

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2018 02:46 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (U351F180007)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	33
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	98
Total	100	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - AENP - 1: 84.351F

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (U351F180007)

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:

(1) The national significance of the proposed project.

(2) 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.

(3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

1) The applicant provides a detailed description of the national significance of the proposed project that focuses on increasing its reach across the country and around the world. The applicant is proposing to exceed the current rates of 1.4 million (on-site at the center) and 10 million (digitally and indirectly) students currently served, by growing and improving their current educational offerings to include youth in Pre-K – 12th grade (including students with disabilities) (pg. 1, 3-4, 6, 8 & appendices).

The proposed project is well-developed and includes expanding the current space by 72,000 square feet to improve educational programming with a dedicated learning lab, summer camp program, and professional development workshops for educators (both on-campus and digitally) through their national network (pg. 1-2).

2) The applicant states that they are positioned to reach educators and students in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and 28 countries that include career development programs for aspiring artists, school and community partnerships programs, along with productions and presentations for children and youth. Moreover, the applicant shares their strategies for dissemination of information to include utilizing the advisory group at The Center (i.e., Education Committee, Board of Trustees) to provide their expertise and feedback on methods for supporting the use of the effective and impactful strategies from the field (pg. 7-8, 26).

3) The applicant is a nationally recognized organization that has established relationships around the world. The proposed project is designed to focus on the integration of arts education into standards-based education and is proposing to pair the classroom teacher with a teaching artist, which is an excellent strategy to meeting the needs of all students in the classroom. More importantly, the applicant has recognized the need to ensure that students with disabilities are part of the overall plan for improvement and has identified multiple strategies to address this population (pg. 9, 14, 17, 28).

Weaknesses:

1) None noted.

2) None noted.

3) None noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project will provide community and national outreach activities that strengthen and expand partnerships among schools, local educational agencies, communities, or centers for the arts, including national centers for the arts.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the arts education needs of pre-kindergarten-through-grade-12 children and youth, with special emphasis on serving children from low-income families and children with disabilities.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (as defined in the notice), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in the notice).

Strengths:

- 1) The applicant provides a robust and detailed plan for ensuring community and national outreach activities to include the implementation of a continuous improvement process for each of the programs (i.e., Visual Arts, Special Education, Digital Learning, Knowledge Development, Research & Evaluation). The outreach and engagement is vast and includes school and community programs (classroom-based, school and district-wide). The detailed logic model provides a clear map of programs areas and outcomes that clearly align to a local and national level (pg. 9-10).
- 2) The overall program design is well developed and includes program activities at every level (Pre-K through adulthood). There is a significant focus on special education and accessibility, which demonstrates the applicant's understanding of the need to provide services from birth and beyond. The applicant will take a systems approach to serving the targeted populations (i.e., low-income, children with disabilities) by incorporating a service-area component (i.e., digital learning, special education, curriculum and product development) to delivering services (pg. 13-15).
- 3) The applicant proposes to improve outcomes by streamlining and integrating operations across related programs as evidenced by the Logic Model that outlines the strategies for increasing and improving access to high quality arts education programs based on service and program areas using three overarching areas (i.e., school and community programs, productions and presentations, and creative workforce development) that will result in interrelated local and national programs (pg. 10-11).
- 4) The applicant provides a detailed Logic Model that crosses all the education programs. To ensure that the proposed model will work, the applicant utilized the services of the in-house Research & Evaluation team that will support the overall project in the development of establishing goals, and measures that will be used to develop a formative and summative evaluation (pg. 18 & Appendix

Weaknesses:

- 1) None noted.
- 2) None noted.
- 3) While the applicant provides a detailed discussion of the approach, details on how they will use existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources are not clearly described (pg. 10-11).

4) None noted.

Reader's Score: 33

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

(1) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Strengths:

1) The applicant provides a detailed plan that focuses strongly on eradicating barriers to equal access. The overall project design takes into account the various populations to be served (i.e., English learners, students with disabilities, ethnic and racial diversity, and geography). The proposed Universal Approach includes a website that provides tools for educators, students, and parents. The online portal includes various methods that take into consideration the various learning styles and potential audience (pg. 28).

