



U.S. Department of Education

OMB No: 1855-0031

Exp: 10/31/19

Check only one box per Program Office instructions.
[X] Annual Performance Report [] Final Performance Report
Check only one box per Program Office instructions.
[] Planning Year [X] Implementation Year

General Information

- 1. PR/Award #: U351D180054
2. Grantee NCES ID#: Click here to enter text.
3 Project Title: Skin in the Game
4. Grantee Name (Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.): Global Writes Inc.
5. Grantee Address (See instructions.)80 Kathwood Road, Yonkers N.Y. 10710
6. Project Director (See instructions.) Name: Maria Fico Title: Co-president
Phone #: 914 497-8445 Ext: Fax #: 914 779-8768
Email Address: maria@globalwrites.org

Reporting Period Information (See instructions.)

7. Reporting Period: From: 10/1/2019 To: 9/30/2020

Budget Expenditures (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)

8. Budget Expenditures

Table with 3 columns: Category, Federal Grant Funds, Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share). Rows include Previous Budget Period, Current Budget Period, and Entire Project Period.

Indirect Cost Information (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)

9. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? []Yes [X]No
b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government? []Yes []No
c. If yes, provide the following information:
Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: Click here to enter a date. To: Click here to enter a date.
Approving Federal agency: []ED []other (Please specify): Click here to enter text.
Type of Rate (For Final Performance Reports Only): [] Provisional [] Final [] Other (Please specify): Click here to enter text.
d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:
[] Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?
[X] Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) (See instructions.)

10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached? [X]Yes [] No [] N/A

Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)

11. Performance Measures Status

- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? [X]Yes [] No
b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department?

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Maria Fico
Name of Authorized Representative

Co-president, Global Writes Inc.
Title

Click here to enter text.
Signature

12/4/2020
Date



U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report Project Status

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Address each section of the Executive Summary outlined. Keep your responses brief and do not exceed two pages.

Project highlights: Global Writes (*GW*) has partnered with the Delaware County Intermediate Unit (DCIU) 25 and the Southeast Delco School District (SE Delco) for this first implementation year of *Skin in the Game (SIG)*. *Skin in the Game* extends the *GW* model for integrating the arts with literacy and technology by incorporating concepts in *Science, Technology, Reading, Engineering, Art, and Math (STREAM)* with core subject and arts curricula. In October of 2018, 2 treatment schools (Harris School and Sharon Hill School) and 2 control schools (Darby Township and Delcroft School) were randomly assigned to treatment and control conditions for the program. During Year 2, the first year of project implementation, *GW* conducted ongoing meetings with SE Delco, DCIU 25, and treatment school principals to coordinate professional development, order necessary materials, and begin project implementation for all students in grades 4 and 6, which started in September 2019. A project coordinator from SE Delco manages the day-to-day activities of the project for both treatment and control schools as well as supports 14 treatment classroom teachers, 4 arts and library media specialists and 5 teaching artists with project implementation. A project manager, hired by the DCIU 25, supported control school activities as well as assisted with *SIG* program activities to support sustainability of the program model through the DCIU 25 beyond the grant period. With district and school administrative support, the SE Delco project coordinator conducted ongoing monthly planning in the *SIG* model for 4th and 6th grade teachers. *GW* also arranged visitation for two new 4th grade teachers, six special education teachers, two music specialists and five teachers in grades 5 and 7, to visit 5 New York City mentor schools that have been implementing *SIG* for at least 3 years. *GW* worked with Metis Associates and SE Delco to implement evaluation instruments for both teachers and students in grade 4 and 6 to review the first year of the project. To date, *GW* hired 5 teaching artists from the Philadelphia area that supported all 4th and 6th grade classroom teachers via a 20-week residency co-teaching model, which began in October 2019 and ended in May 2020.

Extent to which the expected outcomes and performance measures were achieved:

Despite the shutdown of school buildings in March 2020, *GW* was able to achieve many of the outcomes it anticipated for the first year of project implementation for *SIG*. Below are some of the key accomplishments of the project in Year 2

- In person project implementation for grades 4 and 6 began mid-October 2019 and upon school closures in mid-March, *GW* was able to plan with the district and implement *SIG* activities with grades 4 and 6 students remotely until the end of May, 2020. Implementation occurred with fourteen grade 4 and 6 classroom teachers and 4 teacher specialists (2 arts and 2 library media) during a *SIG* project period that occurred for four 45-minute periods per week with a total of 339 students in grades 4 and 6. All teachers and teacher specialists collaborated for two 45-minute periods per week with a teaching artist.
- Program activities with students included 30 or more hours of instruction in the use of technology tools including Nearpod, digital media apps, Bloxels, and game design to support developing and publishing of *STREAM*-based projects, exchanging feedback and ideas and reflecting on their project experiences with their teacher and through online student surveys.
- *GW* conducted a total of 90 hours of professional development for 26 classroom teachers (14 grade 4/6, 12 grade 5/7) 6 special education specialists, 2 reading intervention, 2 art, 2 music, and 2 library media specialists, as well as the SE Delco project coordinators from DCIU 25 and SE Delco school district. Professional development included 33 or more hours focused on program design and *STREAM*-based instruction in the form of project workshops and mentoring sessions. *GW* also supported grade 4 and 6 teachers, library media specialists, and arts specialists for 3 full days in their classrooms and five teaching artists received at least 15 hours of training in *SIG*.
- Treatment teachers participated in weekly online topic discussions with their colleagues using Google Classroom, a collaborative web-based resource.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

- Teacher to teacher mentoring via videoconferencing and online collaboration tools did not occur due to COVID-19 school closures. However, 15 SE Delco school district teachers received at least 6 hours of mentoring from NYC teachers and teaching artists through a virtual visit with 5 New York City mentor schools that have been implementing **SIG** for at least 3 years. In addition, during the months of June through September 3 SE Delco teaching artists were mentored for 7 hours by 3 NYC teaching artists via video conference.
- While the in -person training scheduled for May 2020 was cancelled due to COVID-19 school closures, **GW** conducted a 3-hour virtual training for all teachers in grades 4 through 7 as well as specialists and teaching artists on May 19th and 20th. In addition, ten 5th and 7th grade teachers developed curriculum maps during two full days of remote collaboration with **GW** and the SE Delco director of curriculum on June 15-16, 2020. **GW** also conducted a 6-hour real time hybrid training in September for all grade 4 through 7 teachers, 3 SE Delco teaching artists and 3 NYC teaching artists. The training was conducted using a hybrid model so teachers were able to participate either in-person or remotely.
- **GW** and SE Delco treatment schools hosted one student Game Design showcase on October 8 and 9, 2019. Each school had a family game night that featured an overview of the **SIG** project and family game playing for parents and their children. There were approximately 200 family and student participants at the events. A second game evening was planned for May 2020 to feature student developed games, but that event was cancelled due to COVID-19 school closures.
- The DCIU 25 project manager supported treatment teachers in their classrooms on a weekly basis from October 2019 through March 2020. In addition, the DCIU 25 project manager supported control schools by providing professional development for Wonder Workshop’s Dash, Dot, and Cue. The control schools received a full-day workshop and ongoing access to the online curriculum and resources provided by DCIU 25. The control schools also received professional development for the Museum of Science’s Engineering is Elementary (EiE) curriculum and resources, as well EiE kits to integrate into STEM courses. None of the DCIU 25 training to control schools included any **SIG** activities or tools.
- **GW** has continued to expand the online interactive website created during Year 1, containing activities, implementation guidelines, and strategies for program development as well as options for conducting game design activities remotely.

The **GW** AAEDD study used a cluster randomized controlled trial (RCT) design in which 4 schools were randomly assigned to either treatment or control conditions. Although no schools were dropped out from the study (i.e., no cluster-level attrition), there were quite a few students who did not respond to the post survey due to COVID-19, and therefore led to high student-level attrition (i.e., 76.2%). As a result, this RCT study had high attrition rate and was not able to meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards *without* reservations. To meet the WWC standards *with* reservations, it is required that baseline equivalence must be established for each analytic sample in the RCT studies with high attrition. Therefore, propensity score matching (PSM) was carried out to satisfy this requirement. Table 1 below provides a summary of the progress for each measure.

Table 1: Performance Measure – Status of Progress Summary

PM	Performance Measure	Status
1.1	By fall of 2019, treatment schools will create and implement 4 curriculum maps that correlate the elements of SIG with the key ideas of the mathematics, literacy, science, and social studies curriculum for grades 4 through 8 students.	Met
1.2	By the end of the project period, treatment schools will have implemented a scaffolded arts curriculum for students in grades 4 through 8 that supports project-based instruction.	N/A (Yr.4)



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

PM	Performance Measure	Status
1.3	By June of each project implementation year, 16 core subject teachers and 4 teacher specialists in treatment schools will have implemented a STREAM-based model of arts integrated instruction.	Met
2.1	In each project implementation year, treatment students' gains in literacy (reading) and mathematics achievement will significantly exceed those of students in control schools. (GPRA Measures 1 and 2)	Not Measured
2.2	In each project implementation year, treatment students will demonstrate significantly greater gains in motivation toward learning than students in control schools.	Not Met
2.3	In each project implementation year, treatment students will demonstrate statistically significant gains in attainment of 4C's for 21 st century learning.	Met
2.4	In each project implementation year, treatment students will demonstrate increased appreciation for learning through the arts.	Not Met
2.5a	In each project implementation year, at least 60% of treatment students will demonstrate increased use of technology tools.	Met
2.5b	In each project implementation year, at least 60% of treatment students will demonstrate increased comfort with technology tools.	Met
3.1a	By June of each project implementation year, at least 70% of the core subject treatment teachers and teacher specialists will report increased use of an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction.	Not Met
3.1b	By June of each project implementation year, at least 70% of the core subject treatment teachers and teacher specialists will report increased comfort with an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction.	Met
3.2	By June of each project implementation year, at least 80% of treatment core subject teachers and teacher specialists will demonstrate use of online collaborative resources.	Met
3.3a	By June of each project implementation year, at least 75% of treatment core subject teachers and teacher specialists will report increased use of technology tools to support 21st century teaching.	Met
3.3b	By June of each project implementation year, at least 75% of treatment core subject teachers and teacher specialists will report increased use of and comfort with integrating the technology tools to support 21st century teaching.	Not Met
4.1	By the end of project year 4, treatment schools will commit to sustaining a locally-adapted version of the Global Writes model with its core subject area and scaffolded arts curriculum and maintain its participation in the Global Writes community.	N/A (Yr.4)
4.2	By the end of project year 4, DCIU experts, participating teachers, and school administrators will submit proposals to at least 2 local or national presentations to disseminate successes and challenges of <i>SIG</i> .	N/A (Yr.4)
4.3	By the end of project year 4, DCIU will create partnerships for <i>SIG</i> implementation with at least 1 additional school district.	N/A (Yr.4)
4.4	In each project year, at least 10 requests for information about the Global Writes model from non-AAEDD grantees will be made via online inquiries generated from the Global Writes and DCIU websites.	Not Met

