, but also create collaboration experiences for teachers and arts professionals to benefit NY students for years to come. The open-source model of digital dissemination is a strength. Teachers will be involved with the Arts Partners throughout from initial development of the assessments, to evaluation and revising the tools and associated curriculum, to ongoing PLCs to continue to promote Arts Education.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible

applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

This proposal is clearly a practice or program that has not already been widely adopted, as high-quality assessments, and even more so in the arts, are greatly needed in today's schools. The innovative nature is clear in that the proposal will integrate technology into arts education for a number of students and will make all materials (including assessments, units of study, pd materials, and toolkit) open and digitally available to all schools.

The need for keeping arts education in schools is critical. Creating high-quality assessments for the areas of the arts will guarantee that it remains a strong part of the curriculum.

The development of CAD teams (Curriculum and Assessment Teams) made up of Arts partners and teaching staff shows a strong first step to achieving the project goals of creating Arts Education Assessments. This team approach to creating curricular resources will strengthen the relevance and rigor of the arts education that will ensue. Forming PLCs in the treatment schools will allow for continued professional development and collaboration amongst teacher participants. Weekly on-site consulting by Arts Achieve will ensure ongoing, high-quality participation.

The project goals are specific and very-well laid out with steps to achieving outcomes listed by implementation year.

This project provides a strongly supported effort to create high-quality arts assessments and a community of support around them to not only improve the arts education experiences for students involved, but also create collaboration experiences for teachers and arts professionals to benefit NY students for years to come. The open-source model of digital dissemination is a strength. Teachers will be involved with the Arts Partners throughout from initial development of the assessments, to evaluation and revising the tools and associated curriculum, to ongoing PLCs to continue to promote Arts Education.

Page 15 illustrates some very current research findings that improved arts education improves graduation rates.

Weaknesses

Even more reimbursed time could be planned for teachers to work with the Arts experts to create a stronger partnership and continue the review and mentoring to a larger scale.

Reader's Score: 23

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

Studio in a School has previously partnered with NYCDOE on numerous projects including creating local arts standards ("Blueprints") in 2003 and delivering related professional development to 2,400 arts teachers beyond that. This provides a strong case for past performance and knowledge in the same content area as the proposed grant project. The Arts Partners are highly qualified in the professional arts fields.

Weaknesses

Although the proposal claims that prior history has increased student participation in the arts, more professional development, improved teaching, and higher graduation rates, there is no hard core data to prove this correlation.

Reader's Score: 23

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The proposal includes numerous examples of dissemination modes. The applicant's past history of scaling similar projects clearly shows the capacity to do with this proposed project as well. The digital nature of the content will allow for easy accessibility for others beyond the treatment schools. Funding is promising from external partners to assure successful scalability. Strong in-kind support is demonstrated through partners' funding. Page 25 shows a possible scaling potential beyond New York.

Weaknesses

The proposal does not mention scalability beyond the state of New York to the degree that could be discussed, although there is every evidence that this would be possible. An estimated cost of \$25 per student beyond the term of the grant is a bit unclear. Assessments, online pd, and other resources will

already be created and fully function-able.

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths

By creating PLCs and professional mentoring, the schools should be able to sustain the project beyond its term of implementation. The stakeholders show strong support from the areas of the arts and the NYCDOE and prior history. Prior history shows strong assumed support for this movement.

Weaknesses

Does not show any support from the teachers themselves, teachers' unions, etc., for desire to sustain the project into the future.

Reader's Score: 9

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) 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.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

The Management Team is clearly identified as well as project evaluator and evidence exists that they will work closely together throughout the duration of the project. Retreats and inter-visitations should provide adequate management of carrying out the objectives of the project.

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

n/a

Weaknesses

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement

innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

n/a

Weaknesses

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

n/a

Weaknesses

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

n/a

Weaknesses

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 1:32 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 4:34 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	24
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 38: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>One of the unintentional consequences of NCLB - combined with state budget deficits - has been to narrow the curriculum. Applicant argues that the arts contribute to the English/Language Arts achievement, as well as graduation and strength of diploma, for those students who receive sufficient arts exposure. Applicant describes a population of culturally diverse, high-need students who, while surrounded by the cultural resources of New York City, may not benefit from these resources without tools and measures of the</p>

arts. If it's tested, it's taught. Project is well-defined, and has extremely clear goals, explicit strategies, and measurable outcomes.

Weaknesses

The link to English-Language Arts standards, rather than just arts standards, should be strengthened as schools will be more likely to invest in ELA because of its high-stakes status. Applicant should consider whether the arts also can and should impact mathematics.