2) The Professional Development component is well-designed and provides opportunities for on-site and distance learning. The applicant indicates they offer 30 workshops annually on site for local teachers and teaching artists providing over 29 hours of support along with pre and posttests, which appear to be sufficient. Moreover, the applicant documents professional development activities using a whole school approach that focuses on integrating art into the traditional curriculum (pg. 31-33).

3) The applicant provides a detailed description of the various partnerships that have been established to include school districts and other entities (5th-grade initiative, Get on the Bus) that clearly document a collaborative relationship (pg. 3-4, 33-35) that is focused on integrating arts and education in a symbiotic relationship.

Weaknesses:

1) None noted.

2) None noted.

3) None noted.

Reader's Score: 25

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:

(1) 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.

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in the notice) about the project's effectiveness.

Strengths:

1) The applicant provides for a formative and summative evaluation design that focuses on the collection of qualitative (semi-structured interviews, surveys) and quantitative (participation of students with disabilities and low-income families) data that will be collected and analyzed on a quarterly basis and discussed during quarterly meetings. The overall design provides sufficient data collection opportunities as the applicant has looked at multiple quasi-experimental studies in designing the proposed evaluation plan (pg. 44-46).

2) The applicant has designed an evaluation plan that will take into account the need for structuring a continuous improvement process and as such used a national strategy focused on Plan-Do-Study-Act that includes the development of a Logic Model for each of the programs. The plan to collect and analyze data quarterly is a strength that will allow the applicant to make mid-year corrections, which is important for a project of this magnitude (pg. 43-44).

3) The overall evaluation design includes propensity matching and an appropriate analytic approach that is thorough and provides sufficient detail that could produce promising evidence of the project's effectiveness and areas that were challenges. The applicant provides preliminary data from a previous evaluation that was clearly used to determine the approach for the proposed project (pg. 41-43).

Weaknesses:

1) None noted.

2) None noted.

3) None noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/07/2018 02:46 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/08/2018 12:03 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (U351F180007)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	31
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	96
Total	100	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - AENP - 1: 84.351F

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (U351F180007)

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:

(1) The national significance of the proposed project.

(2) 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.

(3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

1) The national significance of the project is reflected in the fact that the project is advocating for increasing access to high-quality arts education with a special emphasis on removing barriers to access, including serving children from low-income families and children with disabilities (p. 8). The research shows students from low-income families who were deeply engaged in the arts demonstrated better academic outcomes than students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds who had less arts involvement (p.3). The research continues stating participation in arts education predicted better graduation rates and makes students five times more likely to graduate high school. The project focuses the problem of as the poverty concentration of a school rises, access to the arts drops (p.4).

2) The applicant will use appropriate mechanisms to broadly disseminate the data and information on its project so as to support further development or replication. The Kennedy Center had a broad intra-network and cross-network capacity and systems for dissemination of information (p. 24). The applicant will use Partners in Education (PIE) to provide professional development on information about the project and will present at PIE's annual meeting (p. 26). The applicant will present at four national conferences and two regional conferences (p. 25, App.C 1). The applicant will publish professional papers (p. 26).

3) The Kennedy Center Education Division reaches educators and students in all 50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, and 26 countries (p. 7). The Kennedy Center Office of VSA and Accessibility has national expertise on effective approaches to improving and increasing access and inclusion to arts education for children and youth with disabilities (p. 8). The proposed program has program activities including school and community partnerships programs, productions and presentations for children and youth, and creative career development programs for aspiring artists (p. 7-8). The research showing participation in arts education predicted better graduation rates (p. 3) show the importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes of the proposed project on student achievement.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project will provide community and national outreach activities that strengthen and expand partnerships among schools, local educational agencies, communities, or centers for the arts, including national centers for the arts.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the arts education needs of pre-kindergarten-through-grade-12 children and youth, with special emphasis on serving children from low-income families and children with disabilities.
- (3) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (as defined in the notice), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in the notice).

Strengths:

1) The applicant has the ability to reach educators and students in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and 26 countries for proposed program activities including school and community partnership programs (p. 7-8). The applicant has documented providing national-level, high-quality arts education projects and services for children and youth, with an emphasis on serving children from low-income families and children with disabilities (p. 1). The previous program has allowed the Kennedy center to develop partnerships with and among schools, local education agencies, and other cultural organizations (Appendix G) with the plan to continue to grow partnerships and educational offerings with the proposed project.