Briefly summarize contributions the project has made to research, knowledge, practice, and/or policy: As described previously, the Year 1 planning year (2018-2019) evaluation reported the following:

- *GW* revised and expanded its *SIG* curriculum as well as made it public on the *GW* website.
- Teachers involved in the planning year were trained in new classroom practices, strategies, and game design fundamentals.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

- Students of teachers involved in the planning year had increased opportunities for collaboration, critical thinking, and communication through their engagement in group work developing games, as well as increased access to a variety of technology tools in the classroom.
- Treatment schools adopted STREAM-based learning and modified school schedules to include a weekly **SIG** period for treatment students.

In Year 2, (2019-2020), the evaluation found the following outcomes for treatment students and teachers:

- Treatment students demonstrated statistically significant gains in attainment of 4C's for 21st century learning.
- Eighty percent of treatment students demonstrated increased use of technology tools.
- Sixty-nine percent of treatment students demonstrated increased comfort with technology tools.
- Eighty-two percent of treatment teachers reported increased comfort with an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction.
- All (100%) of treatment teachers reported increased use of technology tools to support 21st century teaching.

In addition, the evaluation of the **SIG** project includes: the use of objective performance measures, including the project's ability to demonstrate an increase in student achievement; objective performance measures to assess attainment of locally-developed objectives and outcomes; and is designed to examine differences between participating (treatment) students and non-participating students (control). Several evaluation tools have been developed that could have good practical application in other arts education settings. These include:

- Pre- and post-surveys measuring teachers' comfort levels with using an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction and with integrating technology to support 21st Century learning; how teachers are implementing learned skills into their classrooms; insights into the collaborative relationships between teachers, teaching artists, PD providers, and mentors; and successes and challenges of the project.
- Pre- and post-surveys measuring students' appreciation for learning through the arts, as well as their use of and comfort with technology.
- A 21st Century Skills rubric measuring each of the 4C's (including critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, and communication).

On February 26, 2020 **GW** was awarded the rights to the educational use of the name "Skin in the Game," by the U.S. Patent and Trademark office. Under Class 41, the term "Skin in the Game" is registered to **GW** as a title for providing professional training services to teachers in the fields of science, technology, reading, engineering, arts, and math; providing workshops to teachers in the afore mentioned fields and providing during school and after-school educational programs in those fields. This adds to policy and practice by solidifying the national recognition of game design as it relates to the arts and its significance in teaching and learning.

Progress Towards Meeting Program Level Goals:

How has your project integrated standards-based arts education into the core elementary and middle school curriculum?

Skin in the Game is a STREAM-based model that includes a maker-based approach to game design. Its curriculum model includes the use of visual arts applications and digital media that have been integrated into the SE Delco existing core curriculum. Curriculum maps, developed by the classroom, arts and library media teachers at the treatment schools in June 2019 were implemented during implementation Year 1 in grades 4 and 6. These curriculum maps were expanded to grades 5 and 7 in June 2020 leading to the development of 16 curriculum maps, 4 for each grade in math, ELA, science and social studies for use in implementation Year 2, beginning October 2020. By the end of the grant period, these locally



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

developed curriculum maps, which include integrated music and visual arts learning will be adopted for use in school's district wide in grades 4 through 8.

How has your project strengthened standards-based arts instruction in elementary and middle school classrooms?

Inclusion of the arts and library media specialists from the 2 treatment schools in the project in all planning and professional development activities has begun to strengthen and deepen the connections between arts instruction and content-based learning at the elementary and middle school level. These specialists have begun to work more collaboratively with the treatment classroom teachers and have increased their knowledge and capacity for creating art using a variety of technology tools. The arts and library media specialists contributed to the development of the curriculum maps with classroom teachers in June 2019 and June 2020 and have supported classroom treatment teachers during this year's implementation in grade 4 and 6 in art-making game design projects connected with the curriculum themes for each grade. In addition, the 6 special education teachers that provide push-in support in all treatment school classrooms also received training in **SIG** this year and have begun to include game design **SIG** activities in supporting the varying modalities of learning for the special needs students they serve. Five teaching artists this year provided a push-in residency model of 90 minutes per week for 20 weeks, working collaboratively with arts and library media specialists to support them and classroom teachers in the creation of art-making activities that are scaffolded based on grade and student abilities and aligned with their curriculum throughout the school year. Three NYC teaching artists have been working as coaches to the SE Delco teaching artists to support them with game design strategies and activities that can be implemented remotely. One of the positive aspects to school closures for this project has been the ability to have teaching artists work across cities in developing exemplary practices for **SIG** and further building collaboration among experienced artists as mentors to new artists in this area.

Based on your current evaluation efforts, what evidence do you have that your project has improved students' academic performance, including their skills in creating, performing, and responding to the arts?

Evaluation activities throughout 2019-2020 (Year 2) produced outcomes that show the project's positive effects on participants. Most importantly, treatment students demonstrated statistically significant gains in attainment of 4C's for 21st century learning following their participation in the **SIG** interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction. The majority of treatment students also reported increased use of and comfort with technology tools. In addition, all treatment teachers reported increased use of technology tools to support 21st century teaching and the large majority of teachers reported increased comfort with an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction.

Overall, the Year 2 evaluation included the following activities:

- Attendance at the Arts in Education conference to gather information to help guide the implementation and evaluation of the project.
- Planning and attending the kick-off meeting with staff from **GW**, SE Delco, the DCIU 25 to review the evaluation design and discuss next steps help guide the evaluation and programmatic implementation.
- Review of project documentation, including all program materials. Ongoing discussions between **GW**, SE Delco, the DCIU 25, and Metis were held to ensure consistency with the grant proposal and to allow for effective evaluation of the program.
- Administration of the following evaluation instruments:
 - Pre- and post-surveys measuring teachers' comfort levels with using an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction and with integrating technology to support 21st Century learning; how teachers are implementing learned skills into their classrooms; insights into the collaborative relationships between teachers, teaching artists, PD providers, and mentors; and successes and challenges



U.S. Department of Education Grant Performance Report Project Status

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

of the project. Pre-surveys were completed by treatment teachers in fall 2019, and post surveys were completed in spring 2020.

- Pre- and post-surveys measuring students' appreciation for learning through the arts, their use of and comfort with technology, as well as their academic motivation, as measured by the Inventory for School Motivation (ISM). Pre-instruments were completed by treatment and control students in fall 2019, and post instruments were completed in spring 2020.
- A 21st Century Skills rubric measuring each of the 4C's (including critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, and communication). The pre-instrument was completed by classroom teachers in treatment schools for their students in fall 2019, and post instruments were completed in spring 2020.
- Each treatment and control teacher and student was assigned an identification number in order to match their results from pre to post.
- Approval by the Metis IRB.
- Observations of project meetings were conducted by Metis, including those occurring in March 2020 where teachers discussed implementation of the program and learned about various technology tools.
- Regular project meetings were held with **GW**, SE Delco, DCIU 25, and Metis staff to discuss project development and implementation and to ensure the project was on track. These meetings also allowed time for review of project documentation, development of evaluation instruments, and discussions of lessons learned throughout the planning year.

How will the work conducted under this project be sustained beyond the life of this grant?

It is anticipated that DCIU 25 will develop a level of expertise in **SIG** to bring it to other Pennsylvania school districts. Through successful impact on student engagement and academic progress, we are hopeful that SE Delco will develop a cadre of expert teachers who can turnkey the model beyond the grant period throughout the district schools. The implementation, revision and adoption of **SIG** curriculum maps by the SE Delco school district will also support the sustainability of the project beyond the grant period throughout both treatment and control schools. The building of a model for ongoing collaboration of teachers, teaching artists, and students across the NYC, Long Island and SE Delco schools will support sustainability of the project through relationship building and sharing of ideas and milestones throughout the life of the grant and beyond. **GW** will continue to develop and make available the components and resources developed during the project on its website. A team of lead teachers and administrators from NYC, LI and SE Delco participated in a summer retreat using a hybrid model of participation. The group came together to begin to plan for beyond the grant period so that they can continue to collaborate on new ideas for **SIG**. All materials purchased through grant funds will remain property of the schools beyond the grant period.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION A – Population Served

Instructions: Complete the table below for each participating treatment school. Grantees in a planning year must still report on student achievement. This will serve as your project’s baseline data. Grantees in a planning year may be contacted to provide additional data.

Table 1

School Name	Title I	SIG Tier ¹	In SIG Comp. Preference Priority?	% of students eligible for Free or Reduced Meals	% Female	Project a part of School Improvement Plan?	Grade Levels		# of Students		School-Based Instructional Staff		GPRA Measure Data # of Participating Treatment Students			
							In School	Participating in Project	In School	Participating in Project	# of Participating Classroom Teachers	# of Other Participating Staff	Who Took Test		Who Achieved Proficiency	
													Reading	Math	Reading	Math
Harris School	Yes	0	No	86.28%	48.60%	No	1-8	4,5,6,7	788	375	15	6	0	0	0	0
Sharon Hill School	Yes	0	No	83.49%	50.07%	No	1-8	4,5,6,7	649	311	11	8	0	0	0	0

¹ This designation will no longer exist under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) as of the 2017-2018 school year.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION A – Population Served

Instructions: Complete the table below for each participating comparison school. Grantees in a planning year must still report on student achievement. This will serve as your project baseline data.

