

Resources

ESP Partnership Self-Evaluation Tool

Criteria	Barely Makin' It	On the Way	You're There	For Example
<i>Arts Instruction & Overall Plan</i>				
Involvement of certified arts specialists	We have no plans for the involvement of school-based certified arts specialists		Our project plans include the full involvement of all school-based certified arts specialists.	
Plan to develop or advance school or district-wide arts and AIE instructional plan	Our school does not have an overall arts and AIE instructional plan and does not seem to understand how this program fits into an overall effort to improve teaching and learning.		Our school has a well-developed arts and AIE instructional plan, and this project complements and/or is a major component of that plan.	
Evidence of district support	Our district has little to no knowledge of our project and provides no tangible support.		Our district supports our project in many ways, including monetary support, PR and advocacy.	
<i>Past Relationship w/ School & History of Program</i>				
Evidence of growth of program	Our program has not changed in any significant way since we began working with this partner.		Our program includes a rigorous reflection component and improvements are made each year as a result.	
Evidence of school change	Our school has not made any changes in scheduling or staffing, nor have attitudes changed as a result of this project.		Our school has made several changes as a result of and in support of this project (e.g., alteration of the physical space, scheduling changes, etc.).	
Evidence of cultural organization change	Our organization has not become more education friendly, nor has our education department received more resources as a result of this work.		Our organization has become far more education focused and our education department has received more resources as a result of this work.	

Resources

ESP Partnership Self-Evaluation Tool

<i>Challenges</i>				
Identification of challenges	We did not discuss challenges that the students and teachers are facing before designing our partnership project. Our partner just thought it would be great to have our program in their school.		Our school partner undertook a needs identification process before entering into a partnership agreement with us. It is clear that our work together will target the specific needs identified.	
<i>Goals & Objectives</i>				
Goals	Our goals are very broad and not clearly linked to the challenges we identified with our partner school.		Our goals are clearly related to the challenges we identified with our partner school.	
Objectives	Our learner outcomes (objectives) are broad and not measurable, and they are not clearly related to our goals or challenges.		We have clearly defined objectives for the students and teachers, and they clearly relate to our goals and challenges.	
<i>Steering Committee & Project Team</i>				
Steering Committee (a body of representatives from the school, cultural organization and the community at large who set overall goals and continually evaluate and advocate for the program)	Our Steering Committee lacks diverse representation and has infrequent meetings. The role of our Steering Committee and its members is not clearly defined.		Our Steering Committee is diverse and inclusive in its membership. It meets regularly and maintains a clear governing structure. Its role is clearly defined and its goals are well articulated.	
Expertise of project leadership members	The expertise of our project leadership members is vaguely appropriate for the role of each member.		Our project leadership members have the appropriate expertise for their roles in the project.	
Roles and responsibilities of partners	We seem to have distinct and separate visions and expectations for the project. Roles and responsibilities are vague, elusive and subject to constant change, and participants are not clear on who is responsible for what.		We have a shared vision and expectations for the project. All roles and responsibilities of the participants have been clearly defined and articulated, and all stakeholders have been informed of them.	
Administrative ability	Our administrative infrastructure is stressed and fragile, and we do not have the personnel to manage a project of this scope.		We have a strong administrative infrastructure and more than adequate staff to oversee the program.	

Resources

ESP Partnership Self-Evaluation Tool

Project management	It may be unclear to the participants in our project who is responsible for managing the project. Lines of communication seem to be confused.		It is very clear to all project participants who is responsible for managing the project. Lines of communication are clear.	
<i>Curriculum Integration</i>				
Integration of arts and non-arts subjects	Our curricular connections between the arts and non-arts subjects are superficial and contrived.		Our curricular connections are deep and meaningful and provide clear evidence of two-way integration between the arts and non-arts subjects.	
Addressing the New York State Learning Standards	Our project only addresses the Standards in the arts subject.		We address all appropriate Standards in both the arts and non-arts subjects.	
Collaborative design of curriculum by teachers and artists	The teachers in our project provide information to the artist and the artist plans the project and curriculum accordingly.		The teachers and artists in our project design the curriculum collaboratively. They each contribute knowledge and they learn from each other.	
Collaborative teaching between teachers and artists	The artist in our project teaches the classes and the teacher either participates with the students or plays the role of disciplinarian.		The teachers and artists in our project collaboratively teach the curriculum. At times they co-teach and at other times they teach separately.	
<i>Professional Development</i>				
Provision of collaboratively planned professional development for project participants and other school/community members	We provide minimal professional development for our project participants. These sessions usually consist of art-making workshops, are not collaboratively planned and are taught by the artist.		We provide extensive and mandatory professional development for many stakeholders in our program. When appropriate, it is collaboratively planned and taught. Sessions include opportunities for study groups, looking deeply at student work, and conducting research around our project.	