2) As shown in Exhibit 3 (p. 10), the Kennedy Center is integrating and streamlining their operations to foster development and expansion of local and national programs. The applicant has five service areas: VSA/Special Education and Accessibility, Digital Learning, Knowledge Development: Curriculum and Product Development, New Work Development, and Research and Evaluation to meet the needs of all students at each age group (p. 12). The programs offered are under three program areas: School and Community Programs, Productions and Presentations, and Creative Workforce Development. As a whole the proposed program and activities is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the arts education needs of pre-kindergarten-through-grade-12 children and youth, with special emphasis on serving children from low-income families and children with disabilities.

3) The applicant has documented building the proposed project upon a similar program from 2012 from the Arts in Education National Program (AENP) allowing the Kennedy Center to provide national-level, high-quality arts education projects and services for children and youth, with an emphasis on serving children from low-income families and children with disabilities (p. 1).

4) The applicant documents research findings (p. 1-6) which has had positive outcomes on student graduation rates and the aspiration to attend college (p. 3). Applicant included a very detailed logic model (p.13) with a logical progression from inputs to long-term outputs incorporating a plan of continuous improvement using plan, do, study, act (Appendix A).

Weaknesses:

3) Although the applicant documented the proposed project would build on a similar previous program with related efforts to improve relevant outcomes, the applicant failed to document using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources (p. 1).

Reader's Score: 31

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

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

(1) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Strengths:

1) The applicant give a very detailed description of quality project services (Appendix E) which will have an impact on the intended recipients, for example ARTSEDGE is designed for all PreK-12 learners from all skill levels and backgrounds to build confident connections to the arts and the world through culturally relevant and accessible learning experiences (Appendix E, p. 1). The project services a listed out in detail for each area: School and Community Programs, Productions and Presentations, and Creative Workforce Development (Appendix E, p.1).

2) The applicant describes in detail the professional development services to be offered to educators and partners, who are serving students, to ensure the professional development offered is directly aligned with the curriculum and the school system's priorities. The professional learning resources provided by the applicant include having teaching artists lead a workshop, multi-session courses on art integration, demonstrated teaching, coaching, and study groups (Appendix E, p. 6). The applicant includes a copy of their professional development for teachers 2017-2018 brochure in Appendix J pages 1 through 40. The applicant shows 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.

3) The applicant documents many partnerships in Appendix E, Appendix G, and Appendix H. The letters of support included in Appendix H detail what the partnership entails, including partner contributions. for example Berklee Institute for Arts Education will co-present at a conference and the Kennedy Center will provide professional development for the art educators in the area along with arts educational opportunities for individuals with special needs (no page number listed). The applicant effectively demonstrates the extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

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:

(1) 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.

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

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in the notice) about the project's effectiveness.

Strengths:

1) The applicant describes collecting semi-structured interviews and surveys to collect qualitative data about program implementation and quality as well as quantitative data about participation of students with disabilities and students from low-income families (p. 44). In Appendix D, the applicant has included information on the Research and Evaluation: Programs by Level, Possible Constructs, and Measures. Exhibit B gives sample options for Impact Measures: Student Level (App.D p. 2). Exhibit C is the Performance Measures (App.D p. 3-6). The applicant has demonstrated through the narrative and tables 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.

2) The applicant is using the Plan-Do-Study-Act continuous improvement process (p. 43). Formative measures are imbedded in the program to assess how well programs are implemented and provide a continuous feedback loop to program managers to ensure program improvement over time (p. 43). A quarterly meeting schedule will be established with each of the program areas (p. 43). The formative evaluation will focus on implementation and the summative evaluation will focus on the programs relevant impact(s). (App. D and p. 45). The applicant demonstrates the extent to which these methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

3) The project team in collaboration with program staff will develop the design, develop and test pilot data collection instruments and identify participants in year 1, conduct studies in year 2, and analyze the data in year 3. The applicant includes a detailed description of performance measure in Appendix D Exhibit C: Performance Measures (p. 3-6). The Exhibit C includes the measurement for all three of the program areas: School and Community Programs, Productions and Presentations, and Creative Workforce Development; which describes the extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence about the project's effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **20**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/08/2018 12:03 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/09/2018 10:20 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (U351F180007)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	31
Quality of Project Services		
1. Project Services	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	20
Sub Total	100	96
Total	100	96

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - AENP - 1: 84.351F

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (U351F180007)

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:

(1) The national significance of the proposed project.