Table 2

School Name	Title I	SIG Tier ²	In SIG Comp. Preference Priority?	% of students eligible for Free or Reduced Meals	% Female	Grade Levels		# of Students		GPRA Measure Data # of Participating Comparison Students			
						In School	Participating as Comparison Group	In School	Participating as Comparison Group	Who Took Test		Who Achieved Proficiency	
										Reading	Math	Reading	Math
Darby Township School	Yes	0	No	79.82%	47.51%	1-8	4,5,6,7	663	329	0	0	0	0
Delcroft School	Yes	0	No	84.89%	34.17%	1-8	4,5,6,7	670	338	0	0	0	0

² This designation will no longer exist under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) as of the 2017-2018 school year.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION A – Population Served

Table 3: GPRA Summary Table (Measure 1)

Complete the summary table in this section using the information below:

GPRA Measure 1: The percentage of students participating in arts model projects funded through the AAEDD program who demonstrate proficiency in mathematics compared to those in control or comparison groups.		
Target		
Name of test(s) and grade levels assessed	Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) is administered annually to students in grades 3-8 in mathematics.	
	AAEDD Students	Comparison Students
Number of students taking standardized tests		
Number of students achieving proficiency*		
% of students achieving proficiency		
Actual		

Note: *If using a standardized test, please refer to your state’s definition of proficiency for that test.

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Data to measure this GPRA are not available for this reporting period due to COVID-19 school building closures.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.

The Pennsylvania System School Assessment (PSSA) was not administered in the 2019-2020 school year, and, thus, this GPRA was not measured. It will be measured and reported on in future reports pending data availability.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION A – Population Served

Table 4: GPRA Summary Table (Measure 2)

Complete the summary table in this section using the information below:

GPRA Measure 2: The percentage of students participating in arts model projects funded through the AAEDD program who demonstrate proficiency in reading compared to those in control or comparison groups.		
Target		
Name of test(s) and grade levels assessed	Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) is administered to students in grades 3-8 in English language arts skills.	
	AAEDD Students	Comparison Students
Number of students taking standardized tests		
Number of students achieving proficiency*		
% of students achieving proficiency		
Actual		

Note: *If using a standardized test, please refer to your state’s definition of proficiency for that test.

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Data to measure this GPRA are not available for this reporting period due to COVID-19 school building closures.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.

The Pennsylvania System School Assessment (PSSA) was not administered in the 2019-2020 school year, and, thus, this GPRA was not measured. It will be measured and reported on in future reports pending data availability.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION B - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data

Project Objective: Build the capacity of the Southeast Delco School District and schools to offer a standards-based arts education program that is integrated with the core academic curriculum.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
1.1 By fall of 2019, treatment schools will create and implement 4 curriculum maps that correlate the elements of SIG with the key ideas of the mathematics, literacy, science, and social studies curriculum for grades 4 through 8 students.	4	4/4	100	N/A	4/4	100

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

This performance measure was met in Year 1, and information was provided in the Year 1 Ad Hoc report in fall 2019. In 2018-2019 treatment teachers engaged in curriculum mapping with SE Delco core standards in literacy, social studies, science, math, the arts, and library media studies. Treatment teachers piloted professional development strategies with their students and provided feedback and challenges they encountered from piloted activities in the Google Classroom created for project idea sharing and feedback. As of June of 2019, 10 treatment teachers and 3 project administrators designed and piloted 4 curriculum maps. The curriculum maps were edited and expanded throughout Year 2 to include a total of 16 curriculum maps, 4 for each grade in the areas of ELA, math, science, and social studies and will continue to be revised in future implementation years.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION B - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data

Project Objective: Build the capacity of the Southeast Delco School District and schools to offer a standards-based arts education program that is integrated with the core academic curriculum.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
1.2 By the end of the project period, treatment schools will have implemented a scaffolded arts curriculum for students in grades 4 through 8 that supports project-based instruction.		/	100%		/	Enter %

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Performance measure 1.2 will be measured at the end of the grant through an analysis of implementation data for each grade level at each school. As of the end of Year 2, students in grades 4 and 6 participated in the scaffolded, project-based arts curriculum. Overall, a total of 14 core subject 4th and 6th grade classroom teachers and 4 teacher specialists (2 arts and 2 library media) implemented **SIG** activities across all subject areas during a **SIG** project period that occurred for four 45-minute periods per week. A total of 339 students in grades 4 and 6 participated. All teachers and teacher specialists collaborated for two 45-minute periods per week with a teaching artist. Upon school closures in mid-March **GW** continued to plan and implement **SIG** activities through the end of May 2020.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION B - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data

Project Objective: Build the capacity of the Southeast Delco School District and schools to offer a standards-based arts education program that is integrated with the core academic curriculum.						
Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
1.3 By June of each project implementation year, 16 core subject teachers and 4 teacher specialists in treatment schools will have implemented a STREAM-based model of arts integrated instruction.	20	/	Enter %	28	/	Enter %

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project performance measure 1.3 is measured through the analysis of teacher participation data. Participation in program activities are maintained and tracked by the project directors and the SE Delco project coordinator on an on-going basis. Throughout Year 2, **GW** conducted a total of 90 hours of professional development in the **SIG** with a total of 20 classroom teachers (14 4th and 6th grade and 6 special education), 2 reading intervention specialists, 2 art, 2 music, and 2 library media specialists, as well as SE Delco project coordinators from DCIU 25 and SE Delco school district. **GW** supported the grade 4 and 6 treatment teachers, with 3 full days of **SIG** activities in their classrooms. In addition, five teaching artists received 15 or more hours of training.

In preparation for Year 3 activities, **GW** conducted training with teachers in grades 4-7. While the in person training schedule for May 2020 was cancelled due to COVID-19 school closures, **GW** conducted a 3-hour virtual training for all classroom teachers in grades 4 through 7 as well as specialists and teaching artists on May 19th and 20th. In addition, ten 4th and 7th grade teachers developed curriculum maps during two full days of remote collaboration with **GW** and the SE Delco director of curriculum on June 15-16, 2020. **GW** also conducted a 6-hour real time hybrid training in September for all grade 4 through 7 teachers, 3 SE Delco teaching artists and 3 NYC teaching artists. The training was conducted using a hybrid model so that teachers were able to participate either in-person or remotely.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION B - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data

Project Objective: Build the 21st Century skills of elementary and middle grade students, increase their academic achievement in literacy and mathematics, and deepen their appreciation for the arts as an integral component of the learning process.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.1 In each project implementation year, treatment students' gains in literacy (reading) and mathematics achievement will significantly exceed those of students in control schools. (GPRA Measures 1 and 2)		/	5%		/	Enter %

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 2.1 was designed to be measured through collection and analysis of the PSSA ELA and math scores for treatment and control students in each implementation year. This measure will not be reported in Year 2 due to COVID-19 school building closures.

c) If Measure was "Not Met," describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.

The Pennsylvania System School Assessment (PSSA) was not administered in the 2019-2020 school year and thus this GPRA was not measured. It will be measured and reported on in future reports pending data availability.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Build the 21st Century skills of elementary and middle grade students, increase their academic achievement in literacy and mathematics, and deepen their appreciation for the arts as an integral component of the learning process.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.2 In each project implementation year, treatment students will demonstrate significantly greater gains in motivation toward learning than students in control schools.		/	5%		/	>5%

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 2.2 is measured through the collection and analysis of data from the Inventory for School Motivation (ISM), a published instrument with established reliability and validity designed to measure student motivation towards learning. The ISM was developed in 1991 to measure motivational characteristics of individuals and groups as they relate to school across cultural contexts. This evaluation uses three of the eight scales, which pinpoint students’ levels of motivation toward the following orientations: Task Involvement, Effort, and Social Concern. By the end of Year 2, it was expected that treatment students’ gains in motivation towards learning would significantly exceed that of the gains of control students. Pre-data were collected for treatment and control students in fall 2019 and post-data were collected in May 2020 (to the extent possible given the COVID-19 school building closures).

The **GW** AAEDD study used a cluster randomized controlled trial (RCT) design in which 4 schools were randomly assigned to either treatment or control conditions. Although no schools were dropped out from the study (i.e., no cluster-level attrition), there were quite a few students who did not respond to the post survey due to COVID-19, and therefore led to high student-level attrition (i.e., 76.2%).

Given the small sample sizes, the following student-level matching variables were included in the PSM process: FRL status (yes/no), the corresponding pre-test composite survey measure, and baseline PSSA ELA scale score. PSM was conducted separately for each of the three survey composite outcome measures (i.e., Performance Measure 2.2): Task scale, Effort scale, and Social Concern scale.³ After baseline equivalence was established for each analytic sample, multiple linear regression⁴ was used to examine the **GW** AAEDD program impacts on these target outcomes. In addition to the three matching variables and the treatment dummy indicator, the following baseline student characteristics were also included in the full regression models to further strengthen statistical control for possible confounds: grade level (grade 6/grade 4), gender (male/female), race/ethnicity (black/other), LEP status (yes/no), special education status (yes/no), and PSSA Math scale score. The regression analyses did not find any statistically significant gains in motivation toward learning when comparing the treatment students with their comparison counterparts regarding any of the three

³ Note that all the survey composite measures in this study were obtained by dividing the total raw score of all the items that belong to a scale/subscale by the total number of survey items answered in that scale/subscale (i.e., an average score that removes the influence of item missing responses).

