

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2014 02:20 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	32
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	23
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	17
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
<b>Total</b>	100	72

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 8: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

#### Strengths:

The applicant addresses the priority in the proposed project in that they are seeking to improve academic outcomes for EL students in academic courses such as ELA, and history through arts integration and the infusion of ESL standards. The approach is novel in that the applicants infuse arts integration and technology in the Story Studio framework that is currently being used within the program. It seems that the applicants are seeking to use the art of story telling as a method of providing access to ELs to the learning curriculum in the targeted academic areas. The primary focus of the proposed project is to develop the teaching skills of content area teachers so that the teaching and learning of ELs can happen within the general education environment instead of using a pull-out model where ELs will have to be taught in isolation with an ESL teacher.

The proposed project will contribute to the advancement and development of theory, knowledge, and practices as it will provide teachers with more information on best practices for addressing the needs of ELs in the general education classroom. The proposed project contributes to the field of study also by increasing the level of understanding of literacy learning for ELs.

**Weaknesses:**

the use of the E-learning tools seems primarily for the teachers with no thought as to how the integration of technology that directly impacts the students can be beneficial to the significance of the proposed project. Teachers currently receive a lot of PD on e-learning tools; many of which they do not typically use on a daily basis. This portion of the proposed project could have been strengthened had the applicant addressed the priority from the perspective of infusion of technology for the purposes of student learning.

**Reader's Score: 32**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

**1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).**

**(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.**

**Strengths:**

The strengths of this project design are that the applicant actually included goals, activities, and a logic model demonstrating that they have actually thought about what they would like to achieve in the proposed project and how they will go about achieving these goals.

The applicant has sufficiently identified possible risk to the proposed project and ways in which to mitigate those risk. The applicant has shared this information in a clear and cohesive table which has explicitly listed the risk to each individual goal and how the applicant will mitigate the specific risk. This is strength to the proposed project as it clearly states the risk and the mitigation.

**Weaknesses:**

The goals as written are not specific. The applicant has stated what they want the ELs to achieve, and what they want the teachers to achieve through the implementation of their project, but to what extent? For example in Goal #1 the applicant states the ELs should improve in English fluency, ELA test scores, explicit vocabulary, and use of technology, but to what extent. Even if they improve by half a percentage point that is an improvement, but does that constitute a quality design? Further I am not sure how the applicant plans to measure the long term goal of achieving to full capacity. I do not see a connection between the logic model and these goals. The same can be stated for Goal number 2; it is not written specifically enough to allow me to make the connection as to how the activities listed will lead to the desired outcome.

While the narrative is well written with a lot of information on the need for PD for teachers centered on the instruction of ELs, I still do not fully understand the how of this project. The applicant discusses that teachers will be given PD to strengthen the literacy skills for ELs in the content area, but I am not clear on how providing PD in Story Studio will equate to automatic teacher effectiveness in the classroom. Additionally, I am not sure how this differs from the previous Story Studio project by this applicant other than the addition of the technology piece and the push to train content area teachers on how to teach ELs instead of using specialized teachers.

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

**1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.**

**(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.**

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

**(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has included a clear and detailed table on the members of the project management team and the roles and responsibilities of each key member of the team. A comprehensive timeline for the implementation of targeted project activities is included and metrics for assessing program progress is clearly developed with identified annual targets for monitoring of progress towards project goals.

In the project narrative, the applicant has identified key partners and their level of commitment to the project. This is a strength in that the applicant not only listed the key partners, but has also clearly explained the purpose of each key partner and their role in the successful implementation of project activities and progress toward project goals.

The feedback loop and continuous improvement plan is adequate as the applicant has outlined when feedback will be collected, and how it will be assessed for the purposes of improvement.

The skills and expertise of the identified PD are adequate as she has experience with the organization and has managed programs of similar magnitude in the past.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant has identified only one person as the PD for this large scale project. While the person identified seems very skilled and able to carry out the responsibilities of the project, the reader has concern with the ability for this person to be bi-coastal and ensure that the project is making progress as outlined in the design in both NY and LA, especially since the identified PD will only contribute .3FTE to the project.

