

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/15/2017 02:53 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (U422B170027)

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

Panel #2 - Civics Panel - 2 - 5: 84.422B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (U422B170027)

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 applicant provided a comprehensive and detailed effort at describing a unique approach to involve and increase the American History, Civics, Government, and Geography knowledge of 375 K-8 teachers. The target population is identified and includes an average of 40.6% percent of the students from families with incomes below the poverty line and a rate of 96.7% for free and reduced lunch. Four high needs schools are identified which need improvement based on persistently low achieving schools. Project (C.H.A.R.G.E.) Civics History through Advanced Research and Geography Education has chosen themes and the years for the content as identified on page e21. The logic model provides a comprehensive outline that describes the resources, activities, outcomes, and impact the project will have on improving the professional development for teachers. There are five project content components clearly identified and delineated in the proposal that will impact 75 KEDC history teachers each year. The five components which are clearly described in the proposal include historical encounter session (32 hours), summer NCHE colloquium (40 Hours, historical field institute (32 hours), school improvement network through walkthroughs, and teacher curriculum institute (12 hours). A rubric on page e34 is included which details the criteria for teacher selection. Administrates will also receive professional development on effective observations during the grant period. CHARGE will collaborate with a number other institutions and organizations which are described by providing a rationale for the selection and the specific activities and contributions indicated on page e35-37. The project reflects the use of the What Works Clearinghouse and additional impact studies to determine the effects of the activities on student achievement. The approach for teacher professional development is based on research presented in the application and it will be designed and implemented to focus on connecting the history of America with instructional rigor and conceptual themes of the early American experience. This will support and enhance teaching strategies to make American History, Civics, Government, and Geography exciting and meaningful for students.

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:

The applicant provided many solid examples on how the project will build local capacity to meet the needs of the target population. The teachers will participate in professional development that will focus on improving teaching strategies to support the students' understanding of American History, Civics, Government, and Geography. Teachers will maintain a portfolio that will include lessons learned during the seminar participation. The use of peer mentoring will be used to support other teachers in the district to promote new and innovative methods of teaching and learning. Lesson plans in American History, Civics, Government, and Geography developed by teachers will be shared with other teachers on the website. The applicant shared on page e47-48 a list of gaps and how they will be addressed. As an example, one of the gaps identified is the lack of resource materials to teach history content and the focus of ESSA is math and reading. The gap will be addressed by teachers receiving historical readings from National Council for History Education to further their in-depth knowledge of the current year's theme of topics as indicated in page e47. There is a description of the demographics of the schools and solid letters of support.

The applicant effectively addresses the issue of the attainment of results by the project. The chart on page e49-52 describes the objectives, performance measures, and progress outcomes to sustain the program of training. As an example, the applicant on page e50 states in objective 2 states that there will be an 80% increase in student achievement in American History, Civics, Government, and Geography in each year of the project. The applicant also describes on page e50 that the percentage achievement increase that will be gained each year by the students for year 1; 10%, year 2; 15%, and year 3; 20%

The applicant provides a solid and comprehensive dissemination plan that will allow others to use the different strategies and activities. The applicant described various models such as the train-the-trainers, peer tutoring, professional learning communities, online classrooms, and other strategies will be used to ensure that the project will be maintained in the schools. Teachers will share their newly acquired instructional strategies at local, state, and national history 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:

The applicant provided a thorough description of the timeline, continuous improvement strategies and milestones, and responsible partner. The dates are specific as are the strategies and person(s) responsible. There will be an Advisory Committee (AC) as indicated on page e53 that will include the Project Director, College partner/historian, NCHE staff (via online), KEDC CIO, KEDC Social Studies Consultant, KDE Representative, a Project Coordinator, a student representative from a minimum of four schools, Museum Historian, Evaluator, minimum of four History/ Civics Teacher, and minimum of four district Superintendent (or designee). The purpose of the AC is to monitor the grant and oversee the budget, develop professional development activities, establish any new policies/ procedure, and a list of additional responsibilities. There will also be administrative support, technology integrated support, connectivity, website, custodial,

fiscal management, office and classroom space, phones, equipment, furniture, and professional development facilities for regional workshops and other services provided by KEDC. All procedures and practices will be followed according to the policies and procedures established by KEDC. There are five objectives identified in the proposal which includes performance indicators. The time commitment of the project director (33%), project coordinator (100%) appear to be reasonable and appropriate to meet the outcomes of the project. A contract with an external evaluator to conduct the studies to determine the impact of the project also seems appropriate and adequate to support the progress of the project. The specific duties and responsibilities of the project director and project coordinator are clearly delineated in the proposal.