⁴ Note that according to the WWC guidelines, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) is required for cluster RCTs where the unit of assignment differs from the unit of analysis. However, in this study, the total number of clusters was too small (i.e., 4 schools) for the HLM models to converge. Therefore, multiple linear regressions were used for impact analyses instead.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

composite outcomes (see Table below). Therefore, this student performance measure **target was not met**. Note that for all the treatment-comparison contrasts analyzed, effect size index (i.e., Hedges' *g*) were generated to measure the practical importance of every finding, in addition to assessing intended program outcomes only based on statistical significance level. The effect sizes calculated show that the program impacts on these target outcome measures were small.

Regression results of student motivation towards learning

Outcome Measure	Sample Size (Matched Pairs x 2)	Unadjusted Means		Regression-Adjusted Means		Estimated Impact	Effect Size in Hedges' <i>g</i> ^a	<i>p</i> -value
		Comparison	Treatment	Comparison	Treatment			
Task Scale	50 x 2	4.490	4.465	4.496	4.459	-0.038	-0.070	0.7127
Effort Scale	48 x 2	4.065	4.142	4.064	4.143	0.079	0.113	0.5430
Social Concern Scale	46 x 2	3.865	3.932	3.846	3.951	0.105	0.127	0.5109

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.

In March 2020, the school buildings closed due to COVID-19, thus, limiting number of students who were able to complete the post-survey due to lack of computer and internet access. This resulted in high student-level attrition (i.e., 76.2) from pre- to -post and limits the potential of the program to demonstrate impacts between treatment and control students at this time. While the program is continuing to operate in Year 3 remotely, program staff are working to ensure high response rates to instruments and program activities, including working directly with teachers and parents. It is hoped that this will result in lower student-level attrition in Year 3.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Build the 21st Century skills of elementary and middle grade students, increase their academic achievement in literacy and mathematics, and deepen their appreciation for the arts as an integral component of the learning process.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.3 In each project implementation year, treatment students will demonstrate statistically significant gains in attainment of 4C's for 21 st century learning.		/	5%		/	0%

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 2.3 is measured through the collection and analysis of data from a local-developed 21st Century Skills rubric measuring each of the 4C's (including critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, and communication) for students. Developed collaboratively by **GW**, Metis, and a former arts partner, the 21st Century Skills rubric was first used in the National Endowment for the Arts project, *The Mirror and the Canyon: Reflected Images, Echoed Voices: Chapter Two* research study of the **GW** model. It was expected that, in each year, treatment students would demonstrate statistically significant gains in their 21st Century Skills. Pre-data were collected for treatment students in fall 2019 and post-data were collected in May 2020 (to the extent possible given the COVID-19 school building closures). Repeated measures *t*-tests were carried out to investigate whether there were significant differences in changes in the target outcomes over time. This target was **met** with the following outcomes for treatment students:

- Critical Thinking & Problem Solving: statistically significant gain ($t=16.997, df=296, p=.000$)
- Collaboration: statistically significant gain ($t=15.939, df=296, p=.000$)
- Creativity & Innovation: statistically significant gain ($t=17.519, df=296, p=.000$)
- Communication: statistically significant gain ($t=13.078, df=296, p=.000$)
- Rubric Total (a total raw score of the 4C's): statistically significant gain ($t=19.099, df=296, p=.000$)

c) If Measure was "Not Met," describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Build the 21st Century skills of elementary and middle grade students, increase their academic achievement in literacy and mathematics, and deepen their appreciation for the arts as an integral component of the learning process.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.4 In each project implementation year, treatment students will demonstrate increased appreciation for learning through the arts.		/	5%		/	10%

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 2.4 is measured through the collection and analysis of the data from a locally-developed student survey designed to measure students’ appreciation for learning through the arts. This instrument was developed using items adapted from previous **GW** AEMDD projects to assess treatment students’ appreciation for learning through the arts, as well as their use of and comfort with technology. A composite score was generated from nine pertinent survey items measuring students’ appreciation for learning through the arts to assess this performance measure. Specifically, the composite measure was an average rating score of all the items responded to in the appreciation survey subscale, obtained by dividing the sum of the raw scores for all the non-missing pertinent survey responses by the total number of survey items answered by a given respondent. The range of the appreciation composite score was from 0 to 3. It was expected that in Year 2, treatment students would demonstrate composite scores that are significantly greater at post-test than at pre-test. Pre-data were collected for treatment students in fall 2019 and post-data were collected in May 2020 (as possible with COVID-19 school building closures). A repeated measures *t*-test was carried out to investigate whether there was a significant difference in the change in the target outcome over time. This target was **not met** as the gain in this composite over time was *not* statistically significant ($t=1.675, df=68, p=.099$).

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.

In March 2020, the school buildings closed due to COVID-19, thus, limiting number of students who were able to complete the post-survey due to lack of computer and internet access. This resulted in high student-level attrition (i.e., 76.2) from pre- to -post and limits the potential of the program to demonstrate impacts. While the program is continuing to operate in Year 3 remotely, program staff are working to ensure high response rates to instruments and program activities, including working directly with teachers and parents. It is hoped that this will result in lower student-level attrition in Year 3



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Build the 21st Century skills of elementary and middle grade students, increase their academic achievement in literacy and mathematics, and deepen their appreciation for the arts as an integral component of the learning process.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.5a In each project implementation year, at least 60% of treatment students will demonstrate increased use of technology tools.		60/100	60%		80/100	80%

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 2.5a is measured through the collection and analysis of the data from a locally-developed student survey to measure students’ use of technology. This instrument was developed using items adapted from previous **GW** AEMDD projects to assess treatment students’ appreciation for learning through the arts, as well as their use of and comfort with technology. To assess this performance measure, a composite score was generated from 24 pertinent survey items measuring student use of technology. A composite measure in this case was an average rating score of all the items responded to in the corresponding survey subscale, obtained by dividing the sum of the raw scores for all the non-missing pertinent survey responses by the total number of survey items answered by a given respondent for the use-of-technology subscale. The range of the use-of-technology composite scores was from 1 to 5. It was expected that in Year 2, treatment students demonstrate significantly greater scores at post-test than at pre-test. Pre-data were collected for treatment students in fall 2019, and post-data were collected in May 2020 (to the extent possible given the COVID-19 school building closures).

For this measure, which specified target percents of students who reported an increase from pre to post, a difference score was first calculated using the post-measure subtracted by the pre-measure, and then the percentage of the difference scores larger than 0 was calculated so that this performance measure could be evaluated directly based on the specified target percents. Overall, 80.0% of treatment students (N=70) reported demonstrating increased use of technology tools, thus the measure was **met**.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Build the 21st Century skills of elementary and middle grade students, increase their academic achievement in literacy and mathematics, and deepen their appreciation for the arts as an integral component of the learning process.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.5b In each project implementation year, at least 60% of treatment students will demonstrate increased comfort with technology tools.		60/100	60%		69/100	69%

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 2.5b is measured through the collection and analysis of the data from a locally-developed student survey to measure students’ comfort with technology. This instrument was developed using items adapted from previous *GW* AEMDD projects to assess treatment students’ appreciation for learning through the arts, as well as their use of and comfort with technology. To assess this performance measure, a composite score was generated from 23 pertinent survey items measuring students comfort with technology. In this case, a composite measure was an average rating score of all the items responded to in the corresponding survey subscale, obtained by dividing the sum of the raw scores for all the non-missing pertinent survey responses by the total number of survey items answered by a given respondent for the comfort-with-technology subscale. The range of the comfort-with-technology composite scores was from 0 to 4. It was expected that in Year 2, treatment students would demonstrate significantly greater scores at post-test than at pre-test. Pre-data were collected for treatment students in fall 2019 and post-data were collected in May 2020 (to the extent possible given the COVID-19 school building closures).

For this measure, which specified target percents of students who reported an increase from pre to post, a difference score was first calculated using the post-measure subtracted by the pre-measure, and then the percentage of the difference scores larger than 0 was calculated so that this performance measure could be evaluated directly based on the specified target percents. A total of 68.6% of responding treatment students (N=70) reported demonstrating increased comfort with technology tools, thus the measure was **met**.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Increase teacher capacity in integrating STREAM-based project learning and 21st century skills into literacy and mathematics instruction.						
Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.1a By June of each project implementation year, at least 70% of the core subject treatment teachers and teacher specialists will report increased use of an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction.		70/100	70%		11/27	41%

Explanation of Progress:

- a) Status of progress:
 Met Not Met In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*
- b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 3.1a is measured through the collection and analysis of the data from a locally-developed teacher survey to measure teachers’ use of an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction. Additional questions focus on how teachers are implementing learned skills into their classrooms; insights into the collaborative relationships between teachers, teaching artists, PD providers, and mentors; as well as successes and challenges of the project. This instrument uses a combination of Likert-scale and open-ended questions. Using the data from the surveys, composite measures were calculated to assess the growth of teachers from baseline (prior to their participation) to the spring of each project year. Pre-data were collected for treatment teachers in fall 2019 and were collected in May 2020 (to the extent possible given the COVID-19 school building closures).

To assess this performance measure, a composite score was generated from 3 pertinent survey items measuring teacher use of the interdisciplinary curriculum. In this case, a composite measure was an average rating score of all the items responded to in the corresponding survey subscale, obtained by dividing the sum of the raw scores for all the non-missing pertinent survey responses by the total number of survey items answered by a given respondent for the comfort-with-technology subscale. The range of the comfort-with-technology composite scores was from 0 to 5.

For this measure, which specified target percents of teachers who reported an increase from pre to post, a difference score was first calculated using the post-measure subtracted by the pre-measure, and then the percentage of the difference scores larger than 0 was calculated so that this performance measure could be evaluated directly based on the specified target percents. Based on the observed data, there were only 40.7% of the core subject treatment teachers and teacher specialists (N=27) who reported increased use of an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction, thus the target was **not met**.

- c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.