Reader's Score: 24

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

Applicant has substantial experience with similar projects and the project partners have worked together for sufficient time that organizational structure should be no barrier. Applicant presents two separate studies demonstrating notable achievements: (1) findings that students who complete an arts sequence are more likely to graduate, and to graduate with a regents diploma; and (2) a study of an early childhood program by applicant

that showed positive effects on language and learning of children.

Weaknesses

None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

Applicant states an intent to directly impact 14,400 students in 24 schools. This represents a relatively small segment of the NYC school system, with its more than 1.1 million children. Applicant intends to create substantial resources through the proposed project (3 levels of assessments, exemplar

lessons, professional development) and has established an ongoing relationship with the NYC DOE (also a partner) sufficient to enable the project's expansion to the entire system. Although not discussed at length, project could potentially impact many other school systems through available resources. One partner, Cooper-Hewitt, will contribute to this wider dissemination. Cost estimates of scale-up are modest and manageable. Dissemination appears largely standard, but the involvement of NYC DOE should ensure that the program will be scaled up.

Weaknesses

Applicant should consider targeting a larger audience, particularly the ELA and mathematics communities, if results show positive impact on ELA and/or mathematics. Given the high stakes status of these two subjects, applicant should further collaboration with core content areas wherever possible.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths

Applicant (including all partners) has been engaged in work in this area for a number of years and demonstrates a thorough commitment to arts education. Based on the iterative development of past projects, it is anticipated that applicant will continue to develop and grow the proposed project beyond the life of the grant. Partners have committed funding to the proposed project, and have further committed to pursue funding. More importantly, "it is the intent of this project to embed the required skills, knowledge, and ability in the school team so that the project activities are sustainable beyond the term of the grant." (p. 27)

Weaknesses

None significant noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) 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.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

Management plan is explicit and detailed, reflecting applicant's substantial experience with this type of project. Qualifications are exceptional.

Weaknesses

None significant noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning**

programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that

are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 4:34 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 4:58 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	19
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	4
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 38: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396C100448)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposed project appears to be an innovative project that focuses on developing and implementing benchmark arts assessments for visual arts, music, dance and theater for students in 5-8th grade (p. 3) . This appears to innovative because due to recent economic hardships, art and music classes are some of the first departments to lose funding or even be eliminated because they are not directly tied to state achievement standards.

The applicant provided several statistics (p. 3) demonstrating that a significant number of students in their targeted population live in poverty, are minority students, live in foster care, are homeless or has been incarcerated. Often students living in such environments are not exposed to the arts outside of school; therefore they are deprived of the educational benefits of visiting a museum or attending a dance recital. However, the applicant indicated that current art programs are unable to demonstrate a connection between achievement in the arts to student academic growth; therefore it is difficult for educators and policy makers to continue to support and advocate for arts programs (p. 5). After reviewing this information, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated various reasons why benchmark art assessments need to be created to help high-need students in their proposed project. The applicant also indicated that an art-performance based tool does not currently exist, providing a sound argument for how this project is innovative. It appears that this model may be attractive to schools because it aligns with state benchmark standards.

The project established a clear set of goals and provided a table (p. e6-e12) that outlined project objectives and outcomes related to each goal, and the time when each objective/outcome would be implemented. After reviewing this table, it appears that the applicant has clearly identified their project goals and has established objectives and measurable outcomes that will ensure that project goals are met on time

Weaknesses

--

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for**

all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The applicant did an excellent job of demonstrating that they and their partnerships have been able to sustain a project with the NYCDOE focused on creating standards for visual arts education tied to state and national standards, which has reached a significant number of students in grades K-12 (p. 16). This suggests that the applicant has had previous experience implementing and sustaining a project of similar size and scope; therefore they should be able to successfully implement their proposed project.

The applicant also reported a recent and similar project, in which results from the first year indicated that students understanding and art achievement and performance significantly increased.

The applicant also demonstrated that results from this collaborative project indicated that teachers felt the program helped increase students learning, thinking and performance related to art (p. 19). This indicates that teachers perceive their previous projects to be beneficial to student learning, and suggests that their proposed project will also be appealing to teachers.

Weaknesses

Although results from previous projects suggested improved student achievement, pre and post data was not provided to support this statement/conclusion (p e.18).

Also, previous projects increased teacher's knowledge and understanding of art concepts; however meaningful data was not presented to support the effects of this strategy for students or for the schools. In general, the applicant did not include data to demonstrate the effects that their previous projects have had on improving student achievement.