(2) 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.

(3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

1 - The applicant's wealth of programs reach an impressive number of students, teachers, schools, and communities across the country (map page 8).

2 - The application proposes several dissemination strategies both digital (ArtsEdge) and in-person (national conferences) that will ensure a far reach of information regarding effective arts education interventions (pg. 25-26).

3 - The application is grounded in quality research about both the effectiveness of arts interventions broadly (pages 2-4) and research specifically about the themes of these particular programs (pages 20-23).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly discussed; no weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will provide community and national outreach activities that strengthen and expand partnerships among schools, local educational agencies, communities, or centers for the arts, including national centers for the arts.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the arts education needs of pre-kindergarten-through-grade-12 children and youth, with special emphasis on serving children from low-income families and children with disabilities.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes (as defined in the notice), using existing funding streams from other programs or policies supported by community, State, and Federal resources.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in the notice).

Strengths:

1 - The following components of the project—Partners in Education, Changing Education Through the Arts, and Any Given Child—are particularly well equipped to expand partnerships with schools, LEAs, and communities (Appendix E, pages 6-9). The design and impact at each level was very clear, particularly when viewed from the logic model —here you can clearly see the impact rippling from individual students and teachers (the classroom approach) to entire schools, districts, communities, and even a universal approach (Appendix A). It is a very comprehensive design with a national reach.

2 - The applicant has an impressive number of arts education offerings specifically designed for students with disabilities with a long track record of this service (page 12). Even more impressive is the commitment to tracking and improving the percentage of students with disabilities being served by the Any Given Child program, to bring it in alignment with the national average percentage of students with individualized education programs (page 45).

3 - The proposal clearly builds on existing efforts to improve student learning through the arts, as evidenced by the applicant's long history of providing similar services (pgs. 1, Appendix E).

4 - The narrative and appendices contain a clear rationale based on copious data that is relevant to the proposed project and potential outcomes. Additionally, data from previous funding cycles (page 42) demonstrates the effectiveness of the current programs that would continue under the new grant cycle.

Weaknesses:

3 - In the SF-424 form, it says that the applicant is requesting \$8MM and bringing \$7.6MM in other revenues, totaling \$15.6MM/year. However, neither the budget narrative nor the proposal narrative mentions details about the mentioned "other" and "program income" that would build on or integrate with existing funding streams.

Reader's Score: **31**

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of project services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (1) The likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services.**
 - (2) 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.**
 - (3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.**

Strengths:

1 - The proposed project is very likely to have the intended impact, as it has a long track record offering these programs nationally (page 1), and the design of the programs is structured in a sound logic model (Appendix A), with research to support the impact of each piece of the logic model (pages 2-4, Appendix B, and Appendix I) .

2 - In particular, the certificate offered through Changing Education Through the Arts (pages 31-32) provides rigorous and sustained professional development, with a high number of required hours, coaching strategies, and study groups for teachers.

3 - The proposed project contains a myriad of partners: teaching artists at the classroom level (Appendix E, page 3); LEAs at the district level (Appendix E, page 8); a backbone organization at the community level (Appendix E, page 7); and

national dissemination strategies such as the Partners in Education conference (page 25).

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly discussed; no weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: **25**

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:

- (1) 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.**
- (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in the notice) about the project's effectiveness.**

Strengths:

1 - The narrative contains a detailed explanation of the methodology for evaluation (pages 41-49), and contains a wealth of information around intended outcomes and measures for those outcomes (Appendix D, particularly pages 3-6).

1 - The methods of evaluation proposed are varied, such as counting numbers of participants vs a survey of participants (pg. 44), which will result in both quantitative and qualitative data.

2 - The applicant has a previously established and detailed internal process for continuous feedback and improvement built into the program design and logic model (plan-do-study-act on page 43), which provides for periodic assessment.

3 - The proposed evaluation design contains mixed methods and controls for as much variance as is possible, such as using nested data to account for standard errors and fixed or random effects (page 50). Additionally, page 43 outlines positive outcomes (promising evidence) from previous research on the proposed programs, which demonstrate a history of success not only in the program design but also in the evaluation model

Weaknesses:

This criterion was thoroughly discussed; no weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: **20**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/09/2018 10:20 AM