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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History (U422B170039)
Reader #3:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	20
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan	20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Quality of Project Eval.	25	25
Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Civics Panel - 2 - 1: 84.422B

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

Applicant: Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History (U422B170039)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--**
   (i) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
   (ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
   (iii) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

   Strengths:

   The application provides detailed evidence to show the project services are exceptional and will address the priorities of the competition. Building upon previously successful affiliate programming, the application proposes to improve teacher effectiveness and student achievement through online professional development teacher and weeklong residency study. The project as presented, can potentially reach numerous teachers due to the flexibility of scheduling and numerous units of study, they can successfully complete the programs with ease. The professional development model presented is supported by up-to-date research that are aligned with the common core standard and public education policy thus increasing the likelihood of teacher and student success (pgs. e25-e28). The application further provides information referencing the collaborative partners who will provide support to the project through assessments, programming, technology which will further support the goals and objectives of the project, this is evidenced on pgs. e121-e131.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
   (i) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
   (ii) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
   (iii) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

   Strengths:

   The significance of the project is successfully documented through the proposed number of teachers and schools to be served over the five-year of the grant. Using best practices in history and civics educational training and professional development, the plan to build content knowledge through online and face-to-face instruction and increased use of technology and digital tools is evident. The logic model is thorough and offers further insight into the caliber of the project activities, objectives and goals of the project. The application provides a clear and concise description of the goals and outcomes for the project which are focused on student and teacher achievement through the collection of data and

continual project feedback. The application provides detailed information to show the proposed services will meet the needs of the targeted population. This is substantiated through the demographic data for the targeted service areas and the overall project services to be provided (pgs. e60-e61). Several methods for disseminating project information whereby resources will be readily available to teachers, students and others who want to use the model and resources

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
  (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
  (ii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

  Strengths:

  The application describes the management plan including the key staff who will be responsible for the project activities. The educational attainment and work experiences are described and show that their capability for implementing and monitoring the proposed project services. The timeline presented is for one year, however the application will use the first year as a guideline for the other grant years which will ensure the services provided are successful. The milestones are presented and clearly indicate that the plans will provide opportunities for continual performance feedback and assessment of the project activities (pgse56-e57). The time commitments presented are appropriate and are sufficient to support the project activities to be provided and will meet the objectives of the project, this is evidenced in both the narrative and budget narrative on pages e206-e207.

  Weaknesses:

  No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—**
  (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
  (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

  Strengths:

  The evaluation outlined in the narrative have strong potential significance. The proposed plan includes significant qualitative and quantitative data collection. The application proposes to use a quasi-experiments approach to measure the fidelity and quality of implementation of the project services to determine the extent to which the outcomes for the project have been reached. The quantitative/qualitative methods and performance measures will answer the research questions associated with the project outcomes. The narrative proposes a wide array of data and information to be collected, including the frequency of collection and overall analysis. This is combined with a clear plan for regular feedback indicates that a comprehensive evaluation plan for the project is present (pgs. e61-e70).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. **Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:**

   (a) Using high-speed internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly Open Educational Resources;

   (b) Implementing high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials that are aligned with rigorous college- and career-ready standards;

   (c) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through Digital Credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics; and

   (d) Using data platforms that enable the development, visualization, and rapid analysis of data to inform and improve learning outcomes, while also protecting privacy in accordance with applicable laws.

   Strengths:

   The application presents a project which involves implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities and online simulations whereby teachers can earn professional development continuing education units through the Humboldt State University Extended Education program.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

___

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2017 03:13 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History (U422B170039)
Reader #2: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Quality of Project Design		35	35
Significance			
1. Significance		20	20
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan		20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Quality of Project Eval.		25	25
	Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority			
1. CPP		10	10
	Sub Total	10	10
	Total	110	110

Technical Review Form

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

Applicant: Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History (U422B170039)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--**
   (i) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
   (ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
   (iii) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

   Strengths:

   i)
   The applicant describes their current program will provide over 100 hours of Professional Development through intensive, ongoing, classroom-focused activities in History, Civics, and Geography to improve instruction and student achievement. The program will include online classes, teleconferencing with scholars, online collaboration between teachers and coaches, and a flipped classroom approach to delivering PD. This project will address an opportunity to increase over 250 teachers' content knowledge and provide new and innovative pedagogical resources and strategies to bring back to their classrooms. The application includes a comprehensive Logic Model that clearly demonstrates the relationship between goals and objectives, project impact activities and inputs, outputs, outcomes – short, medium and long term.