In March 2020, the school buildings closed due to COVID-19, thus, limiting the types of work that teachers were able to engage in with students due to lack of computers and internet access. The program is operating in Year 3 with full access to technology for teachers and students, with the hope of allowing for full implementation and strong outcomes.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Increase teacher capacity in integrating STREAM-based project learning and 21st century skills into literacy and mathematics instruction.						
Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.1b By June of each project implementation year, at least 70% of the core subject treatment teachers and teacher specialists will report increased comfort with an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction.		70/100	70%		22/27	82%

Explanation of Progress:

- a) Status of progress:
 Met Not Met In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 3.1a is measured through the collection and analysis of the data from a locally-developed teacher survey to measure teachers’ comfort with an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction. Additional questions focus on how teachers are implementing learned skills into their classrooms; insights into the collaborative relationships between teachers, teaching artists, PD providers, and mentors; as well as successes and challenges of the project. This instrument uses a combination of Likert-scale and open-ended questions. Using the data from the surveys, composite measures were calculated to assess the growth of teachers from baseline (prior to their participation) to the spring of each project year. Pre-data were collected for treatment teachers in fall 2019 and were collected in May 2020 (to the extent possible given the COVID-19 school building closures).

To assess this performance measure, a composite score was generated from 3 pertinent survey items measuring teacher comfort with the interdisciplinary curriculum. In this case, a composite measure was an average rating score of all the items responded to in the corresponding survey subscale, obtained by dividing the sum of the raw scores for all the non-missing pertinent survey responses by the total number of survey items answered by a given respondent for the comfort-with-technology subscale. The range of the comfort-with-technology composite scores was from 0 to 5.

For this measure, which specified target percents of teachers who reported an increase from pre to post, a difference score was first calculated using the post-measure subtracted by the pre-measure, and then the percentage of the difference scores larger than 0 was calculated so that this performance measure could be evaluated directly based on the specified target percents. Overall, 81.5% of teachers and teacher specialists (N=27) reported increased comfort with using an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction, thus the target was **met**.

- c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Increase teacher capacity in integrating STREAM-based project learning and 21st century skills into literacy and mathematics instruction.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.2 By June of each project implementation year, at least 80% of treatment core subject teachers and teacher specialists will demonstrate use of online collaborative resources.		80/100	80%		33/40	83%

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 3.2 is measured through the collection and analysis of data from the collaborative planning online tools used throughout the project. During Year 2, a total of 33 of the 40 participating teachers including 26 classroom teachers (14 grade 4/6, 12 grade 5/7) 6 special education specialists, 2 reading intervention, 2 art, 2 music, and 2 library media specialists, 4 teaching artists and 2 project coordinators from SE Delco and DCIU 25 participated in monthly online topic discussions with their colleagues using Google Classroom, a collaborative web-based resource. Thus the measure was **met**.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Increase teacher capacity in integrating STREAM-based project learning and 21st century skills into literacy and mathematics instruction.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.3a By June of each project implementation year, at least 75% of treatment core subject teachers and teacher specialists will report increased use of technology tools to support 21 st century teaching.		75/100	75%	N/A	27/27	100%

Explanation of Progress:

- a) Status of progress:
 Met Not Met In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 3.3a is measured through the collection and analysis of the data from a locally-developed teacher survey to measure their use of technology tools to support 21st century teaching. Additional questions focus on how teachers are implementing learned skills into their classrooms; insights into the collaborative relationships between teachers, teaching artists, PD providers, and mentors; as well as successes and challenges of the project. This instrument was developed to use a combination of Likert-scale and open-ended questions. To assess this performance measure, a composite score was derived from the 16 pertinent survey items measuring teacher use of technology tools to support 21st century learning. A composite measure in this case was an average rating score of all the items responded to in the corresponding survey subscale, obtained by dividing the sum of the raw scores for all the non-missing pertinent survey responses by the total number of survey items answered by a given respondent for the use-of-technology subscale. The possible range of the use-of-technology composite scores was from 1 to 5. Using the data from the surveys, a difference composite score was calculated to assess the growth of teachers from baseline (prior to their participation) to the spring of each project year. Pre-data were collected for treatment teachers in fall 2019, and post-data were collected in May 2020 (to the extent possible given the COVID-19 school building closures).

For this measure, which specified target percents of teachers who reported an increase from pre to post, a difference score was first calculated using the post-measure subtracted by the pre-measure, and then the percentage of the difference scores larger than 0 was calculated so that this performance measure could be evaluated directly based on the specified target percents. Based on the observed data, all (i.e., 100%) of the treatment core subject teachers and teacher specialists (N=27) reported increased use of integrating technology tools to support 21st century teaching, thus the target was **met**.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Increase teacher capacity in integrating STREAM-based project learning and 21st century skills into literacy and mathematics instruction.						
Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.3b By June of each project implementation year, at least 75% of treatment core subject teachers and teacher specialists will report increased use of and comfort with integrating the technology tools to support 21 st century teaching.		75/100	75%	N/A	15/27	56%

Explanation of Progress:

- a) Status of progress:
 Met Not Met In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*
- b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Project Performance Measure 3.3b is measured through the collection and analysis of the data from a locally-developed teacher survey to measure their comfort with integrating the technology tools to support 21st century teaching. Additional questions focus on how teachers are implementing learned skills into their classrooms; insights into the collaborative relationships between teachers, teaching artists, PD providers, and mentors; as well as successes and challenges of the project. This instrument was developed to use a combination of Likert-scale and open-ended questions. To assess this performance measure, a composite score was derived from the 16 pertinent survey items measuring teacher comfort with integration to support 21st century learning. A composite measure in this case was an average rating score of all the items responded to in the corresponding survey subscale, obtained by dividing the sum of the raw scores for all the non-missing pertinent survey responses by the total number of survey items answered by a given respondent for the comfort-with-integration subscale. The range of the comfort-with-integration composite scores was from 1 to 6. Using the data from the surveys, a difference composite score was calculated to assess the growth of teachers from baseline (prior to their participation) to the spring of each project year. Pre-data were collected for treatment teachers in fall 2019 and post-data were collected in May 2020 (to the extent possible given the COVID-19 school building closures).

For this measure, which specified target percents of teachers who reported an increase from pre to post, a difference score was first calculated using the post-measure subtracted by the pre-measure, and then the percentage of the difference scores larger than 0 was calculated so that this performance measure could be evaluated directly based on the specified target percents. Based on the observed data, only **55.6%** of teachers and teacher specialists (N=27) reported increased comfort with integrating technology tools in support of 21st century teaching, thus the target was **not met**.

- c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.

In March 2020, the school buildings closed due to COVID-19, thus, limiting the types of work that teachers were able to engage in due to lack of computers and internet access for students at the time of the post-survey. The program is operating in Year 3 with full access to technology for teachers and students, with the hope of allowing for full implementation and strong outcomes.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Evolve the Global Writes model and expand the Delaware County Intermediate Unit 25 arts offerings by developing online resources for the dissemination of exemplary arts-based educational programming.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
4.1 By the end of project year 4, treatment schools will commit to sustaining a locally-adapted version of the Global Writes model with its core subject area and scaffolded arts curriculum and maintain its participation in the Global Writes community.	4	/	Enter %		/	Enter %

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Performance Measure 4.1 will be measured at the end of the grant through a review of MOUs from each treatment school indicating their commitment to sustain program beyond the end of the project. Data to address this performance measure will be provided in the final performance report.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Evolve the Global Writes model and expand the Delaware County Intermediate Unit 25 arts offerings by developing online resources for the dissemination of exemplary arts-based educational programming.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
4.2 By the end of project year 4, DCIU 25 experts, participating teachers, and school administrators will submit proposals to at least 2 local or national presentations to disseminate successes and challenges of SIG.	2	/	Enter %		/	Enter %

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Performance Measure 4.2 will be measured at the end of the grant through a review of materials from presentations to local or national conferences. Data to address this performance measure will be provided in the final performance report.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Evolve the Global Writes model and expand the Delaware County Intermediate Unit 25 arts offerings by developing online resources for the dissemination of exemplary arts-based educational programming.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
4.3 By the end of project year 4, DCIU 25 will create partnerships for SIG implementation with at least 1 additional school district.	1	/	Enter %		/	Enter %

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Performance Measure 4.3 will be measured at the end of the grant through a review of MOUs between DCIU 25 and other districts. Data to address this performance measure will be provided in the final performance report.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Project Objective: Evolve the Global Writes model and expand the Delaware County Intermediate Unit 25 arts offerings by developing online resources for the dissemination of exemplary arts-based educational programming.

Project Performance Measure	Target			Actual		
	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
4.4 In each project year, at least 10 requests for information about the Global Writes model from non-AAEDD grantees will be made via online inquiries generated from the Global Writes and DCIU 25 websites.	10	/	Enter %	0	/	Enter %

Explanation of Progress:

a) Status of progress:

- Met
 Not Met
 In Progress *(only applicable to measures with completion dates that fall after the end of the reporting period. In Progress measures must be updated in the Ad Hoc Report)*

b) Description of progress (include challenges faced, if any).

Performance measure 4.4 is measured through an annual review of the online inquiries from the **GW** and DCIU 25 websites. This measure was not met in Year 2 due to COVID-19 school closures as well as a shift in DCIU 25 efforts to supporting online content-based instruction to SE Delco schools.

This measure will be a focus for the 2020-2021 school year.

c) If Measure was “Not Met,” describe how and when the measure will be met, and any lessons learned.