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   09/21/2014 02:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/17/2014 09:21 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	34
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	29
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
<b>Total</b>	100	81

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 8: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

##### General:

This project incorporates teacher professional development, coaching, and online communities into an arts integration-based model for instruction, Story Studio. The project goals involve improvement of fluency as well as academic skills; the Story Studio framework focuses on providing a language-rich environment, using digital tools to support language use, and incorporating Common Core standards for language arts into language and social studies coursework. The project design provides for ongoing teacher support and financial incentives for teachers; the bi-coastal nature of the project, combined with the use of an online digital platform, provide opportunities for dissemination and scale-up. The project evaluation plan incorporates both quantitative and qualitative measures and addresses the impact of Story Studio on student achievement as well as incorporation of promising instructional practices into day-to-day instruction.

## Reader's Score:

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.**

##### Strengths:

The application responds to absolute priority 4, subpart a, by incorporating digital tools to support Common Core standards and English instruction, both of which have an overall goal of improving achievement for English learners. The application presents pilot data from the Story Studio approach, which has been piloted in two large, urban districts with high EL populations. The project is novel in that it synthesizes digital storytelling, an arts-integration-based professional development component, and Common Core standards to support students' language proficiency growth and subject-area success. The applicant also describes a set of comprehensive professional development supports which will be provided to participating teachers; these include an online community, embedded coaching and PD, opportunities for co-teaching, and financial incentives for teachers who remain part of the initiative. The application details plans at the end of the project for scalability, including dissemination of the model and presentation of the Story Studio initiative to other

districts who may be interested in participating.

**Weaknesses:**

While the applicant states that there is a strong theoretical base underlying arts integration, teacher professional development, and other components of the project, and it is clear how this project will contribute to practice, a more full discussion of the contributions to theory and knowledge would be useful.

**Reader's Score: 34**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

**1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).**

**(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.**

**Strengths:**

The project involves three long-term and three short-term goals. These goals are stated clearly and explicitly and all involve measurable outcomes. The Logic Model provided in the appendix provides timeframes, inputs and outputs and clearly delineates elements of the project and how they are aligned to the goals. The project includes goals related to student achievement, teacher knowledge and implementation of arts integration to support ELs, and ongoing creation of digital communities of teachers who are using Story Studio. The project narrative provides metrics used to assess each of these. The narrative also describes potential risks involved for each program goal and presents steps to minimize risk, which include coaching, modeling, incentives for teachers and coaches, and whole-school adoption. The narrative describes the steps to be taken to accomplish each goal, including a gradual rollout of the initiative among teachers from different disciplines so as to provide for ongoing formative assessment and improvement as needed. The activities described under each goal spell out steps which will be taken to accomplish the goal and are clearly described. Project staff will work with classroom teachers to support the implementation of Story Studio lessons and arts-integration based approaches; specific supports described appear generally sufficient to accomplish the goals and include co-teaching and coaching by project staff, deployment of arts-based strategies in the classroom, and ongoing, embedded professional development. The project design provides for significant teacher involvement and peer coaching, increasing potential for teacher buy-in and continuous adoption.

**Weaknesses:**

While project goals are explicitly stated, it would be useful to see more specificity around the logistics of teacher coaching and assessment of teachers' implementation, given the importance of teacher skills to Goal 2. For example, specific topics for workshops and more detail about differentiating workshop content to teacher background (p. 9), as well as more detail about how "PD will grow with teachers as they progress through years 1-3," would be helpful in understanding the nature and scope of the PD provided to teachers.

**Reader's Score: 29**

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

**1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.**

**(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.**

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

**(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.**

### **Strengths:**

The management plan includes concrete objectives and specifies individuals responsible for project activities. In-school implementation will be supported by school liaisons and procedures for ongoing communication and improvement are described. The plan specifies procedures which will be used to formatively assess progress toward project goals, and describes how data will be collected and used. Data analysis to assess ongoing progress will include frequent meetings with a variety of stakeholders. The project includes an array of partners who have capacity to support the project and who have prior involvement with the project. The narrative identifies a private-sector match. The project personnel, including the proposed Project Director, have experience managing large-scale initiatives and substantial budgets and appear well-qualified to support the goals of this project.

### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant needs to provide additional specificity regarding how formative data will be collected and interpreted in order to support ongoing feedback and continuous improvement.

**Reader's Score: 18**

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

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

**(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**

**(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**

**(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

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

evaluation effectively.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

Not applicable.

**Weaknesses:**

Not applicable.

