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

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Council for History Education (U422B170026)
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: National Council for History Education (U422B170026)

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 proposes a program called Project LEAD in Osceola, Florida train 75 teachers and ultimately impact 40,000 K-12 students. The applicant will make use of on-line and face to face sessions using a colloquium model developed under funding from a FIPSE grant, which brings together a historian and a classroom teacher. The applicant clearly defines the underserved students to which it will impact as those who are below the poverty level. The applicant will make use of learning communities and will shift the focus of the content delivered each year. Partners include the Library of Congress, the Bar Association and the University of Florida. The applicant cites 2 recent studies, one by Guskey and other from the Center for Public Education, to support their proposed project.

   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 applicant clearly indicates the magnitude of the project, as they propose to serve 8,000 students per year and increase ability of teachers to create curricula. The applicant also aims to improve student test scores through better trained teachers, further indicating the project's impact. The applicant has conducted a needs assessment which indicated that 56.4% of history teachers were not certified to teach history and that only 3% are National Board Certified in History, among other factors. The applicant will disseminate the result of the project through in-person presentations at

local and national conference as well as on-line.

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 applicant has a long history of managing previous projects of similar scope. The applicant will establish an advisory council which will include project staff, teachers, the project evaluator, and partner staff, among others. The time commitment of staff is appropriate and includes a full-time coordinator. The applicant's timeline is broken down by month and includes establishing the first-year professional development by November 2017. The applicant also provides a continuous feedback improvement flowchart.

   Weaknesses:

   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:

   The applicant evaluation plan provides for qualitative measures including classroom observation and quantitative measures including teacher pre and post-activity assessments. The timelines for data collection are clear as are the persons responsible. The applicant has identified an external evaluation. The specific instruments and data sources, including test data and course syllabus, are detailed.

   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:

The applicant includes that each teacher will receive a touch screen laptop to allow them easy access to online learning opportunities. The applicant will align the activity content with Florida state standards and teachers will receive digital badges for demonstrating competency in content areas.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/17/2017 02:37 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Council for History Education (U422B170026)
Reader #3: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Quality of Project Design		35	33
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	23
	Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority			
1. CPP		10	10
	Sub Total	10	10
	Total	110	105

Panel #4 - Civics Panel - 2 - 7: 84.422B

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

Applicant: National Council for History Education (U422B170026)

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 proposal targets 40,000 high-need K-12 students in Osceola County where 81% of the student population qualifies for the free/reduced lunch program (p3)—thus aligning with absolute priority (1).

   The proposal takes into consideration that high-need schools are the schools who can least afford to have teachers out of class and/or the schools where finding quality substitutes can prove difficult. The project addresses that concern by providing a mix of face-to-face interactions—on weekends and during the summer months, when possible—with blended learning opportunities. (p. 4, 9)

   The inclusion of a logic model provides clarity to the project's vision, short-term, long-term and overall impact. (p. 5)

   The blended learning approach (face-to-face PD balanced with online virtual PD) has been supported by research to provide the greatest benefit for learners (K-12 through adult).

   The focus on teacher/participant created lessons encourages buy-in among participants and values their content expertise. (p. 9-10)

   The project includes strong partnerships from local, state and national level and all of which have previously partnered on successful grants. The commitment from the Osceola County school district strengthens the proposal. (p. 7-9)

   This proposal relies and builds upon other NCHE funded projects. For example, the proposal integrates NCHE's 2016 Teaching with Primary Resources Grant from the Library of Congress. Connections such as this solidify the strength of the proposal partnerships. The Library of Congress is one of the partners for this proposal. (Abstract & p. 7)

   The project proposal provides rationale for levels of partnerships and explains how each partnership is relevant. This supports the ways that partners can specifically be effective within the confines of the grant requirements. For example, the proposal considers partnerships that provide support in the areas of higher education, history/civics historians and historical sites. (p. 15-16)

   NCHE's Colloquium Model has been in use for many years; more importantly, the model has survived the test of time and remains an effective, research-based approach that aligns to today's methods and strategies.