   ii)
   The applicant clearly identifies their partners who include Los Angeles Unified School District, Del Norte & Humboldt County Offices of Education, Long Beach State and Humboldt State Universities, and regional history organizations. They identify their Affiliate program that includes more than 13,500 K-12 schools in all 50 states, 4 US territories, and 39 foreign countries and reaches
   more than six million students yearly. Sixty percent of the Affiliate Schools are Title I schools. They demonstrate their history of successfully meeting the needs of diverse students throughout the US.

   iii)
   The applicant discusses a number of current references and resources from the National Council of Social Studies and how the program demonstrates the use of their Framework for learning. The applicant has over 20 years of experiences in developing and providing K-12 history programs. This program has been developed based on the California History– Social Science Framework integrates the Common Core (adopted 2010) and English Language Development Standards (adopted 2012). It also includes the California required Fair Education Act requirements to include California History.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
   (i) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
   (ii) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
   (iii) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

   Strengths:

   i) The applicant clearly describes how their program has been used over the years to implement TAH grants and support over 500 teachers. This project will clearly expand these numbers and provide experiences for many more teachers, students, and schools. (pgs. 7-11) This program will allow much more teachers to earn a Masters degree in History in a much shorter period of time.

   ii) The applicant states that the project will develop the ability of district and university staff to build capacity and over five years, more than 450 teachers will participate in at least 100 hours of history, civics, and geography training. The applicant states that this project will be sustained by their non-profit partners who will continue to support teachers after the grant ends.

   iii). The applicant clearly describes how they will use their website to disseminate their project results. They will provide publication of program resources and results. In addition, they will post on the California Digital Blackboard which is available to all schools and educators in the state. They will create presentations for the Teaching Channel. They will share with their over 13000 Affiliate schools. They will create and present at a variety of state and national conferences.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
   (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
   (ii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

   Strengths:

   i)The applicant clearly discusses how they will be able to replicate and manage this project from NY in California. They clearly discuss data-driven decision making to ensure implementation with fidelity, resulting in (2) increasing levels of appropriate support, coaching and required services for teachers. The project staff and evaluators will implement a systematic data collection system. The evaluators will develop a process-focused matrix to measure progress towards milestones and provide site-level and project-wide data reports which will be reviewed in the monthly Leadership Team

ii) Project staff are clearly identified, their job responsibilities are stated, their qualifications are noted. The evaluation team is equally strong and identified. They are all an integral component of the management team. There is a detailed project timeline that clearly articulates the project activities, who are the responsible parties; and the allotted time frame. The applicant states that all staff will have adequate time to oversee and support the project. The budget clearly aligns FTE for project staff and supports the commitment.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—**
   (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
   (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

   Strengths:

   i) The applicant clearly discusses how they will be able to replicate and manage this project from NY in California. They clearly discuss data-driven decision making to ensure implementation with fidelity, resulting in (2) increasing levels of appropriate support, coaching and required services for teachers. The project staff and evaluators will implement a systematic data collection system. The evaluators will develop a process-focused matrix to measure progress towards milestones and provide site-level and project-wide data reports which will be reviewed in the monthly Leadership Team

   ii) Project staff are clearly identified, their job responsibilities are stated, their qualifications are noted. The evaluation team is equally strong and identified. They are all an integral component of the management team. There is a detailed project timeline that clearly articulates the project activities, who are the responsible parties; and the allotted time frame. The applicant states that all staff will have adequate time to oversee and support the project. The budget clearly aligns FTE for project staff and supports the commitment.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. **Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:**

   (a) Using high-speed internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly Open Educational Resources;

   (b) Implementing high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials that are aligned with rigorous college- and career-ready standards;

   (c) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations,

such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through Digital Credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics; and

(d) Using data platforms that enable the development, visualization, and rapid analysis of data to inform and improve learning outcomes, while also protecting privacy in accordance with applicable laws.