This measure was not met in Year 2 due to COVID-19 school closures as well as a shift in DCIU 25 efforts to supporting online content-based instruction to SE Delco schools. This measure will be a focus for during Year 3 and will include additional revisions to the **GW** and DCIU 25 websites.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION C –Non-Construction Programs: Budget Summary

Instructions

1. **Approved Budget:** Enter the amount awarded for the current reporting year in each budget category. Enter the start date of the grant budget year (e.g., 10/1/14) and the end date of the budget year (e.g., 9/30/15). If you are not sure of the start and end dates of the budget year for your grant, contact your project officer.
2. **Carryover from Prior Year:** Enter the amount of any funds carried over from the prior budget year.
3. **Expenditures to Date:** Enter the amount of funds expended to date in each budget category. Enter the period that the expenditures cover. The start date will be the start of the grant budget year (e.g., 10/1/14). The end date will be the end of the current reporting period (e.g., 5/30/15). If you are not sure of the start of the budget year or the end of the current reporting period, contact your project officer.
4. **Anticipated Costs:** Enter the amount of funds encumbered that will be expended prior to the end of the grant budget year. If this report covers the end of the budget year, this column should be empty.
5. **Carryover to Following Year:** Enter the amount of funds you propose to carry over to the next budget period.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION C –Non-Construction Programs: Budget Summary

BUDGET SUMMARY U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS							
Budget Categories	Approved Budget	Carryover from Prior Year	Expenditures	Anticipated Costs		Carryover to Following Year	
<i>Reporting Period</i>	<i>Start: 10/01/19 End: 09/30/20</i>		<i>Start: 10/01/19 End: 09/30/20</i>	<i>Start: End:</i>		<i>Start: 10/01/20 End: 09/30/21</i>	
1. Personnel	200,000.00	0.00	194,817.46	0.00		00.00	
2. Fringe Benefits	00.00	0.00	00.00	00.00		0.00	
3. Travel	25,200.00	0.00	25,361.02	0.00		00.00	
4. Equipment	00.00	0.00	00.00	00.00		00.00	
5. Supplies	50,000.00	0.00	52,835.25	0.00		00.00	
6. Contractual	235,320.00	0.00	237,507.27	00.00		00.00	
7. Construction	0.00	0.00	00.00	00.00		00.00	
8. Other	10,000.00	0.00	10,000.00	00.00		00.00	
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	520,520.00	0.00	520,521.00	00.00		00.00	
10. Indirect Costs	00.00	00.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	
11. Training Stipends	52,800.00	14,600.00	67,399.00	00.00		00.00	
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	573,320.00	14,600.00	587,920.00	00.00		00.00	



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION C – Non-Construction Programs: Budget Summary

BUDGET SUMMARY NON-FEDERAL FUNDS							
Budget Categories	Approved Budget	Carryover from Prior Year	Expenditures	Anticipated Costs		Carryover to Following Year	
<i>Reporting Period</i>	<i>Start: mm/dd/yy End: mm/dd/yy</i>		<i>Start: mm/dd/yy End: mm/dd/yy</i>	<i>Start: mm/dd/yy End: mm/dd/yy</i>		<i>Start: mm/dd/yy End: mm/dd/yy</i>	
1. Personnel	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
2. Fringe Benefits	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
3. Travel	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
4. Equipment	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
5. Supplies	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
6. Contractual	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
7. Construction	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
8. Other	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
10. Indirect Costs	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
11. Training Stipends	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	
12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount	Enter \$ Amount		Enter \$ Amount	



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION C – Non-Construction Programs: Budget Summary

1. Please provide an explanation if funds have not been drawn down from the G5 System to pay for the budget expenditure amounts reported in items 8a. – 8c of the Cover Sheet: NA

2. Please provide an explanation if you *did not* expend funds at the expected rate during the reporting period:

3. Describe any significant changes to your budget resulting from modification of project activities:

Personnel costs were slightly lower than anticipated. Costs for travel and supplies was slightly higher than anticipated. Travel was extended this year due to the need to serve 2 additional grades of teachers. Some teachers wanted to attend training in-person so *GW* traveled in September to SE Delco to accommodate a hybrid model of professional learning. Additional supplies were needed to accommodate new teachers that were added to the program in grades 4 through 7 and the special education teachers that support all classrooms. The increase in contractual services was due to the mentoring of teachers and teaching artists by NYC teaching artists to support the shift in program activities from in-person *SIG* instruction to remote *SIG* activities.

4. Please describe any changes to your budget that affected your ability to achieve your approved project activities and/or project objectives: N/A

5. Do you expect to have any unexpended (carryover) funds at the end of the current budget period? Yes No.

a. If yes, please explain why.

6. Describe any anticipated changes in your budget for the **next** budget period that require prior approval from the Department (see EDGAR, 2 CFR 200.407, as applicable): N/A



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION D – Budget Narrative

Instructions

1. Provide an itemized budget breakdown, and justification by project year, for each budget category listed in Sections C. For grant projects that will be divided into two or more separately budgeted major activities or sub-projects, show for each budget category of a project year the breakdown of the specific expenses attributable to each sub-project or activity.
2. For non-Federal funds or resources listed in Section C that are used to meet a cost-sharing or matching requirement or provided as a voluntary cost-sharing or matching commitment, you must include:
 - a. The specific costs or contributions by budget category;
 - b. The source of the costs or contributions; and
 - c. In the case of third-party in-kind contributions, a description of how the value was determined for the donated or contributed goods or services.

[Please review ED's general cost sharing and matching regulations, which include specific limitations in 2 CFR 200.306, and the applicable Office of Management and Budget (OMB) cost principles for your entity type regarding donations, capital assets, depreciation and use allowances. OMB cost principle circulars are available on OMB's website at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/index.html>]

3. If applicable to this program, provide the rate and base on which fringe benefits are calculated.
4. If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, this information is to be completed by your Business Office. Specify the estimated amount of the base to which the indirect cost rate is applied and the total indirect expense. Depending on the grant program to which you are applying and/or your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement, some direct cost budget categories in your grant application budget may not be included in the base and multiplied by your indirect cost rate. For example, you must multiply the indirect cost rates of "Training grants" (34 CFR 75.562) and grants under programs with "Supplement not Supplant" requirements ("Restricted Rate" programs) by a "modified total direct cost" (MTDC) base (34 CFR 75.563 or 76.563). Please indicate which costs are included and which costs are excluded from the base to which the indirect cost rate is applied.

When calculating indirect costs (line 10) for "Training grants" or grants under "Restricted Rate" programs, you must refer to the information and examples on ED's website at: <http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html>.

You may also contact (202) 245-8082 for additional information regarding calculating indirect cost rates or general indirect cost rate information.

5. Provide other explanations or comments you deem necessary.
-

Budget categories and details of expenditures:

Personnel-under this category the grant covers project salary costs for 2 project co-directors (\$75,000 total), a project coordinator from the SE Delco school district (\$60,000), and a project manager from the DCIU 25 (\$59,817.46). These allocations were based on time spent monthly on project activities and project management as well as roles and responsibilities of each individual, based on their annualized salaries. These funds were expended monthly in accordance with the allocation provided.

Travel-under this category are included costs for travel and lodging for the project to and from New York to Philadelphia. These costs, at the allowable EDGAR guidelines covered tolls, lodging and gas for 2 project directors, the SE Delco project coordinator, the DCIU 25 project manager and 3 consultants, two teaching artists with expertise in digital media and game design applications and an expert in strategies for supporting special needs students. Consultants provided professional development for the project as well as classroom support at both treatment schools from October 2019 through September 2020. Costs were also covered for travel and lodging for **GW** project directors, SE Delco administrators, and DCIU 25 project staff at the AAEDD conference in Washington DC. In addition, travel costs for SE Delco teachers and administrators coming to NYC to meet and visit mentor schools covering train fare and taxi fare were included in travel costs. Funds were expended slightly above the allocated amount for Year 2 of the project, (\$25,200 allocated, \$25361 spent).

Supplies-under this category supplies for game design professional development and classroom supplies for piloting of game design activities were purchased. Supplies included games, maker space art supplies, iPads and printers, AR/VR materials, and video game production tools such as Bloxels. Purchases were made for in classroom implementation for all grades 4 and 6 teachers as well as for



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

special education and grade 5 and 7 teachers who received monthly training on **SIG** activities during this project year. A total of \$ 52,835.25 was spent in this category during project Year 2 which was slightly higher than the \$50,000 allocation. Additional funds were used for classroom supplies for grades 5 and 7 teachers for anticipated project implementation occurring in Year 3 as well as for new teachers in the program that were not anticipated in the initial budget.

Contractual-under this category is included the following contractual services:

- Hiring and training for **SIG** new teaching artists for the SE Delco treatment schools (5 hired and trained) (\$17,280 allocated)
- Planning, training and mentoring for new teaching artists in **SIG** arts activities (\$18,720 allocated). This activity increased due to increases in mentoring by NYC teaching artists due to impending school closures and the need to learn more about providing **SIG** activities remotely for SE Delco teaching artists.
- Teaching artist 25-week residencies in treatment schools (\$86,400 allocated)
- Purchase of online subscription services for game design for treatment schools. (\$24,000 allocated)
- Cloud-based subscription for online collaboration NYC to SE Delco teachers and students (\$12,000 allocated)
- Professional development consultants provided to SE Delco teachers to support differentiated learning in **SIG** work for Special Needs students. Also, consultants to provide video documentation of project work completed during this funding period. This includes participation in a 3-day summer training for selected lead SE Delco teachers and administrators (7) in **SIG** turnkey training. (\$19,200 allocated).
- Evaluation-this allocation covered the refinement, production, and implementation of evaluation instruments for teachers and students of both treatment and control schools in SE Delco, which were created in Year 1. (\$75,000 allocated). Implementation of these instruments occurred remotely for post implementation in Year 2. Additional activities vary and include IRB submission, project meetings, observation of training and program activities, review of project documentation, and attendance at the Arts in Education conference. Standardized testing will not occur this year in the SE Delco school district so this component will not be included in the evaluation reporting in Year 2.

Other-Under this category is control school compensation to include classroom supplies and materials not related to the **SIG** project activities. The allocated \$10,000 was spent on the purchase of supplies for control schools as indicated in the anticipated budget.

