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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Education City of Chicago, 299 (U351C140052)

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

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		5	5
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		10	8
Quality of Project Services			
1. Project Services		15	11
Quality of Project Personnel			
1. Project Personnel		15	15
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		30	23
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	23
	Sub Total	100	85
Priority Questions			
CPP-Technology			
Competitive Preference Priority-Technology			
1. CPP-Technology		20	14
	Sub Total	20	14
	Total	120	99

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Professional Development Arts Educators - 5: 84.351C

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

Applicant: Board of Education City of Chicago, 299 (U351C140052)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   General:

   N/A

Reader's Score: 5

   Sub Question

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

      Strengths:

      Through providing teachers professional development that enhances and expands their effectiveness and knowledge of integrating arts with Core Curriculum, and the replication ability of these, this project is very like to build local capacity to provide, improve, and expand services to address the needs of the teachers and the students whom they serve.

      Weaknesses:

      N/A

      Reader's Score:

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

      Strengths:

      Comprehensive dissemination of the results of proposed project through PD presentations by participating teachers to other educational professionals, providing technical assistance to other educators, visits by others to observe focus schools, posting on partner websites resources, and utilization of partner websites to inform other educators will enable others to use the information or strategies learned through this project.

      Weaknesses:

      N/A

      Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 8

Sub Question

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

   Strengths:

   The proposed project to improve student learning and teacher effectiveness as a result of integrating arts and technology into the regular curriculum is conceptually very well supported through strong theory that positively supports project focus. Several research sources cited include nationally recognized education publications, recognized authorities on the subject of education and arts integration, and partner current research data obtained from arts in education project research. References cited provided supporting evidence of arts integration's positive impact on student learning and higher achievement levels, and support of teacher professional development evidencing the building of teachers' knowledge and competencies with improvement in instructional practices with strengthened self-efficacy and teacher-led lesson planning and design. (pp.18-22

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   Applicant's project design provides a plan for continuation of the project purposes and benefits by including elements and activities that will be incorporated into the Applicant's Department of Arts Education and disseminated to other schools and teachers in the school system. Planned project elements and activities include project teacher training of other teachers, project schools utilizing the products outcomes and tools to align the school system Guide for Teaching and Learning in the Arts to National Core Arts Standards, and to utilizing project best practices to inform others and incorporate media arts into the school system Arts curriculum. (p. 24)

   Weaknesses:

   There is no mention of direct or indirect student involvement in ongoing sustainable elements of the project in the classroom. No direct mention of how technologies will continue to be utilized to facilitate student and teacher involvement other than indirectly through curriculum alignment at the school system level. It is unclear what's happening with technology in the classroom to ensure that both students and teachers are actively participating in on a continuous basis as a result of this project.

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

   General:

   N/A

Reader's Score: 11

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

   Strengths:

   Quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented are adequate, with Applicant providing strategies of language interpretation, program materials in alternative formats to accommodate varied learning styles, and inclusion of students with IEPs. Applicant will also ensure equal access for all teachers by advertising in printed media and online, and through public announcements. Teachers will be chosen based on several recruitment strategies that are relevant, appropriate and inclusive.

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   The quality, intensity and duration of the professional development for the MCLBs is adequate enough to lead to improvements in knowledge and practice among those recipients of the training. (pp.26-27)

   Weaknesses:

   The frequency of professional development and direct involvement of ALL teachers in learning strategies (other than the MCLBs) is not enough over a 4 year period to ensure improvements in practice among the remainder of teachers. (pp.26-28). Even though the Applicant plan indicates the creation of 5 Units over a 4-year period that will be generated, the MCLB and Classroom partner teachers have only 1 co-planning day per unit. Additionally, more teacher training and development of other arts teachers who are not MCLBs is needed, so that the benefits of the project training can be utilized instructing students in those classrooms. If this is a model dissemination pilot project to determine the efficacy and outcomes of this type of project, then the given involvement of only the MCLBs is understood. But if not, then more involvement in teacher development – in some way – should be included. (It is unclear how or if the MCLBs more frequently pass their newly learned knowledge onto those teachers whom they lead.)

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   Based on research results cited by the Applicant, services to be provided by the proposed project, and the assessment of the professional development impact on teacher capacity, knowledge and the effect of instructional practices effect on student engagement (see Project Evaluation section), improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards is likely.