Resources

ESP Partnership Self-Evaluation Tool

Professional development for teaching artists	We provide one or two training/professional development workshops per year for our teaching artists.		We provide extensive professional development for our artists in areas such as evaluation/assessment, childhood development, diverse learning styles, etc.	
Knowledge and use of research	We are not up to speed on the research that has been published on AIE, nor do we know how to conduct research within our project.		We are conversant with the current research in the field and we are using research techniques within our program.	
<i>Work plan/Time line</i>				
Planning and reflection	Our project team members rarely come together for dedicated planning and reflection time. In fact, planning usually happens at lunch or on the run in the hallways.		Our project team members come together often for regularly scheduled planning and reflection meetings. In addition, planning between artist/teacher teams happens during scheduled release time and rarely during lunch or the teacher's prep period. Teachers are paid if this happens after school.	
Work plan strategy	Our work plan is vague and does not include time between artist visits for further exploration by teachers and students or for reflection and fine-tuning.		We have a detailed and thorough work plan that includes regularly scheduled reflection and planning meetings so we can make mid-course corrections. There is plenty of time between artist visits for further exploration by teachers and students.	
<i>Parental/Community Involvement</i>				
Plan for involvement of parents	We invite the parents to our culminating event.		We have an extensive plan that involves parents in all appropriate program levels (e.g., volunteerism in the classroom, parent workshops, at-home activities, membership on the Steering Committee) and we continue to look for fresh approaches to parental involvement.	

Resources

ESP Partnership Self-Evaluation Tool

Use of cultural and other resources	Our project only utilizes the resources of the partner cultural organization and has not thought about how to incorporate the use of other resources or partnerships.		Our project utilizes many other cultural resources and makes use of appropriate partnerships within our community.	
<i>Evaluation/Assessment</i>				
Evaluation of the implementation process	We use a pre and post questionnaire to evaluate our program.		We use several methods to evaluate the implementation process of our project, including pre/mid/post questionnaires, interviews with teachers and artists, regular reflection meetings and a final end of year evaluation meeting.	
Assessing changes in student learning and teaching practice	We have not yet developed plans for assessing changes in student learning or in teaching practice.		We have a thorough, targeted and doable approach to assessing the changes we are looking for in student learning and teaching practice. We use several instruments in order to get many points of view on the changes we are looking for. For instance, we use portfolios, journals, students' self-assessments, student interviews, teacher interviews and rubrics.	
Documentation plan and analysis/summary of documentation.	We don't know who will be responsible for collecting, analyzing and summarizing documentation of student/teacher/artist learning.		We have a thorough plan for collecting, analyzing and summarizing documentation of the changes we are looking for. It is also clear to all participants who is responsible for doing this work.	

Resources

ESP Partnership Self-Evaluation Tool

<i>Sustainability</i>				
Sustainability plans	We have not yet looked at strategies for sustaining this project beyond the life of funding by NYSCA.		We have carefully broken down our program into its essential elements, prioritized these elements in terms of their importance to the program, and analyzed the resources that will be necessary to continue each program element. We have also looked at a plan for continuously developing more leaders in our project and will develop methods for welcoming new comers and helping them share the ideals and vision for our work.	
<i>Advocacy and Dissemination</i>				
Advocacy	While we publicize our project in all pertinent materials, we do not yet have an advocacy plan in place to develop support from all stakeholder communities.		We not only publicize our partnership and its work widely, we also have an advocacy plan in place that targets many communities and stakeholders on the local, state and national levels. This plan is directly tied to our sustainability plan.	
Dissemination	We have begun to transport the learning from this project to the work we do with other schools.		We actively participate in the RLI Network and other mechanisms for sharing the work we are doing in the partnership, and this work informs and catalyzes all of the work we do with school partners.	
<i>Written Agreement/Budget</i>				
Written Agreement	Our written agreement is a form letter on the cultural organization's stationary with no articulation or evidence of an		Our written agreement clearly outlines and defines the roles and responsibilities of each partner, as well as the goals	

Resources

ESP Partnership Self-Evaluation Tool

	understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each partner or the goals of the project. Signatures are missing and there is no mention of the school's financial match.		of the project. Required signatures are there and the school's cash financial match is committed to in writing. Our agreement clearly shows that it was jointly developed with our school partner.	
Program cost effectiveness	Our fiscal competence is questionable and our fundraising capabilities for this program are minimal. We rely on NYSCA funding and the fees from the school almost entirely. In addition, costs for the program are not in proportion to the number of students served.		In addition to NYSCA funding, we have developed a fundraising strategy and actively seek and receive substantial outside funding. In addition, costs for the program are proportionate to the number of students served and the depth of the programming.	
Request amount	We have requested more than 50% of the total program cost from NYSCA.		We have requested less than 50% of the total program cost from NYSCA.	
School match	Our school is not putting in the required amount of cash for the project, as outlined in the NYSCA guidelines.		Our school is putting in more than the required amount of cash for the project.	
Budget and application questions alignment	We did not check to see that everything mentioned in the answers to our application questions is budgeted for in the project budget.		The answers to our application questions and our budget are very clearly aligned.	
Budget annotations	The budget notes section of our application does not show any mathematical formulas or breakouts to support the total amounts shown in the project budget form.		Our budget notes section contains many annotations and mathematical formulas to clearly show the breakdown of large amounts shown in the project budget. This helps to align our budget with the answers to our application questions.	
In-kind contributions	Some of the income in our budget comes from in-kind sources.		All of the income in our budget is cash.	