Reader's Score: 19

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant stated the number of students their proposed projects intends to reach and provided a scale that the partners have previously used to ensure that the project will reach the proposed number of students (p. 24). Additionally, the applicant noted that their previous project required a large-scale replication and that they succeeded at this aspect. Since the applicant is drawing on strategies from their previous projects which allowed them to successfully bring the project to scale, it appears that these strategies should help them accomplish the same for their proposed project.

Interestingly, the project is designed with multiple layers of feedback, which appear to assist in making the project user friendly, thus making the project easy to replicate in a variety of settings. Additionally, the assessments are proposed to be available online, which will allow effortless access for other schools (p. 25).

It appears that the applicant should be able to successfully disseminate information and data from their proposed project because they noted a variety of mediums in which they share the results of their project at the state

and national level (p. 26).

It appears that after the initial development and implementation of the proposed project that the cost per student per school year is relatively low, i.e. \$25 (p. 25); therefore it appears that other school districts would be able support and implement this project as well.

Weaknesses

Although the applicant stated a specific monetary amount they are requesting as part of the i3 grant, they also noted monetary contributions from other sectors, making it unclear as to whether or not, the total amount needed for the project is beyond what they are requesting from the i3 grant (p. 25).

Reader's Score: 4

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths

The applicant successfully demonstrated that they have the resources and support from stakeholders to operate the project beyond the length of development. They documented previous grant funding they have obtained, as well as noting that all of the project partners have committed to contribute to the match (p. 26); therefore it appears that they have the previous experience and commitment to financially sustain the project beyond the Development grant. Additionally, the applicant demonstrated that project partners have continued to advance the project over the past 7 years; therefore they have the experience and ability to continue developing the project.

It also appears that the project will be able to be sustained as a result of the skills and knowledge that teachers within the schools are taught as part of the project and will be able to continue to utilize once the grant period is over (p.

27).

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) 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.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

The applicant indicated that the management team will have monthly scheduled meetings, which appears to be a promising way for the management team to ensure that the project is being implemented appropriately and that they stay within their proposed budget.

Additionally, the applicant included a specific outline of the project strategies and a timeline for each strategy (p. 28-29). It appears that the applicant has developed a thorough plan to ensure that the project will be implemented appropriately and on time, while simultaneously reaching the project objectives.

The applicant provided supporting evidence to suggest that the key project personnel have a vast amount of experience that is directly and indirectly related to the requirements to successfully conduct this project (p. 30-31); therefore the management team should be able to effectively implement a project of this size and scope

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

N/A

Weaknesses

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/26/2010 4:58 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:35 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396D100448)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	6
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	12
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
TOTAL	25	18

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396D100448)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths

1 STRENGTH OF RESEARCH-BASED FINDINGS OR REASONABLE HYPOTHESES

STRENGTHS

1. On page 13 the applicant states its hypothesis to develop standards for evaluating arts program teaching and student outcomes in New York City School District. This is important given on page 14 that there are no school district or statewide standards for the school district or other districts in New York to follow.
2. On page 13 the applicant lists several studies that reinforce the need for standards which helps to improve student achievement.

2 PROPOSED PROJECT ATTEMPTED PREVIOUSLY WITH PROMISING RESULTS

STRENGTHS

1. On page 15 the applicant cites a study of a high school exit test for students in New York City who completed a major arts sequence were found to show meaningful increases in specific outcomes desired by this grant program (i.e. graduation rates and at a high achievement level).

3 PROJECT LIKELY TO HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT AS MEASURED

BY THE EFFECT, ON IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, CLOSING GAPS, DROPOUT RATES, GRADUATION RATES, COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS, COLLEGE GRADUATION.
STRENGTHS

1. On page 14 the applicant lists a study that documents that completion of art courses correlate with higher level of achievement and college attainment. The completion of arts courses indicate positive impact on the funding agency's desired outcomes.

Weaknesses

1 STRENGTH OF RESEARCH-BASED FINDINGS OR REASONABLE HYPOTHESES
WEAKNESSES

1. There were no studies which addressed how setting standards in other states improved student achievement. The studies cited reference only the significance of setting standards but do not address how standards in other states provided statistical data documenting achievement gains.

2 PROPOSED PROJECT ATTEMPTED PREVIOUSLY WITH PROMISING RESULTS
WEAKNESSES

1. There were no weaknesses noted.

3 PROJECT LIKELY TO HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT AS MEASURED BY THE EFFECT, ON IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, CLOSING GAPS, DROPOUT RATES, GRADUATION RATES, COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS, COLLEGE GRADUATION.
WEAKNESSES

1. On page 16 there is no discussion of the relationship between the course offered in the Los Angeles study and the courses or sequencing of courses offered in the existing New York City School District. Without this information, it is difficult to correlate the findings in Los Angeles will be replicated in New York. The applicant makes implied assumptions that are not documented. This presents significant concerns regarding the appropriate documentation of impacts as measured by the effect on student outcomes.