**Reader's Score:**      **0**

---

**Status:**              Submitted

**Last Updated:**    09/17/2014 09:21 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2014 11:09 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	0
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	13
<b>Total</b>	100	13

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 8: 84.411C

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

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

Reader's Score:

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

NA

Weaknesses:

NA

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

**(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.**

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NS

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

**1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.**

**(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.**

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

**(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.**

**Strengths:**

NA

**Weaknesses:**

NA

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

- (1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan will assess both implementation and impact. The applicant plans to measure implementation fidelity for Continuous Quality Improvement so it can make project modifications that may be needed. The attention to implementation fidelity will help ensure that the evaluation focuses on the project as planned. This increases the likelihood of project success. Impact data at the project's conclusion will provide important data of the project's efficacy and its changes in student achievement. The applicant's plan to measure students' scores and proficiency levels includes a variety of data sources (observations, surveys, student work, and portfolios). Collecting this broad data will help show the effect of the project through a range of formats and guide others in implementation (pages 11, 20-25).

The applicant has identified three appropriate key questions for evaluating the proposed project that address critical information. An implementation question is included to help ensure the project is implemented with fidelity at all sites and according to its timeline. A question about intended outcomes will provide a measure of project results through a quasi-experimental design that will provide important information about the project's efficacy. Determining which program components are the strongest drivers of program outcomes, along with the triangulation of data, can be beneficial for future research and will provide valuable information for others who plan to replicate the program. The evaluation plan includes thorough information about how each will be measured. This attention to detail before the proposed project begins helps ensure an impartial evaluation that is comprehensive (pages 19-22, e107-e115).

The evaluation plan includes a proposed sample size and a minimum detectable effect size that aligns well with the expected project impact and will effectively address the project's key questions. The clear expectation of sample sizes for program, treatment, and comparison groups during each year illustrates their attention to detail. The plan to follow What Works Clearinghouse guidelines is important in that it shows the applicant's expectations to add to the current body of research (pages 22-25 e114).

The applicant has identified an external evaluation team with a qualified Principal Investigator. She has experience with other evaluation projects, helping to ensure the proposed project will be evaluated objectively and according to research standards. The proposed project allocates sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively (pages 25, e70-72, e119).

**Weaknesses:**

Although the proposed project includes a goal for self-sustaining communities of educators who implement this program, the evaluation plan did not include plans to address it (pages 9-10, 20-24).

It is unclear whether the external evaluator has expertise in performing evaluations for federal projects, because the key questions do not fully correspond to the proposed project's goals (pages 8-11, 20-22).

**Reader's Score:** 13

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/16/2014 11:09 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2014 06:00 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	0
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	0
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	13
<b>Total</b>	100	13

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 8: 84.411C

Reader #4: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

**General:**

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

**Strengths:**

not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

not applicable

Reader's Score: 0

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

#### 1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the

proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

**Strengths:**

not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

not applicable

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

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

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

**Strengths:**

not applicable

**Weaknesses:**

not applicable

**Reader's Score: 0**

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

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

- (1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.**

**Strengths:**

The project is for the development, implementation, and evaluation of an arts-based functional approach for working with English Language learners. The project involves professional development for teachers (Abstract). The applicant presents three goals that are broken out as short-term and long-term goals (E 24 – 26). The focus is primarily on the short-term goals. The goals are potentially measurable. The clear statement of the goals provides direction for the evaluation plan.

The applicant provides a schedule of events that includes evaluation along with other activities of the project. The timetable specifically mentions when surveys will be taken and observations by the evaluation team (E 30 – 31). Providing the timing for evaluation events with respect to other activities of the project suggests that the applicant has carefully thought through the entirety of the evaluation and thus the evaluation plan is likely to be effective.

The applicant plans for an external evaluation agency (E 29). The applicant describes expertise and experience of the evaluators with respect to the proposed project. The resumes for the three evaluators suggest that they are relatively new to the practice of evaluation; however, they have relevant expertise.

The applicant states and discusses three research questions (key questions) (E 109 – 114). Although not explicit, the two of the questions appear to be associated with the first two goals of the project (E 36 – 38). This is important because for an evaluation to be effective the key questions have to be associated with the goals of the project; otherwise evaluation will be misdirected. The third question addresses fidelity of implementation. The evaluation plan includes the use of qualitative data that will be in the form of interviews, observations, and surveys that are described in various places in the narrative. The applicant also discusses the analysis of qualitative data (E 114). The logical connection, provided by the applicant, between goals, research questions and analyses suggest that the evaluation plan will be effective.