Weaknesses:

Although Applicant mentions classroom observation and teacher reflection utilizing technology as tools for teacher assessment, not mentioned is the frequency and rigor of the formative assessment of the project teachers receiving the professional development.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   General:

   N/A

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

1. **(A) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

   Strengths:

   The Applicant states adhering to EEO diversity planning and employment processes adhering the Federal and State guidelines. The Applicant encourages applications for employment from all groups and has initiatives in place to adhere to EEO and Affirmative Action efforts, ensuring no discrimination exists in its employment policies and practices.

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   Qualifications of key project personnel, who are in the Applicant school system, are in line with the scope of work of the positions. Key personnel are collectively experienced in leadership and/or upper level management of an Arts Education Department and/or Programs in Arts Education, professional development, curriculum development/writing, assessment, community building strategic planning, and Arts project management. All have Masters Degrees.

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Qualifications of key project personnel, who are in the Applicant school system, are in line with the scope of work of the positions. Key personnel are collectively experienced in leadership and/or upper level management of an Arts Education Department and/or Programs in Arts Education, professional development, curriculum development/writing, assessment, community building strategic planning, and Arts project management. All have Masters Degrees.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 23

Sub Question

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

    Strengths:

    The Applicant's management plan is adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget. Milestones for accomplishing the project tasks are given

    Weaknesses:

    Although responsibilities for milestones are provided in a general manner, clearly defined specific responsibilities for each milestone are not provided in terms of who is designated with what responsibility within each milestone. Additionally, no specific dates are included in the "deadline" timeline, with usage of terms such as "convene by" or just listing of a specific month as the deadline.

    Reader's Score:

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

    Strengths:

    Time commitments for ATLAS Project Manager (DAE) and Project Co-Director are adequate to meet adjectives of the project. Time commitment of CAPE Executive Director, and Development & Marketing Associate are adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

    Weaknesses:

    Time commitment for the Principal Investigator services is not listed but is allocated in terms of salary only, as is the CAPE Research Associate who collects and organizes all project data. The CAPE Education Director position, .2

FTE is not adequate to meet objectives of the project. (30-31)

Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   The Applicant reports that on a bi-annual basis data will be collected from teacher self-reflections, observations, interviews, and surveys, to ensure feedback and continuous improvement. The Applicant mentions that feedback surveys will be gathered from participants at each professional development workshop; formative assessments of student learning will be administered after implementation of each curriculum unit, giving immediate feedback on student improvement and comprehension. Results of feedback will be discussed at project team meetings, enabling staff and teachers to utilize data to determine any improvements needed, and to compare feedback data to project benchmarks and timelines, making any adjustments as necessary. Applicant also mentions that data will be shared with the External Evaluator, who will conduct independent analysis of the program, which will support annual reporting requirements as well as inform further program adjustments moving into subsequent years.

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

   General:

   N/A

Reader's Score: 23

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

   Strengths:

   The project employs a quasi-experimental research design, and will generate quantitative and qualitative data. This includes the analysis project goal completion through formative and summative assessments, evaluating the professional development, documentation, planning and dissemination processes, to include assessing the professional development impact on teacher capacity, knowledge, and instructional practices to include its impact on student engagement and academic achievement in reading and math. Utilization of self-report, surveys, generation of teacher lessons/units in the classroom and the use of technology to support the arts integration units.

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   The methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

   Weaknesses:

   Applicant did not give specifics as to how or when performance feedback will be given from formative assessments. Specific dates or times were not listed; non-specific terms such as annual, or one, or each year were utilized.

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   The methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence in most areas.

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP-Technology - Competitive Preference Priority-Technology

1. **Projects that are designed to improve student achievement (as defined in the notice) or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

   Strengths:

   Project will provide professional development in order to build teacher technological capacity to integrate technology into arts and Common Core curricula through:
   (1) Teachers learning how to document their work and instructional practices utilizing technology
   (2) Teachers learning how to utilize technology as a medium for instruction, and
   (3) Teachers learning how to utilize technology to support the National Core Arts and Common Core State Standards as embedded in their curriculum.

   Professional development related to arts and technology integration with Common Core will be given to not only enhance teacher instructional competencies but to help improve student achievement in meeting State academic standards.