Training Stipends-this category includes funds for teacher per session planning beyond work-day hours, teacher substitute coverage for day training activities and NYC teacher mentoring stipends. (\$67,400 allocated). Teachers and teaching artists continued to plan **SIG** activities and refine curriculum maps for grades 4,5,6 and 7 in anticipation of fall 2020 implementation. SE Delco teaching artists worked with NYC teaching artists through remote learning to plan and design remote learning activities for extended school closures in fall 2020.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION E –Additional Information

Project Overview:

1. Name and description of Arts Integration Model:

2. Arts Focus: Dance Folk Arts Media Arts Music Theater Visual Arts

3. Core Content Focus (*e.g., science, social studies, reading, math*) (*Enter all content areas*):

STREAM-based focus across all core curriculum areas including literacy, math, science and social studies with integration of the arts, music, engineering design, and technology.

4. Project focus (*check all that apply*):

- Development, enhancement, or expansion of standards-based arts education programs
- The integration of standards-based arts instruction with other core academic area content

5. Has your state developed standards for Arts Education?

- Yes. Name of standards: Pennsylvania Academic Standards for the Arts and Humanities
- No

6. The model is aligned to:

National Standards (*the arts standards developed by the Coalition for Core Arts Standards-2014 or the National Voluntary Standards for the Arts-1994*) Yes No

State Standards Yes No

7. Please indicate how your implementation of the model has changed over the past year (*if applicable*):

The implementation of the model continued remotely due to COVID-19 school building closures.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION E –Additional Information

Description of Project Implementation

a) **Assessment Tools** Please list the student and instructional staff assessment tools that are being used in this project.

Name and Description of Tool	How it will be/has been administered	Outcome being Measured	Associated Performance Measure #	Completion Date
Teacher Survey	This online survey is administered on a pre/post basis annually to all treatment teachers in Years 2-4 of the grant.	Teachers' comfort with and use of an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction; teachers' use of and comfort with integrating the technology tools to support 21st century teaching	PM 3.1, 3.3	Fall 2019-Pre-survey Spring 2020-Post-survey
21 st Century Skills Rubric	This instrument is completed by treatment teachers for each of their students. The instrument is completed in the spring of each of Years 2-4 of the grant.	Students' attainment of 4C's (communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity) for 21st century learning	PM 2.3	Fall 2019-Pre-rubric Spring 2020-Post-rubric
Inventory of School Motivation	This online survey is administered on a pre/post basis annually to all treatment and control students in Years 2-4 of the grant.	Students' motivation towards learning	PM 2.2	Fall 2019-Pre-survey Spring 2020-Post-survey
Student Survey	This online survey is administered on a pre/post basis annually to all treatment and control students in Years 2-4 of the grant.	Students' appreciation for learning through the arts; use of and comfort with technology tools	PM 2.4, 2.5	Fall 2019-Pre-survey Spring 2020-Post-survey
PSSA	Data from this state-administered achievement test was planned to be collected and analyzed annually for all treatment and control students in Years 2-4 of the grant. These data were not collected in Year 2 due to COVID-19 school building closures.	Student achievement in Reading and Mathematics	GPRA 1, GPRA 2, and PM 2.1	Was not administered in Year 2

a) Are there assessment tools you proposed to administer or develop in your application that you are no longer administering or developing? Yes No. If Yes, Why?
PSSA data were not collected in Year 2 due to COVID-19 school building closures.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

b) Are there assessment tools you did not propose in your application that you are now using or planning to use? Yes No. If Yes, Why?

SECTION E –Additional Information

8. Professional Development

a) Please list the grant related professional development activities in which instructional staff participated during this reporting period.

PD Activity	Purpose	Description of Participants (include number of each participant type – e.g., classroom teachers, art teachers etc.)	Approximate # of hours devoted to activity	Completion Date
Monthly <i>GW</i> Professional Development	Understanding components of <i>SIG</i> project. Training on game design materials and tools, integration of game design across the curriculum, unit planning aligned with standards-based curriculum. Differentiation of activities based on student needs. Changing of activities from in-person to remote.	26 classroom teachers (14 teachers grades 4 and 6, 12 teachers grades 5 and 7 and 6 special education teachers), 2 reading intervention specialists, 2 art, 2 music, and 2 library media specialists as well as the SE Delco project coordinators from the DCIU 25 and SE Delco school district.	90	9/11/20
Classroom piloting and mentoring support for treatment teachers. Visits to NYC mentor schools to meet with experienced teachers and artists and observe <i>SIG</i> activities.	Treatment grade 4 and 6 teachers as well as arts and library media specialists implement strategies and activities learned during professional development in their classrooms to increase their comfort level in using new <i>SIG</i> tools and practices. Grade 5 and 7, as well as special education and music teachers and administrators in SE Delco are able to see how the program works by visiting NYC classrooms and discussing the program with experienced teachers and artists.	14 treatment classroom teachers, 2 art teachers, 2 library media specialists, 2 reading intervention specialists, 1 project coordinator SE Delco and 1 project manager DCIU 25, 1 curriculum director SE Delco. Deliver 1 year of project implementation for grades 4 and 6 students. Six special needs teachers, 2 music specialists and 12 teachers for grades 5 and 7 begin to pilot <i>SIG</i> activities with their students. From NYC schools, there were 6 experienced teachers, 3 teaching artists, and 3 administrators	60	5/2020



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

		who were visited by the SE Delco teachers and administrators.		
Curriculum planning and curriculum map development	Sixteen curriculum maps to integrate SIG with existing units and standards in literacy, social studies, math, science and the arts were developed and edited to be used as a framework for project implementation by all grades 4 through 7 treatment teachers beginning fall 2020.	13 treatment teachers including 2 from each of grades 4 through 7, 2 reading intervention specialists, 1 art teacher, 1 music teachers, 1 library media specialist, 4 teaching artists. 1 DCIU 25 project manager and 1 SE Delco director of curriculum.	12	06/30/20
GW Summer intensive turn-key leadership training	Development of 7 teacher leaders in SE Delco and DCIU 25 who can turnkey SIG activities and mentor inexperienced teachers in the use of strategies and materials for the SIG project. Idea sharing across SIG project administrators and teachers from NYC, Long Island NY and SE Delco, Pa.	3 classroom treatment teachers, 1 coach, and DCIU 25 project manager.	18	07/11/20

- b) Are there professional development activities you proposed to develop in your application that you are no longer developing? Yes No. If Yes, Why?
- c) Are there professional development activities that you did not propose in your application that you are now conducting? Yes No. If Yes, Why?

We are conducting training and mentoring for teachers and teaching artists in how to conduct **SIG** activities through remote and hybrid learning. Due COVID-19 school closures, **GW** is working with the SE Delco school district, and 3 of its teaching artists to develop a remote learning platform for **SIG** activities. The May 2020 professional development session was conducted via remote learning on May 19th and 20th instead of live, as it was intended. The September 2020 professional development was conducted via a hybrid model to accommodate teacher and teaching artists preferences for attendance. Teachers and teaching artists worked on revising and creating curriculum maps using the remote learning platform. Teaching artists in SE Delco will be collaborating and continuing to be mentored by teaching artists in NYC via remote learning. A professional learning Google Classroom space is being used by artists across cities to share **SIG** ideas that can be done at home.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION E –Additional Information

9. Key Resources Developed

a) Please list the key resources that have been developed through this project (e.g., lesson plans, websites).

Name of Resource	Description of Resource and How it Will Be Used	Arts Focus/Core Content Focus	Completion Date
Google Classroom for <i>Skin in the Game</i>	Used as a follow up to bi-monthly professional development sessions for treatment teachers and teaching artists to share their ideas and concerns and to post piloted activities in the classroom. <i>GW</i> and SE Delco also use the classroom to post teacher resources and assignments monthly.	Use of visual media resources for creating art based on <i>SIG</i> activities and STREAM-based classroom project work piloted in the art room, the library and grade 4 through 7 treatment classrooms. Sharing of resources for delivering <i>SIG</i> remotely.	09/30/2020
Google Website for <i>Skin in the Game</i>	Documentation of professional development activities and classroom best practices throughout <i>SIG</i> schools, including across cities where project is being implemented: SE Delco, PA., Bronx, NYC and Amityville, LI. <i>SIG</i> curriculum modules also published with lesson plans and teacher resources for use in the classroom. Updates are being made for remote practices for delivering <i>SIG</i> activities. Provides a template for teachers to use for project implementation in board and video game creation and its integration in all areas of curriculum. This resource is made public on the <i>GW</i> website and is free for use by anyone interested. <i>GW</i> website if being redeveloped to highlight <i>SIG</i> work.	Integration of the arts in a maker space environment creating and using visual media apps to create board games and video game design in the art room and classrooms. Library media research focus for game components and details to support classroom teacher implementation.	9/30/2020
Curriculum Maps	16 curriculum maps have been created in draft form for grades 4 and 7 this year to align <i>SIG</i> activities and resources with the SE Delco curriculum standards in math, literacy, science, social studies, and the arts. These curriculum maps will be used for project implementation in Years 3.	Arts integration with core subjects as well as development of visual arts media curriculum for arts and music teachers.	06/30/2020

Note: All of the above resources will continue to be developed as the project is implemented. The dates of completion reflect the first iteration of the resource made available to project participants. Development of above resources will be ongoing, with edits and additional resources added each year of the grant project.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

- b) Are there resources you proposed to develop in your application that you are no longer developing? Yes No. If Yes, Why?
- c) Are there resources you did not propose in your application that you are now developing? Yes No. If Yes, Why?

Due to COVID-19 school closures in March 2020, **GW** worked with the SE Delco school district as well as it's teaching artists to create remote learning activities that teachers can implement with treatment students for the balance of the school year and in anticipation of remote activities in Year 3.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION E –Additional Information

10. Evaluation

a) Please list the evaluation activities that occurred during this reporting period.