The applicant discusses sample size for a sample that will be drawn from eight schools using a balance comparison group (E 38, E 111). The applicant discusses power and argues that the sample sizes sufficient for the proposed study. The applicant will use a quasi-experimental interrupted time series approach (E 38 – 40, E 111). Since the impact study is to involve state exams into states, the applicant cites the literature in support of a method appropriate for the situation (E 112). These are appropriate evaluation procedures.

The applicant presents a table of metrics for assessing the program and annual targets. There are targets for both teachers and students (E 31 – 32). The targets for teacher are about participation, satisfaction, and knowledge

improvement due to the professional development. Teacher knowledge is to be assessed through classroom observations and interviews (E 110). The applicant plans to use performance measures (E 27). The evaluation will monitor utilization and satisfaction of the innovation as part of the evaluation program (E 26 – 27). The targets for students are that they will increase performance on one or more language related State test (E 31, E 110). Academic language measures are to include district measures, state measures, and a measure of explicit vocabulary use which is to be developed by the project (E 112). Baseline data is to be collected (E55). These are elements of a strong evaluation plan.

The design is to involve a comparison group where both “Qualitative and quantitative data will be collected in both treatment and comparison classrooms to assess the influence of variations between classrooms on implementation goals” (E 39). Collecting appropriate data in both conditions makes for a very strong comparison model.

The applicant plans to implement innovation with fidelity (E 27); to this end, the applicant plans to use a Continuous Quality Improvement approach to ensure that evaluation data is fed back to the project for project improvement (E 27). The applicant specifically addresses fidelity of implementation and the use of data for continuous program improvement (E 114 – 115). The evaluation plan calls for monthly meetings where the evaluation team will provide data to the project team for the purpose of improving implementation (E 34 – 35). Fidelity of implementation and steps taken to sustain fidelity are critical; otherwise, the implementation may vary from the intended implementation resulting in an ineffective evaluation of what was intended.

The budget request is \$367,000, which is approximately 12% of the total budget. The percentage is reasonable and should be sufficient for the project (E 119).

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant uses the words goals, objectives, and outcomes interchangeably (Abstract, E 24 – 26, logic model). However this creates confusion, especially for what is to be evaluated, given that these are technical terms with different definitions and should not be used as synonyms.

While the applicant provides a schedule of events that includes evaluation, the table does not appear to include anything about assessing student academic improvement as one would expect under goal one. The table also does not indicate how the various activities that are listed are connected with the three goals of the project (E 30 – 31).

At one point the applicant refers to knowledge test taken by the teachers (E 31 – 32), but later it turns out that teacher knowledge is to be assessed through observations and interviews (E110). The applicant uses the phrase “pre/post test survey” which confuses the concepts of test and survey; but at other times the applicant uses the phrase “pre/post survey” (E 112). A stronger proposal would avoid such inconsistencies and confusions.

Nothing in the evaluation plan appears to address the third goal which is sustainability. If something is stated as a project goal, it needs to be considered in the evaluation plan. The evaluators are relatively inexperienced. More experienced evaluators may not have missed including all goals in the evaluation plan.

According to the applicant there are to be three persons involved in the evaluation (see resumes). The budget justification however only mentions one person. Moreover, the budget justification does not specify what the funds are for. It appears that the funds are for the salary of the lead evaluator. If that is the case, then there is no indication as to how the other members of the evaluation team are to be supported. There is also no indication that the evaluation would require any supplies or materials. A stronger proposal would provide a more explicit justification for the evaluation budget.

**Reader's Score: 13**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/18/2014 06:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2014 05:29 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
<b>Summary Statement</b>		
1. Summary Statement	0	
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance	35	35
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	30	30
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	10
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
<b>Total</b>	100	75

# Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 8: 84.411C

Reader #5: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Urban Arts Partnership (U411C140107)

## Questions

### Summary Statement - Summary Statement

#### 1. Summary Statement (Optional)

**General:**

N/A

### Reader's Score:

### Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

**Note:** In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposed to address absolute priority to increase number and proportion of ELs in completing courses in core academic subjects using approach grounded in arts integration to address the need for universal teacher preparation by targeting outcomes related to teaching and learning and producing a replicable model for raising capacity of schools to serve needs of ELs.