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:

The applicant indicated that quantitative and qualitative data will be collected and reported quarterly to the Advisory Council. The data will also determine whether the project is being implemented with fidelity and according to the timelines and milestones. Formative and summative data will also be collected as a part of project implementation. The charts included in the proposal identified the key questions, major benchmarks, proposed method of addressing the questions, outcome measures and timelines. Each project objective and outcome includes the relevant data source and timeline for data collection. Baseline data is presented for the of the objectives. Project C.H.A.R.G.E. will implement a quasi-experimental, matched comparison group design and use multiple sources, mixed methods, and statistical tests to measure progress toward meeting the outcomes and to determine whether the objectives described on page e49-51 have been achieved. The applicant describes in detail the use of summative data on the outcomes so mid-course corrections can be implemented. There will be an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation.

The project will provide performance feedback that will determine whether the outcomes are being met and if not present approaches and strategies to improve activities that did not meet expectations, and revise upcoming activities according to feedback. The Advisory Council will monitor progress and denote successes for future dissemination and replication. The applicant described effective strategies to collect data on the project outcomes and use this information to check and define whether the project is progressing along the lines of the outcomes or whether changes should be implemented to improve the outcomes of the project.

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:

The applicant provided solid information and a comprehensive description to address the use of technology to support instructional practices and professional development. CHARGE students will receive a Chromebook to develop digital projects and teachers will support students using Google classroom. Teachers will receive online professional development from the Library of Congress to assist with college and career-readiness (CCR) skills. The online professional development will be designed and implemented based on the needs assessment administered to the teachers in the project. By providing teachers with the necessary online materials, teachers will implement high-quality, accessible online courses and provide program with high-quality accessible digital tools and assessments. These will be aligned with rigorous CCR standards for program staff to track. (e39) An Open Educational Resource (OER) website will provide a variety of resources to the teachers and include standards-based lessons, Historical Encounter session videos with history professor, and others. There was a major emphasis on Technology Design Learning which promotes student engagement. The applicant states that technology is a good tool but it does not replace good teaching. (e208)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/15/2017 02:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/15/2017 09:26 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (U422B170027)

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	19
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Quality of Project Eval.	25	25
Sub Total	100	99
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	109

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Civics Panel - 2 - 5: 84.422B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (U422B170027)

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:

- While the annual focus on a chronological segment of American history would be unnecessary for high school teachers, it is likely that few elementary teachers have had significant coursework in American history and that they could very much benefit from developing content expertise offered in this manner. This need is outlined on page e45 of the proposal.
- Lead academic historians for the project are identified in the proposal.
- During the school year, teachers are given the opportunity for observation and coaching in their own classrooms.
- Academic readings are identified and connected to the themes of each year's institute.
- Use of historical sites for experiential learning are emphasized in the project, which reflects up-to-date practice in the field. Locations in Kentucky and Chicago are clearly identified and built into summer learning plans.
- Plans for an advisory council including teachers, administrators from participating districts, and academic historians are outlined in the proposal.
- A project director with substantial K-12 teaching experience is identified in the proposal.
- Letters of support from all significant named resource providers and participating partners, including school district superintendents, are included in the appendix of the proposal demonstrating thoughtful collaboration with appropriate partners.

Weaknesses:

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:

- The project focuses its efforts on teachers of grades K-8 in a region of Kentucky serving a large number of rural students in poverty. It is an area where enrichment programs for teachers such as this one are likely to be rare, and where students could benefit significantly from increases in capacity and skill by their teachers. Because the teachers will be working with each other over years, and live reasonably close to one another, it is possible that they can continue to collaborate even after the grant has concluded.
- The project proposal integrated the disciplines of American History, Civics, Government and Geography in a way that will be meaningful for teachers and their students.