   Weaknesses:

   No specifics or examples were given as to what technologies would be used or how the applicant would go about offering these professional development opportunities.

Reader's Score: **14**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/06/2014 08:18 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Education City of Chicago, 299 (U351C140052)
Reader #1: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		5	4
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		10	9
Quality of Project Services			
1. Project Services		15	13
Quality of Project Personnel			
1. Project Personnel		15	14
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		30	26
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		25	23
	Sub Total	100	89
Priority Questions			
CPP-Technology			
Competitive Preference Priority-Technology			
1. CPP-Technology		20	16
	Sub Total	20	16
	Total	120	105

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Board of Education City of Chicago, 299 (U351C140052)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   General:

   Strengths

   The applicant provides appropriate plans to build local capacity by extending and refining efforts from their prior Professional Development for Arts Educators grant that developed web- based digital lesson plans and smart phone access to digital lesson plans by building arts leader teachers' capacity for integrating Common Core Standards and Core art standards to increase student achievement and develop teacher capacity to integrate technology instruction. (Abstract). These goals were built on demonstrated needs of the target student population which are underserved as 90% minority 87% of whom come from low income families (p. 7). The project will serve teachers 71% of whom identified the need for collaboration and ideas regarding teaching Common Core, 51% if whom identified the need for a focus on teaching Common Core to low income at -risk students in a national survey (p. 6). Professional development will be provided to Magnet Cluster Lead teachers to integrate standards-based arts instruction with Common Core literacy and math; to create a network for teachers for school-wide planning and implementation; to encourage teacher collaboration and dissemination; and to assess changes in student achievement and teacher practice. (p. 1).

   Weaknesses

   The needs of teachers for professional development were identified from a national survey rather than from local data, such as from surveys taken from teachers participating in the applicant's PDAE past project.

Reader's Score: 4

   Sub Question

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

      Strengths:

      The applicant provides appropriate plans to build local capacity by extending and refining efforts from their prior Professional Development for Arts Educators grant that developed web- based digital lesson plans and smart phone access to digital lesson plans by building arts leader teachers' capacity for integrating Common Core Standards and Core art standards to increase student achievement and develop teacher capacity to integrate technology instruction. (Abstract). These goals were built on demonstrated needs of the target student population which are underserved as 90% minority 87% of whom come from low income families (p. 7). The project will serve teachers 71% of whom identified the need for collaboration and ideas regarding teaching Common Core, 51% if whom identified the need for a focus on teaching Common Core to low income at -risk students in a national survey (p. 6). Professional development will be provided to Magnet Cluster Lead teachers to integrate standards-based arts instruction with Common Core literacy and math; to create a network for teachers for school-wide planning and implementation; to encourage teacher collaboration and dissemination; and to assess changes in student achievement and teacher practice. (p. 1).

Weaknesses:

The needs of teachers for professional development were identified from a national survey rather than from local data, such as from surveys taken from teachers participating in the applicant's PDAE past project.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant has a wide dissemination plan that includes providing teachers with resource guides, materials, curricular samples, and templates that can be used beyond the grant period. Lead teachers will also build an online portfolio of lesson plans, curriculum units and assessments that can be used in other classrooms. (p. 16-17). Participating teachers will conduct professional development for other teachers in a trainer of trainers model; will post project resources, lesson and unit plans, and evaluation results on the district and partner websites; will publish in professional journals; will present at local, state, and national professional conferences; and will provide technical assistance and invitations to educators to visit focus schools; and conduct teacher training outside the area. (p. 17-18).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 9

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately grounds the project's professional development in a theory of change that posits that teachers' participation in sustained and intensive professional development will positively impact their attitudes, knowledge, and self-efficacy that will result in improved teacher practice and positive impacts on students' engagement and achievement. (p. 22). The professional development is also grounded in research on the components of effective professional development, such as observing other teachers and receiving collaboration and ongoing support from mentors and colleagues. (p. 22-23).

The arts based integration approach is also well grounded in extant research demonstrating that students who experienced arts integrated instruction had higher levels of achievement than those who did not (p. 22).

Weaknesses:

Some of the logic model's mid-term and long-term outcomes were actually inputs, such as teachers participating in 40 hours of professional development on arts and technology integration. This activity was repeated as both a short-term outcome and and a long- term outcome. (p. e70).