Reader's Score: 6

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

1 METHODS OF EVALUATION ARE APPROPRIATE TO THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

STRENGTHS

1. On page 20 the applicant will conduct an experimental design including 24 treatment and 24 control school sites at the elementary, middle and high school levels and will include an overall total of 7,200 students over the life of the grant. This combined with the research questions listed on page 21 will provide useful and meaningful outcome data.
2. In the budget narrative the applicant listed funding for focus group participants and \$1,000 for each control school site to encourage participation. This seems appropriate and will be helpful in the data collection efforts.

2 METHODS OF EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION DATA AND PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK, AND PERIODIC ASSESSMENT

STRENGTHS

1. On page 21 the applicant lists numerous periodic and year end data collection and feedback. This is a significant strength of the evaluation process.

3 THE EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE KEY ELEMENTS AND APPROACH FOR REPLICATION OR TESTING

STRENGTHS

1. On page 22 the applicant notes that the evaluation will collect data including data from surveys, focus groups, and observations. These will be

beneficial in providing information regarding the mode of instruction and student achievement.

2. On page 22 the applicant will use multiple regression analysis which could be valuable in determining the level of impact of the multiple variables in the analysis.

3. On page 22 the applicant addresses fidelity which is important to the replication of the model.

4 THE PROJECT INCLUDES SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION EFFECTIVELY STRENGTHS

1. On pages 23 and 24 the applicant indicates it has allocated personnel and resources for the evaluation including description of the evaluator and the funding levels for the evaluation.

Weaknesses

1 METHODS OF EVALUATION ARE APPROPRIATE TO THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE PROJECT WEAKNESSES

1. There does not seem to be any significant weaknesses noted.

2 METHODS OF EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION DATA AND PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK, AND PERIODIC ASSESSMENT WEAKNESSES

1. There were not significant weaknesses noted.

3 THE EVALUATION WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE KEY ELEMENTS AND APPROACH FOR REPLICATION OR TESTING WEAKNESSES

1. On page 14 the applicant noted the positive outcomes that students taking art courses had on math, reading and writing. On page 22 the applicant does not address any data collection or inferential data analysis of these test scores with the number of art courses taken or specific art courses. This oversight lessons the ability of the applicant to answer meaningful, in depth research questions regarding whether these art courses incorporate state standards for math, reading, and writing. The analysis misses significant outcomes to address how and why there is a correlation among these outcomes

4 THE PROJECT INCLUDES SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR THE EVALUATION EFFECTIVELY

WEAKNESSES

1. There were no significant weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 12

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 11:35 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/21/2010 10:33 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396D100448)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	3
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	15
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
TOTAL	25	18

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 08: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: The Studio in a School Association, Inc. -- , - , (U396D100448)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout

rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths

Strengths: The applicant cites research to support the core components of the program: the use of assessments to guide curriculum development, professional development, and data feedback through the use of technology (pg 13).

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: The applicant includes a section on previous attempts and promising results, but fails to demonstrate that the proposed project, or a similar project, has been attempted previously (pgs 14-15). They make the case that students completing more arts credits are more likely to graduate, but this is unrelated to improving the arts program as proposed.

On page 15 the applicant cites evidence that intensive arts involvement during middle and high school is associated with higher levels of achievement and college attainment. The program is designed to improve arts education, not to intensify student arts involvement. Therefore, this argument fails to support implementation of the program components or the specific program design.

Reader's Score: 3

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

Strengths: The use of random assignment of schools to treatment and control, and stratified by school level strengthens the evaluation (pg 20). The design is further strengthened by the use of propensity score matching to select matched comparison students where student-level comparisons are possible.

The evaluation design includes both formative and summative questions, and will employ qualitative and quantitative methods to obtain data. The evaluation plan is fairly comprehensive, including a brief description of data sources, procedures, and a plan for data analysis. (pgs 22-23).

The proposal includes a clear plan for further development and to provide sufficient information about key elements and approach to facilitate replication or testing in other settings. The evaluators will prepare a variety of reports tailored to the needs of specific stakeholders (pg 23).

The applicants planned the evaluation resources with the evaluators (pg 23). The evaluators have the appropriate experience and credentials to conduct the evaluation, and are sufficiently experienced to know the extent of resources required for such an evaluation (Appendix C).

Weaknesses

Weaknesses: There were no weaknesses noted for the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 15

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 10:33 AM