Weaknesses:

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:

- The educational collaborative applying for this grant has experience administering a similarly large and comprehensive Academies for American History and Civics grant, also focused on teacher professional development.
- Grant funds are used to pay for "gold" quality resources such as TCI History Alive print and digital subscriptions. These are high caliber resources that teachers in rural, impoverished schools would likely not be able to afford or have access to without participating in this grant funded project.
- A clear, thoughtfully designed, and detailed budget is provided in the appendix of the proposal.
- The project director will be working full-time on administration of this project, which seems necessary to implement the program as it is designed.

Weaknesses:

- A stipend is provided to participants, but offering and funding graduate credits could provide an additional incentive for teachers to participate and also serve as important measurement of completion and rigor for the program, and could attract a broader pool of teachers, and more teachers with motivations that are not purely fiscal.

Reader's Score: 19

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:

- An appropriately experienced evaluator is named in the project proposal.
- Benchmarks and targets for teacher and student improvement are clearly outlined in the project proposal, and are connected to themes of instruction in the project.
- A guiding advisory council involving teachers, administrators, and academic historians participates in the evaluation process.

Weaknesses:

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:

-Technology is meaningfully integrated into the proposal, with teachers provided with Chromebooks, Google Classroom used as a learning platform, and quality, sought-after digital resources such as EverFi and TCI History Alive provided to teachers via subscriptions.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/15/2017 09:26 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/15/2017 02:23 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (U422B170027)

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	23
Sub Total	100	98
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	108

Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Civics Panel - 2 - 5: 84.422B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (U422B170027)

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 application has demonstrated a sound approach to implement the absolute and competitive priorities. The exceptional manner of implementing the absolute priority lies in use of innovative instruction and professional development in American History, Civics, Government and Geography through grade appropriate professional development workshops, and a strong partnership component among several agencies (pages 1-2). The project focuses on a promise zone area, and the target schools from which teachers are drawn for professional development have 96.74% of students qualified for free and reduced lunch (page 2). The application has also demonstrated an effective method of implementing the competitive preference priority by using high speed internet for high quality digital tools for assessment, using high quality digital tools and assessments that are aligned with rigorous common core standards, and implementing high quality accessible online courses, online learning communities to earn professional development credit (pages 2-3). Thus, both the priorities have been addressed adequately by the applicant.

(ii) The application has adequately addressed the partnership component of the project (pages 1-2). The application has listed pertinent partners such as the National Council of History Education, the Kentucky Council for the Social Studies, the Kentucky Historical Society, the Abraham Lincoln Birth Place, the Teachers Curriculum Institute, the Library of Congress, and other universities. The letters of commitment demonstrate the strong partnerships to implement the project. On pages 17-19, the applicant provides a rationale for selecting the project partners and thereby provides a context for the project activities. Moreover, the application has indicated working the four high-need school districts to draw teachers from institutions with high rates of low income students. The application has thus clearly indicated working with some partners for the grant.

(iii) The project is developed on strong research-based practices with an underlying theoretical framework of "organizing instruction and study to improve student learning" (Pashler, Bain, Bottge, Graesser, Koedinger, McDaniel, and Metcalfe, 2007), as espoused by the logic model provided on page 4, and discussed on pages 19-20. The application discusses project instructional components such as use of multiple representations, learner controller multimedia and hypermedia, using a universal design of blended learning in the context of the project and supported by past research. For instance, the use of hypermedia is supported by Dede (2006) as an effective method to enable learners to focus on learning as well as the data itself which is a major focus of history. On pages 22-23, the applicant has provided a research support for critical project instruction components such as collaborative learning, and links between curriculum, assessment, and professional-learning decisions in the context of teaching specific content.

Weaknesses:

(i), (ii) & (iii) No weaknesses noted.

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 application has provided a detailed discussion on how the project will work with the Kentucky Educational Developmental Corporation to serve approximately 6,036 students who are high-need because of obstacles such as homelessness, foster care status, disabilities, and English Language Learners (page 24). The application has demonstrated the needs of the target school students as the target schools have low proficiency scores in social sciences, especially among low income students and their performance levels compared to state levels. For instance, except for Bell school county, in each of the other four counties, the low-income students perform lower than their state counter parts among both elementary and middle school students (pages 25-26). The application has justified the need for professional development by highlighting target school issues such as instructional problems, high teacher attrition, and lack of adequate teacher preparation. On pages 29-30, the application has substantiated these issues.