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The applicant has incorporated project goals and activities into permanent district level practices that will extend past the end of the grant, such as establishing a district arts education plan; including the arts on the schools' annual score cards to track progress; and matching every school to at least one external arts partner. (p. 12-13). Teachers in the prior PDAE project developed online digital documentation to show relationships between what they were teaching and what students were learning in teacher action research (p. 4). In addition, teachers at other schools will benefit from the project past the grant by receiving materials and lesson plans and templates that can be used past the grant period. (p. 16)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 13

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

Strengths:

The applicant appropriately documented that the majority of student project participants will be from underrepresented groups by including a school demographics table indicating that most target students are Hispanic or African American (p. 25, 9-11). The applicant also provides for inclusion of teacher project participants who are non-native English speakers, teachers of English Language Learners or special needs students, those who teach in low income areas with at risk students, and teachers from poorly funded schools. (p. 25). In addition, the applicant pointed out that arts teachers are a group that has been typically underrepresented within professional development initiatives. (p. 25). Finally, the applicant provides a policy of nondiscrimination based on race, color, national origin, gender, age or disability. (p. 24-25). Materials will be translated and interpreted when needed and include program materials in alternative formats and accommodations for varied learning styles and those with Individual Education plans. (p. 25)

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to describe any specific recruitment plan for minority teachers or how the project will "take into account" teachers with backgrounds that allude to being from or serving underrepresented groups. (p. 25)

Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   The professional development plan provides for sufficient quality by the use of continual data collection and analysis to assess the efficacy of the program activities and progress toward goals; teachers will be able to use classroom observation feedback to assess student learning and instruction, and teachers will be able to provide feedback for each other. The applicant addresses sufficient intensity and duration by providing 41 hours of training each year with teacher leaders teaching at least two arts and technology integrated lessons or units each year in language arts and math and one integrated unit in a content area and by having project staff post documentation of the project on the school website. Workshops will be held at rotating schools and cultural institutions in both full-day and after-school formats. (p. 26-28)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were found.

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   The applicant ensures likelihood that services provided by the proposed project will lead to improvements in student achievement as measured against rigorous academic standards by using a high quality model of professional development that supports teachers self-efficacy and teacher-led planning and design that provides teacher collaboration, peer critique and community creation among teachers that have led to improved teacher practice. In addition, classroom observation feedback will be used to assess students' learning. (p. 25-26). The project partner has a history of developing assessments created by educators that examined student learning in relation to integrating art and academic content. (p. 16) In addition, in the past PDAE grant the integration of arts practices resulted in participating schools increased achievement in reading and math (p. 8). Finally, the evaluation plan provides for measuring student outcomes for language arts and math via achievement test score data (p. 48).
   .

   Weaknesses:

   It is unclear if the achievement test score data will consist of the district administered standardized tests in math and language arts. (p. 48)

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   General:

   N/A

Reader's Score: 14

Sub Question

1. **(A) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant has an adequate plan for encouraging employment applications from diverse backgrounds by advertising in websites, publications, and other media that target individuals from underrepresented groups. The applicant also has a plan to develop position descriptions that are targeted for Equal Employment Opportunity /Affirmative Action and constituting a search committee composed of members representing diversity. Finally, the search will abide by the district's policy manual as an EEO/AA employer with nondiscriminatory hiring practices (p. 28).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were noted.

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   Appropriate qualifications were established for the two full-time project managers by requiring these individuals have a Master's degree in education or the arts; five years of experience in management of a project of similar magnitude; and knowledge of professional development strategies. (p. 29). Other key personnel are also well qualified including the experienced current Director of Arts for the district as supervisor of the project manager; the district's experienced Arts Education Manger of Special Programs; and the Executive Director and Education Director of the partner organization who will provide oversight.(p. 30-31)

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were found.