The applicant will utilize the telling personal narratives found to be successful in building competency in English among ELs as outlined in the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis of Language Development (Krashen, 1998, 2008) p.1-

The applicant proposes to contribute to the theory, Knowledge and practices by building on existing knowledge as indicated in the 2012-2013, Story Studio students found to have Median Adjusted Growth Percentile Scores of 67% in ELA & 72% in Math. Additionally 82% demonstrated increased knowledge of academic vocabulary. Participating ESL teachers improved ability to integrate visual arts and theater units with ESL curriculum (85% and 79% respectively) (p. 5-6). Ninety-seven percent of participating teachers increased communication with other teachers across subject areas. The project is of national significance, and will be poised for dissemination to schools throughout the country where ELs are struggling to succeed. The project is built on evidence-based models for instruction, PD, & school-wide support combined with innovative approach of arts integration and telling personnel narrative within history context.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 35**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

**1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).**

**(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant plans to achieve goals through the implementation of project addresses three short & long term goals (p.8) For example, program staff provides embedded PD, co-teaching weekly to deliver Story Studio and work towards creating long-term portfolio for each students. Studio Story activities, including researching, telling stories, listening to others and engaging conversation wit others, will support practice of social and academic language in and out of the classroom and promote fluency and explicit vocabulary. The delivery and progressive support to promote use of arts integration to support ELs, creating self-sustaining communities to spread arts-based ESL infusion into ongoing teach development will be utilized. Participating teachers will use digital tools to support their Story Studio PD, and e-learning and in-person learning immediately to use tools for their direct benefit.

The applicant has identified the potential risks and strategies to mitigate those risks in Table 1 on page 12 of the proposal. The applicant aligns the risks and strategies to mitigate with the project goals.

Delivery & progressive support to promote use of arts integration to support ELs, creating self-sustaining communities to spread arts-based ESL infusion into ongoing teacher development

Participating teachers use digital tools to support their Story Studio PD

e-learning and in-person learning immediately use tools to their direct benefit.

Table 1 - mitigation of risks on page 12 identifies potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score: 30**

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

**1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.**

**(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.**

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

**(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.**

**Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.**

**Strengths:**

Management plan & key responsibilities-

The applicant has provided information on the management plan and key responsibilities on Table 2 , which identifies key members of management team along with their responsible for project implementation ( p. 13). In addition, the timeline of activities, the metrics used to assess program for progress gathered monthly and for discussion at curriculum meetings are outlined in Table 3 on p. 14 of the proposal. The key partners demonstrate commitment with three involved in proposal planning process and continue to support project in implementation ( p. 17). The applicant provides a process for feedback & continuous improvement for the project to follow a model of CQI based on rapid time data analysis, stakeholder involvement, and flexibility to make mid-course corrections. The Curriculum Committee will meet monthly and review data on progress towards implementation and outcome goals at each meeting. Teaching Artists will meet at least weekly with Project Coordinator to identify needs share ideas and challenges. The Project Coordinator will conference call weekly with Project Manager. The Project Director will meet monthly with other UAP Project Directors to share best practices and work through challenges. The CEO will participate in Curriculum Committee meeting quarterly and other stakeholders will be asked for feedback through surveys and open committee at project events-p. 18-19

The Project Director identified for the project has experience as a VP of Programs @ UAP since 2009 and has led programmatic growth from 1.5 million to 8 million and has managed bi-coastal projects of similar scale.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not appear to have a sufficient number of staff and tie allocated in conjunction with key responsibilities for a bi-coastal project. For example, the CEO & Project Director are less than FTE for a full time bi-coastal project (p. 13). There are two Project Coordinators are less than FTE in Yr 1, which is the initial startup period and typically very time intensive as it relates to the significant amount of time in conjunction with key responsibilities. The instructional designer and evaluator principle investigator are contractual and there is no time allocation given. There one Program Manager who is a FTE to manage a bicoastal project, in the initial startup period and typically very time intensive as it relates to the key responsibilities.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

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

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

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

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

**Strengths:**

N/A

**Weaknesses:**

N/A

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   09/19/2014 05:29 PM