(ii) The application has addressed the question of magnitude of results in the context of project objectives (pages 31-34). For instance, the second objective of increasing student achievement in American history civics, government and geography has a potential to improve students' academic knowledge and retention and will also impact their college and career readiness potential. The project outcomes are provided as increase in knowledge and outreach in measurable terms, that enables to assess the magnitude of the potential impact of the project.

(iii) The application has discussed adequate methods of project dissemination (pages 34-35). The application will use the Training-the-Trainers model that will allow these individuals to offer on-the-job/just-in-time training to their colleagues. The strategies such as teachers sharing new methods of teaching and learning and replication through the district, use of standards-based American History, and presentations at local, state and national conferences will help in potential dissemination. The Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (KEDC) will disseminate consistent information and expectations to all stakeholders beyond the project participants. The project will also create and use standards-based online classrooms that will be accessible for interested parties.

Weaknesses:

(i), (ii) & (iii) No weaknesses noted.

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 application has provided a well-structured plan to implement the project (pages 35-39). The application has discussed clearly the roles of the project director, evaluator, and project coordinator. For instance, the project director directs all program activities and services, while the project coordinator is in charge of recruitment of teacher participants and coordinates for college students (page 37). The project will have an advisory council that includes representatives of partners and ensures the fidelity of implementation and establish policies and procedures (page 35). The applicant has sound procedures for appropriate fiscal controls and documentation of project activities (page 36). The application has also provided an effective timeline to implement the project (pages 27-39). The timeline provides clear milestones and the roles of the partners in the project.

(ii) The application has discussed sufficiently the time commitments of the project director and project coordinator (page 37, and pages 40-41). The project director is at 0.33 FTE and is overall responsible for the project administration and a part of the advisory council. The project coordinator is a full time employee and is mainly involved in recruitment activities, scheduling the professional development with schools, and is in charge of the project implementation. The time commitments of the project administrative staff are adequate to plan, organize and implement the project.

Weaknesses:

(i) & (ii) 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 application has indicated that a qualified contracted evaluator will evaluate the project (pages 37 and 41-42). This provides a helpful combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation support to the project (page 42). For instance, the evaluation will combine the quantitative data of the teachers in their pre and post assessment of professional development and the impact on students' academic achievements. The qualitative data will consist of structured interviews and classroom observations. The application provides guiding evaluation questions and the major benchmarks to assess the questions, the proposed methods for assessment along with clear outcome measures. For instance, the question of assessing the extent to which the project will help in infusing professional learning community, the project will use data of the extent of peer coaching and the teachers' professional growth, gathered in a time-bound fashion (pages 43 to 46). The project evaluation plan is thus well-developed.

(ii) The application has indicated a brief plan to collect feedback data (pages 46-48). The project evaluator will meet with the advisory council quarterly during the year and will allow the advisory council to review the data and activities. The application has indicated the use of a decision-focused model where objective data, including GPRA will help in formative evaluation. The application has provided a detailed plan to collect GPRA data that may be used as an aspect of formative evaluation.

Weaknesses:

(i) No weaknesses noted.

(ii) The project feedback mechanism is limited to project evaluation data and input from members of the advisory council. However, the application has not provided specific methods to gather feedback from teachers who are recipients of the

professional development. For instance, it is unclear how the project participants will be able to provide feedback about various project activities beyond structured interviews.

Reader's Score: 23

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 has adequately addressed competitive preference priority through the following strategies (pages 2-3):

- (a) The application has indicated the use of high-speed internet access by providing participants with Chromebooks to create digital projects, participate in GOOGLE classrooms, participate in online classes of History, and share documents.
- (b) The application will use content learning tools that are aligned to Common Core Rigorous standards. For instance, the project participants will participate in iLEARN digital local history project and teachers will also receive online professional development from the Library of Congress to assist in CCR skills.
- (c) The project will implement high quality accessible online courses by using micro-credentialing, and allow participants with shorter program and specific skills development. The project will develop online modules to help the participants.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/15/2017 02:23 PM