Evaluation Activities	Key Findings	How findings were or will be used	Associated Performance Measure #	Completion Date
Planning and kick off meeting	Staff from <i>GW</i> , SE Delco, the DCIU 25, and Metis used this time to review the evaluation design and discuss next steps help guide the evaluation and programmatic implementation.	Information gathered during this meeting was used to plan the implementation and evaluation for Year 2.	All measures	September 2019
Attendance at the Arts in Education conference	Information to help guide the implementation and evaluation of the project.	Information gathered during the conference was used to help guide the implementation and evaluation of the project.	All measures	October 2019
Review of project documentation (e.g., professional development plans and materials).	Professional development plans and materials as well as program implementation materials were reviewed for content and pedagogical information. Ongoing discussions between <i>GW</i> , SE Delco, the DCIU 25, and Metis were held as the materials were developed to ensure consistency with the grant proposal and to allow for effective evaluation of the program.	Information gathered through project documentation and subsequent conversations were used to help develop the evaluation instruments.	All measures	Ongoing
Observations of project meetings	Metis staff observed a set of project meetings/professional development activities to glean information about the project implementation and inform the development of instruments.	Information gathered through observations were used to help develop the evaluation instruments.	All measures	Ongoing 2020
Implementation of pre/post teacher surveys, pre/post student surveys, and pre/post 21 st Century Skills (4C) rubric	All instruments implemented collaboratively by <i>GW</i> , SE Delco, the DCIU 25, and Metis staff. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Inventory for School Motivation (ISM), a published instrument with established reliability and validity, which is used to measure student motivation towards learning. The 21st Century Skills rubric, designed to measure student attainment of each of the 4C's (including critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, and communication). 	Data from these instruments will be used to address project performance measures. Data were also used to inform mid-course adjustments in project implementation activities.	ISM: PM 2.2; Rubric: PM 2.3; Student Survey: PMs 2.4, 2.5; Teacher Survey: PMs 3.1, 3.3	October 2019-June 2020



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student survey, designed to measure appreciation for learning through the arts, as well as use of and comfort with technology. • The teacher survey, designed to measure teacher: comfort using an interdisciplinary curriculum that integrates STREAM-based instruction; comfort integrating technology to support 21st Century learning; insight into the collaborative relationships between teachers, teaching artists, PD providers, and mentors; and insight into the successes and challenges of the project. <p>These instruments were piloted in May-June 2019 with non-participating SE Delco students and staff. Data from these assessments were analyzed, and the instruments were revised for administration in project implementation years. Each teacher and student was assigned an identification number in order to match their results from pre to post. All pre-instruments were administered in fall 2019 and post instruments were administered in spring 2020.</p>			
Submission to Metis IRB	The evaluation design was submitted to the Metis IRB for review and approval. The study, including all instruments, was approved for implementation	Suggested improvements to the materials were implemented to ensure consistency with human subjects research rules and regulations.	All measures	Spring 2020
Project meetings	Regularly scheduled project meetings were held with <i>GW</i> , SE Delco, DCIU 25, and Metis staff to discuss project development and implementation and ensure the project is on track. In addition, these meetings allowed for reviews of project documentation, development of evaluation instruments, and discussions of lessons learned throughout the planning year.	Information gathered was used to help develop instruments and guide evaluation and program planning.	All measures	Ongoing

b) Are there evaluation activities that you proposed in your application that you are no longer conducting? Yes No. If Yes, Why?

Achievement data were not collected in Year 2 due to COVID-19 school building closures.

c) Are there evaluation activities that you did not propose in your application that you are now conducting? Yes No. If Yes, Why?

d) Select the primary evaluation methodology being used to examine the impact of the project on student outcomes



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Experimental study

Quasi-Experimental study

Other. *Describe:* [Click here to enter text.](#)

e) Indicate the extent to which this study may meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards:

May meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards **Without Reservations**

Will not meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards. Explain:

May meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards **With Reservations**



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION E –Additional Information

11. Partnerships

a) Please list all project partners.

Partner Name <i>(include all partners listed in your application and all new partners)</i>	Role and Activities	Current Partner	Partner is a key decision maker
Southeast Delco School District (SE Delco)	Provides the leadership for the planning, professional development and implementation of SIG activities in the treatment schools; provides guidance for the DCIU 25 in supporting the control schools with non-treatment activities.	Yes	Yes
DCIU 25	Provides a program manager to learn SIG strategies and tools for replication of SIG activities in other PA school districts beyond the grant period; provides support for control school activities not related to the SIG program.	Yes	Yes
Metis Associates	Provides the planning and implementation of all evaluation instruments and activities for the SIG project; assists GW in data analysis and reporting on all evaluation activities in the project.	Yes	Yes
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Select	Select
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Select	Select

b) Has the role of any of your partners changed from what you proposed in your application? Yes No. If Yes, Why?

12. Dissemination

a) Is dissemination scheduled for the current program year? Yes No. If “Yes”, please fill in the chart below. If “No”, Why Not?

Dissemination Topic	Dissemination Method	Scheduled Completion	Actual Completion
GW Skin in the Game Website	Continued creation of Google Site, documenting of photos, and pilot project work. Update site to include remote learning activities.	ongoing	09/30/22
Video documentation of Skin in the Game activity	Videographer continues to support SIG project documentation. Videographer has interviewed students, teachers and administrators to document their thoughts about the program thus far and posted video on the GW website. Videographer is supporting the revamping of the GW site to highlight SIG work.	ongoing	09/30/22



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

<i>GW</i> Internet-Based Curriculum Modules	<i>GW</i> continues development of a series of curriculum modules for teachers to use as a resource for teaching <i>SIG</i> . across multiple cities where it is being implemented. The modules are publicly available on the <i>GW</i> website. The modules are being updated to include remote learning options.	09/30/21	09/30/22
--	---	----------	----------



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION E –Additional Information

b) Is dissemination scheduled for the next program year? Yes No. If “Yes”, please fill in the chart below. If “No”, Why not?

Dissemination Topic	Dissemination Method	Scheduled Completion
<i>GW</i> Website Development	Continued documentation of project implementation by treatment classes, including photos and student project work.	09/30/22
Curriculum Modules for <i>SIG</i>	Continued development of the online curriculum modules as resources for treatment teachers in NYC, Amityville, and SE Delco schools. Uploading of teacher and teaching artist lesson plans as resources to be shared through <i>GW</i> website.	ongoing
Presentations at local events of <i>SIG</i> work	Treatment school students, teachers, and artists will conduct online classroom, school and district-wide celebrations to support <i>SIG</i> treatment school activities and share them with the larger district community.	6/30/21
Presentation at national events of <i>SIG</i> work.	<i>GW</i> project directors will seek to present results of the <i>SIG</i> project at national events such as arts organization conferences and TEDx talks.	6/30/21

13. Other Activities

- a) Please list any other key activities that occurred during this reporting period which have not been included above and their completion dates.
- b) Are there other key activities that you proposed in your application that you are no longer conducting? Yes No. If Yes, Why?

Family and school celebrations of *SIG* work might not be able to be conducted live due to school closures.
- c) Are there other key activities that you did not propose in your application that you are now conducting? Yes No. If Yes, Why?



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Due to COVID-19 early school closures, **GW** began work with the SE Delco school district, DCIU 25, and teaching artists in NYC and SE Delco conducting remote learning **SIG** activities that can be used with students and their teachers. Family and school celebrations for **SIG** may also need to be planned remotely in the future



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

SECTION E –Additional Information

Progress Towards Meeting Program Level Priorities

14. How many Priorities did you address in your application? _____ 4 _____

Complete the table below for each priority addressed:

Priority Name	How was the priority addressed during the reporting period?
<p>AAEDD absolute priority to support projects that develop, disseminate, and integrate high-quality, effective arts based instructional materials and educational programming, including online resources, in multiple arts disciplines</p>	<p><i>Skin in the Game</i> has included 2 visual arts specialists, 2 music specialists and 2 library media specialists from the 2 treatment schools in all of its training activities. These specialists participated in over 30 hours of training between the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years in a variety of visual art-making and music development activities to support their programs. They have been trained in the use of a variety of technology applications that include visual media design used to create art and edit imagery. They have worked with a variety of digital media applications to create and edit video content. They have also learned how to create 3D printed objects for inclusion in games. During SIG implementation Year 1, arts and library media specialists worked with teaching artists to support collaborative projects with grade 4 and 6 classroom teachers, supporting arts integration in both treatment schools. During 2019-2020 curriculum planning arts, music and library media specialists were included in the development of a scaffolded arts-based curriculum that continues to be implemented beginning fall 2020 in both of the treatment schools.</p>
<p>Priority 1-Increase access to standards-based arts education.</p>	<p>Treatment teachers in grades 4 and 6 received a full year of project implementation in SIG, supported by a teaching artist residency for 20 weeks in their classrooms. Through weekly SIG project period activities teachers and students demonstrated some increase in access to standards-based arts education in the treatment schools, grades 4 and 6. Full project implementation of SIG has expanded to grades 4 through 7 beginning October of 2020.</p>
<p>Priority 2-Integrate standards-based arts education into other subjects as part of a well-rounded education</p>	<p>During the 2019-2020 school year 14 treatment classroom teachers, 4 arts and library media specialists and 5 teaching artists integrated SIG activities across all disciplines with their students in grade 4 and 6. In addition, 6 special education teachers and 12 teachers in grades 5 and 7 began to pilot some of the activities learned during this year’s professional development in SIG. These activities have demonstrated integration of arts education in the core subject areas in the treatment schools.</p>



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Priority 3-Improve students' academic performance, including their knowledge and skills in creating, performing, and responding to the arts.

Student academic performance in developing project-based work in **SIG** was documented through video archiving of student work and student pre/post surveys. In addition, increased knowledge and skills in the use of technology was also evident through ongoing informal observations of classes during **SIG** periods and samples of student work that has been posted in the shared Google Classroom. Since there was no standardized testing this school year, academic achievement could not be measured.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report
Project Status**

PR/Award # (11 characters): U351D180054

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this collection is 1855-0031. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 40 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing sources of data, gather data needed, and complete and review information collection. If you have comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates or suggestions for improving this form, please write to the U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission, write directly to the Office of Innovation and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20202-2640.