Strengths:

a)   b) The applicant clearly describes how they will provide high-quality open source digital tools for teachers and students. Their existing website has had seven million unique visitors who accessed Gilder Lehrman content over 9.5 million times. They provide high-quality test preparation available to all students, regardless of socioeconomics or geography. Including the online Advanced Placement (AP) and the US History, Study Guide features a rich variety of resources, including original videos, essays, timelines, and annotated primary sources. The Institute's other digital resources for students include stand-alone digital exhibitions, video lectures, and interactive timelines spanning American history. The teacher program will be available throughout the country. (pg 27-28)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: **10**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/18/2017 03:13 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History (U422B170039)
Reader #1: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Quality of Project Design		35	35
Significance			
1. Significance		20	20
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of Mgmt Plan		20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Quality of Project Eval.		25	25
	Sub Total	100	100
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority			
1. CPP		10	10
	Sub Total	10	10
	Total	110	110

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Civics Panel - 2 - 1: 84.422B

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

Applicant: Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History (U422B170039)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors--**
   (i) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
   (ii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
   (iii) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

   Strengths:

   i.   The applicant provides a comprehensive project that represents an exceptional approach to the priority for the competition. The applicant addresses the priority through an intensive professional development program that is not only intensive but ongoing and classroom-focused. This PD in History, Civics, Geography is designed to not only improve classroom instruction, but also improve student achievement (e16). The applicant further proposes that the A More Perfect Union (AMPU) is designed to serve 50 teachers in 2017-18 and 100+ teachers yearly in 2018-20. The students served by the program attend rural and urban schools with over 80% of students from underserved populations (e16). Unique to this application, AMPU purports to combine face-to-face instruction, and coaching, online study and low-cost resources (CPP), in-class coaching, and summer institutes (e21-e23).

   ii.   The applicant provides an exhaustive list of appropriate partners that they will collaborate within order to maximize the effectiveness of the project services. For example, a partnership was formed with Los Angeles Unified School District, Del Norte & Humboldt County Offices of Education, Long Beach State and Humboldt State Universities, regional history organizations (e16; e21), other historical and civic organizations nationwide, and local non-profit or governmental organizations in California (e38–e39). In addition, the applicant provides comprehensive rationales for choosing the partnerships and the significance the organizations will play in the overall implementation of the project.

   iii.   The applicant thoroughly demonstrates a design that is current and reflective of up-to-date research. As noted in the literature on Professional Development as "zone of desired effects", each of the professional development activities meets the desired effect size indicated for appropriate strategies (e42). Additionally, the proposed professional development model follows the Center for Public Education's 2013 Five Principles of Effective Professional Development: Effective Professional Development in an Era of High Stakes Accountability (e40). Further the applicant proposed to use a student-centered coaching approach that is also research-based (e41). In concert, the applicant effectively designed professional development activities designed to meet skills students will need as adults (e43).

   Weaknesses:

   i.   None noted
   ii.   None noted
   iii.   None noted

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
   (i) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.
   (ii) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
   (iii) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

  Strengths:

i.   The applicant provides a strong description of how the proposed project will build local capacity to improve services that address the needs of these rural and urban schools. By developing strong, self-sustaining partnerships among the local schools, universities, and history-serving organizations the applicant maintains they will be able to ensure sustainability. The applicant further suggests that through the training received, over 450 teachers will be able to directly influence their students and indirectly influence other teachers in the schools where they teach (e50). Also, the continued relationships among the community and non-profit partners will aid in the continued support of teachers after the grant ends. For example, the applicant notes that he local museums will still host visiting historians and exhibitions and invite teachers and their students to attend. In addition, the Nixon Library will offer teacher workshops and host student visits for the LAUSD teachers. Furthermore, by involving the two local universities, AMPU will enable teachers to develop relationships with university historians that will continue beyond the conclusion of the grant funding (e50).

ii.   The applicant clearly outlines goals and objectives with measureable outcomes that will meet the needs of teachers in both urban and rural schools, A More Perfect Union offers the opportunity to study the results of a sustained intervention in these two diverse settings. The districts have significant English Learner populations and as noted, Special Education enrollments far surpass the norm. The project's comprehensive research-based interventions hold the promise of improving instruction and student engagement in measurable and statistically significant ways (e54).