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   Most project staff positions are filled by personnel with relevant expertise. These well qualified staff include the Principal Investigator/Evaluator who has extensive experience in evaluating multi-year, federally-funded education projects and has published on professional development and her assistant who has a doctorate in Education and prior experience with national educational research projects. (p.31-32)

Weaknesses:

No qualifications were described for the Research Associate in terms of relevant prior experience or education that will qualify him to collect data for this project. It is unclear what areas his degrees are in and how they relate to this project or its evaluation.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 26

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant has a clear management plan that adequately identifies project activities, deadlines, milestones, and staff responsible for accomplishing those activities on time and within budget (p. 32-35). The management team will meet quarterly to review project timeline and milestones, monitor the budget, clarify staff responsibilities, and review and modify project activities based on formative assessments. (p. 32)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Time commitments of most key project personal appear to be appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. Two Project Directors will devote full time to this project (p. 29). Other key project personnel will devote 10-20% of their time to supervision of various aspects of the project.(p. 29-30).

Weaknesses:

The time commitments for the Principal Investigator/Evaluator and the Research Associate were not identified. (Budget; p. 30-31). The role of the Principal Investigator was not clearly defined or specified in terms of time

commitment. (p. 30-31)

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

There are adequate provisions for formative evaluation methods that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes in a feedback loop. For example, teacher feedback will be gathered on a biannual basis from self–reflections, observations, interviews, and surveys. Professional development sessions and formative assessments of student learning will be administered after each unit (p. 35). Students will write reflections on their learning three times during the curriculum unit. Annual interviews will be conducted with students and teachers and pre and post surveys will be administered in the first year, as well as professional development exit surveys. Observation protocols will be administered twice during implementation. (p. 41-50). The evaluator will provide monthly feedback to the Project Manager and Co-Director. Professional development leaders will meet at the end of each session with project staff to reflect on how effective the program components have been implemented based on feedback questionnaires from participants. (p. 52-53). Formative evaluation will be conducted on an ongoing basis and regular meetings will occur with the management team and the project staff to determine any needed modifications, a process that will be repeated each project year. (p. 52-53).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 23

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

Strengths:

The project evaluation provides for a mixed-methods quasi experimental design and appropriate objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project, including teachers' attendance records at professional development; frequency counts of digital curriculum templates; and students' achievement test score data (p. 41-50). Appropriate quantitative data include these measures as well as teacher survey measures and scoring rubrics for the templates using t-tests for analysis. Appropriate qualitative data include teacher interviews and classroom observations with a thematic analysis. (p. 41-50).

Weaknesses:

Student achievement measures were not identified. It is unclear if these achievement measures will be gathered as pretest and posttest data.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

There are adequate provisions for formative evaluation methods that will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes in a feedback loop. For example, teacher feedback will be gathered on a biannual basis from self -reflections observations interviews and surveys and professional development sessions and formative assessments of student learning will be administered after each unit (p. 35). Students will write reflections on their learning three times during the curriculum unit. Annual interviews will be conducted with students and teachers and pre and post surveys will be administered in the first year, as well as professional development exit surveys. Observation protocols will be administered twice during implementation. (p. 41-50). The evaluator will provide monthly feedback to the Project Manager and Co-Director; professional development leaders will meet at the end of each session with project staff to reflect on how effective the program components have been implemented based on feedback questionnaires from participants. (p. 52-53). Formative evaluation will be conducted on an ongoing basis and regular meeting will occur by the management team and the project manager with staff to determine any needed modifications, a process that will be repeated each project year. (p. 52-53).

Weaknesses:

There is a discrepancy in sample size by specifying 9 students per classroom on page 39 and 30 per classroom on page e111.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The evaluation adequately provides for evidence of promise by including a quasi-experimental design with treatment and control schools and by stratifying on achievement in a pretest -posttest design. Each objective is met by an appropriate data collection strategy, schedule for data collection, identified data source and participants to be sampled with annual performance benchmarks identified. (p. 42-51). The design included a clear logic model that identified needs and inputs, appropriate activities, and relevant outputs tied to short-term, midterm, and long-term outcomes. (Appendix).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP-Technology - Competitive Preference Priority-Technology

1. **Projects that are designed to improve student achievement (as defined in the notice) or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

   Strengths:

   This project clearly addresses the competitive preference priority by focusing on technology to inform instruction, improve student achievement, and enhance teacher effectiveness. The two major goals are to build art teachers' capacity for integrating Common Core standards and Core art standards to increase student achievement and develop arts lead teacher capacity to effectively integrate technology into instruction (Abstract). The applicant intends to attend to technology that are the most impactful for student learning that allow for abstract thinking and self- directed student construction of knowledge (p. 5).The prior project offered online digital documentation and teaching and learning from web based archives of lesson plans, teaching and learning assessment data, using smart phones to create curriculum, and sharing documentation via the web. (p. 4). This project is intended to extend and refine that focus (p. 4-5).

   Weaknesses:

   It is unclear at what point students will receive the technology to create digital animations and digital music. It is also unclear what software products will be used for students' technology activities. (p. 6).

   Reader's Score: 16

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/29/2014 03:32 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Board of Education City of Chicago, 299 (U351C140052)
Reader #2: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	5	4
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	8
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	15	12
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	15	14
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	30	24
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	25	23
Sub Total	100	85
Priority Questions		
CPP-Technology		
Competitive Preference Priority-Technology		
1. CPP-Technology	20	16
Sub Total	20	16
Total	120	101

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - Professional Development Arts Educators - 5: 84.351C

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

Applicant: Board of Education City of Chicago, 299 (U351C140052)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

   General:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Sub Question

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

   Strengths:

   The program is based on an existing successful program that produced Magnet Cluster Lead teachers (MCLTs) who still are working in the district in leadership positions (p. 8). CAPE is a nationally recognized leader in arts education and still serves as a lead professional development provider and has an established twenty-year collaborative relationship with Chicago Public schools. Both organizations have documented successes in building arts teachers leadership abilities, improving integrated instruction and building online libraries for dissemination (p. 9). MCLT teachers are an ideal population for sharing high-quality, technology-based instruction that integrate with the arts and other academic areas: (p.2). Project follows strategies out in the Chicago Public Schools Art Education Plan, which are designed to build capacity and yield results beyond the grant period and be aligned with Common Core standards (p. 16).

   Weaknesses:

   Nationwide, the majority of teachers are reporting difficulty with preparing for or teaching Common Core standards (p. 7)N. Integrating arts instruction with Common Core will be even more difficult for teachers to learn, develop lesson plans for, and then teach.

   Described how previous MCLT networks have failed due to structural shifts in CPS and the implementation of new standards (p. 13), but did not describe how these challenges would be addressed for the proposed new network of MCLT teachers.

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   MCTs will share their best practices with other teachers in their schools and across the district through digital documentation tools. These "other" teachers will receive resource guides, materials, curricular samples and templates that can be utilized beyond the grant period (p 5). MCLTs will also provide peer-to-peer learning to other

teachers at the school, network, and district-levels in order to share best practices (p. 19).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

   General:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: 8

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

   Strengths:

   The Arts Teachers Leading Achievement & Successes (ATLAS) project is based on: (1) research findings that highlight how arts integration can positively impact student learning (p. 21) and (2) a high-quality model for professional development that is based on research that supports self-efficacy of teachers and teacher-lead planning and design (p. 25). The program is based on a logic model with activities, outputs, and outcomes that are supported by previous research (p. e-70).

   Weaknesses:

   Some of the mid-term and long-term outcomes are actually outputs (for example, participating in 40 hours of professional development on arts and technology integration) and are not quantifiable (i.e., states increased but not by how much).

   Reader's Score:

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

   Strengths:

   Project follows strategies out in the Chicago Public Schools Art Education Plan, which are designed to build capacity and yield results beyond the grant period (p. 16). The program has outlined several sustainability plans that call for MCLTs to train other teachers, project findings to inform district-wide implementation of the new National Core Arts Standards, and the Department of Arts Education (DAE) to utilize the results, products, best practices, etc. from the ATLAS project for DAE's ongoing work and Unit teacher templates (p. 24).

   Weaknesses:

   None noted.

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

   General:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: 12

   Sub Question

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

      Strengths:

      The applicant describes specific strategies for ensuring equal access for all students in participating teachers' classrooms (p. 24). The project will work to ensure equal treatment for participating teachers by taking into account their background, content area, instructional skill level, and other individual school or classroom situations (p. 25).

      Weaknesses:

      The applicant mentioned, but did not provide specific strategies for recruiting underrepresented teachers (p. 25).

      Reader's Score:

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

      Strengths:

      The applicant demonstrates their knowledge and proposed use of professional development services and activities that research has shown to be associated with improved teacher practice (p. 25). In addition, the applicant provided sufficient descriptions of the types of professional development services and activities to be provided during the workshops (p. 18 and 19).