iii.   The applicant provides a complete list of ways in which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated so that they will enable others to use the information or strategies. The results and data will be shared on a variety of websites, including GLI, partnership websites, California based websites. It will also be disseminated through publication in the Institute's regular monthly email blasts to teachers at the 13,500 schools in the free Affiliate School Program. The applicant will also attend and make presentations at national and state conferences such as the California social studies organizations (e56)

  Weaknesses:

i.   None noted
ii.   None noted
iii.   None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
   (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
   (ii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

i.   The applicant provides an extensive management plan, with clearly articulated goals, measurable objectives and expected outcomes. In addition, the detailed Logic Model (e22) addresses each of the goals, and connects the measurable objectives, indicating persons responsible for completing the tasks, how often and expected outcomes. The applicant also provides a detailed yearly plan (e26-36) demonstrating when data is collected, by whom and when the data will be analyzed and reported. The applicant clearly articulates the process AMPU will use requiring leadership, fiscal oversight, clear responsibilities, regular input from the California sites, and a system to support and monitor staff and student success (e56). For example, the applicant notes that there are two overriding principles integrated into their management plan: (1) data-driven decision making to ensure implementation with fidelity, resulting in (2) increasing levels of appropriate support, coaching and other services for teachers which will result in improved student learning (e56).

ii.   The applicant provides a complete list of key personnel, including project director, the requisite skills, the responsibilities and time commitments for each of those persons. For example, the Project Director (25%) will be responsible for managing the project budget, working with partner organizations and the external evaluator, and overseeing preparation of all documentation and reports needed by the US Department of Education (e57-e58). Additionally, California Coordinators are experienced TAH directors and district administrators who have worked extensively with the Institute on TAH grants and other initiatives. They will work with their districts to host AMPU activities (e58). Other key personnel include and are not limited to Lead Historians, Instructional Coaches (ICs), LAUSD, Coordinator, the northern California Lead IC, PD activities leader (including developing surveys and evaluation documents), LA-based field evaluator and project evaluator (e58-e59)

Weaknesses:

i.   None noted
ii.   None noted

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers—
    (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
    (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Strengths:

i.   The applicant provides relevant and appropriate methods of evaluation including the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project.   These will be collected through both formative and summative outcomes which will produce both quantitative and qualitative data. Through the use of a quasi-experimental evaluation plan, the applicant will determine AMPU's effect on student content knowledge and literacy skills (using a nationally normed exam) with over 10,000 students (e16). The applicant further proposes to finalize the evaluation design and instruments, determine control schools and groups, gather baseline data (including observations in the northern schools) and refine the evaluation plan to ensure the program design and implementation are aligned with the evaluation requirements upon notification of award (e61-e62).

ii.   The applicant uses appropriate methods of evaluation that will yield performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the evaluators will develop a process-

focused Fidelity Matrix to measure progress toward meeting milestones as well as site-level and project-wide data reports which will be reviewed in the monthly Leadership Team (LT) meetings which will allow the LT to make mid-course corrections and plan for sustainability(e57).

Weaknesses:

i.   None noted

ii.   None noted

Reader's Score: **25**

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority

1. **Projects that are designed to leverage technology through one or more of the following:**

    (a) Using high-speed internet access and devices to increase students' and educators' access to high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials, particularly Open Educational Resources;

    (b) Implementing high-quality accessible digital tools, assessments, and materials that are aligned with rigorous college- and career-ready standards;

    (c) Implementing high-quality, accessible online courses, online learning communities, or online simulations, such as those for which educators could earn professional development credit or continuing education units through Digital Credentials based on demonstrated mastery of competencies and performance-based outcomes, instead of traditional time-based metrics; and

    (d) Using data platforms that enable the development, visualization, and rapid analysis of data to inform and improve learning outcomes, while also protecting privacy in accordance with applicable laws.

    Strengths:

    The applicant extensively provides evidence that the proposed project will address three of the requirements within the competitive priority through the use of online classes, teleconferencing with other scholars, online collaboration between teachers and coaches, and through the use of a flipped classroom approach to professional development (e46-49).

    Weaknesses:

    none noted

Reader's Score: **10**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/18/2017 03:13 PM