      Weaknesses:

      None noted.

      Reader's Score:

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

      Strengths:

      The ATLAS project is based on previous research that has demonstrated success in improving teacher instruction and student achievement through professional development focused on arts instruction and integration with core curriculum (p. 21). The applicant provides detailed timelines, milestones, and strategies—including many capacity-building activities—to ensure that the professional development activities will lead to improvements in student achievement that are aligned with Common Core and National Core Arts standards.

      Weaknesses:

      None noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the following factors:

General:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 14

Sub Question

1. (A) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

Strengths:

The applicant proposes that CPS will use an equal opportunity diversity planning and employment process and proposed specific strategies for encouraging applications from underrepresented groups (p 28).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

The PI has extensive experience in managing federally funded education projects and has an Ed.D. The qualifications, roles, and duties are sufficiently described for key project staff (pgs. 30 and 31).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score:

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

Strengths:

Minimum qualifications for two full-time project managers is a Master's degree in education or the arts, 5 years of managing similar projects, and knowledge of professional development strategies (p. 29).

Weaknesses:

Qualifications for Research Associate are not detailed (p. 31)

Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

   General:

   None noted.

Reader's Score: 24

   Sub Question

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

      Strengths:

      The applicant describes a Project Management Team—composed of the DAE directors, ATLAS project manager and co-manager, the CAPE Executive and Education directors, and the CPS arts integration and instructional advisor—that will meet quarterly to ensure the project times and monthly milestones are met, staff roles are clear, and necessary adjustments to project activities are made based on ongoing formative assessment measures (pgs. 32 to 35)

      Weaknesses:

      None noted.

      Reader's Score:

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

      Strengths:

      Two full-time project managers and the time commitments of the other key personnel seem sufficient to carry out project activities (pgs. 29 to 32).

      Weaknesses:

      Applicant does not state how much time the Principal Investigator will devote to the project (p. 31) and the budget suggests that her PI services are covered under funding for evaluation and so the roles are not clearly defined (p. e-105).

      Reader's Score:

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

      Strengths:

      The Project Management Team will meet quarterly to ensure the project times and monthly milestones are met, staff roles are clear, and adjustments to project activities will be made, as necessary, based on ongoing formative assessment measures (pgs. 32 to 36). The applicant describes regular and timely performance feedback activities that will be conducted through a variety of formative methods (pgs. 35,52).

      Weaknesses:

      None noted.

Sub Question

    Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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

  General:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 23

  Sub Question

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

  Strengths:

The applicant includes the use of objective performance measures that are associated with project outcomes and will produce qualitative and quantitative data (p. 37 and 38 and pgs. 41 to 51). These measures will include students' standardized test scores (p. e110).

  Weaknesses:

None noted.

  Reader's Score:

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

  Strengths:

The Project Management Team will meet quarterly to ensure the project times and monthly milestones are met, staff roles are clear, and adjustments to project activities will be made, as necessary, based on ongoing formative assessment measures (pgs. 32 to 36). The applicant describes regular and timely performance feedback activities that will be conducted through a variety of formative methods (pgs. 35,52).

  Weaknesses:

None noted.

  Reader's Score:

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

  Strengths:

This is a quasi-experimental, cluster design that does not suffer from any serious confounds (at least based on information in the application) and could produce evidence of promise, if it is well-implemented and the Hierarchical Linear Modeling is applied correctly. In particular, the HLM would need to control for baseline differences of the analytic sample between the treatment and control groups (p. 39 and 40).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

There is a possible inconsistency in the sample size. The evaluation section states that 9 students per classroom will be selected for participation (p. 39) but Human Subjects Narrative states 30 students per classroom will be selected (p. e111).

Reader's Score:

Priority Questions

CPP-Technology - Competitive Preference Priority-Technology

1. **Projects that are designed to improve student achievement (as defined in the notice) or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant describes well the "documentation through technology" online activities that teachers will engage in (and are supported by previous research) and described how teachers will integrate technology in their instruction through, for example, digital animations, music and soundscapes, websites, blogs, digital imagery and other multimedia formats. (p. 3 to 6)

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant did not describe which technology tools would be used for particular grades.

Reader's Score: 16

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/17/2014 10:41 PM