   The integration of the following elements reflects the project designers' emphasis on integrating not only technology-based, digital learning concepts but also up-to-date knowledge of effective practices: graphical presentations, real-world

scenarios, interactive technologies, game-based learning, and collaborative learning. (p. 17-19)

The project's emphasis on research based strategies and its integration of ESSA legislation lends credence to its claims of up-to-date research-based and evidence-based alignment. (p. 21)

Weaknesses:

The overview (p. 4) lists each content focus as being applicable for grades K-12. However, many of these concepts do not seem grade appropriate for lower grade levels. For example, the concept of judiciary power and World War studies would not be grade appropriate for primary students. The chart (p. 12) does delineate for Year 1, but only Year 1, between Grades K-5 and Grades 6-12.

The project does not count for student attrition within the project.

Reader's Score: 33

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 proposal aligns the ways that the competitive priority (high-speed internet access and educator access to digital tools) will enhance the over grant's overall effectiveness. This explicit identification of links between digital tools with educator effectiveness and learner skill advancement strengths the proposal. (p. 22)

In addition, the writers specifically address the challenges of the ESL population (over 59% are Hispanic and the overall student population represents 101 different languages), the proposal acknowledges challenges yet also clarifies ways to address those challenges using test scores to validate the need for more advanced and effective instructional strategies. (p. 22-25)

The project developers have reviewed needs SPECIFIC to the Osceola district. They have studied data and analyzed the credential status of teaching staff. For example, more than half of those currently teaching history lack certification. Of those who are certified, only 3% are National Board Certified. These data points, along with others embedded in the proposal (p. 25), demonstrate the project's potential to significantly affect the quality of instruction. Furthermore, each of the district's schools readily admit that American History/Civics/Geography are short-changed when it comes to addressing the potential of increased student achievement. (p. 25) As a result, it is reasonable to conclude that an increase in address historical thinking skills along with other relevant historical strategies could lead to a significant increase in educator confidence and resulting student achievement. (p. 25-27)
Furthermore, by addressing apparent gaps in professional development, the project planners are able to identify the areas that need to be targets. (p. 28-29)

By addressing needs based on data, the project is able to identify objectives, performance measures and progress outcomes. (p. 31-32)

The proposal integrates a train-the-trainer model that relies on teachers passing on what they've learned. While no model

guarantees effectiveness, the train-the-trainer model provides potential. A challenge could be teacher turnover at the identified high-risk district; however, the proposal does address that by providing consistent dissemination of information, expectations, resources (including teacher-created online classrooms), and a "robust" OER website. (p. 33-34)

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 inclusion of the Advisory Council (AC) with representation from teachers and evaluators helps to guarantee the success of the project within its time constraints. (p. 35) The AC will serve as a timekeeper of sorts—making sure that identified tasks are completed.

In addition, the AC will help to identify content adjustments based on feedback from participants and their own observations. These are elements that project staff may miss. (p. 35)

Pages 36-37 provides descriptors for project staff. Based on these descriptors, it's reasonable to conclude that staff members carry the content expertise and/or professional experience needed to carry out the proposal's activities and to meet goals and objectives and will be overseen by a full time project director. Furthermore, and timelines seem reasonable given the identified responsibilities and experiences of staff. (p. 36-38)

The inclusion of monthly AC meetings in year one followed by quarterly meetings in subsequent years indicates a recognition by staff that year one is likely to be considerable more labor intensive than years 2-5. (p. 40-41)

Weaknesses:

The project is written with a five year focus and the recipient of this grant is only guaranteed three years (with an option of two additional years as determined by USDOE). It is unclear how the project could be fully completed in three years, if awarded a three-year grant.

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:

Although not required, the applicants have chosen to use an outside evaluator. The evaluator, Tom Mills of the National Evaluation Group, was selected in order "to maintain fidelity and objectivity." (p. 47)

A balanced approach of quantitative and qualitative feedback (p. 41) will help ensure that implementation is going as expected.

Specific and clear performance measures and outcomes will guide the evaluation plan and are clearly explained on p. 42-43.

The continuous flow feedback chart, located in the previous section demonstrates the role that timely feedback will play in the project's ongoing development.

The plan clearly lists benchmarks, outcome measures and timelines—all of which provide a clear picture of the evaluation plan's structure. (p. 46-47)

Weaknesses:

Since the AC is meeting monthly during Year One, it would be beneficial if they could receive feedback and other applicable information from the evaluator. However, the evaluation plan only includes feedback at quarterly AC meetings. (p. 42)

The plan descriptions of the evaluators meetings with the AC are confusing and seem to conflict with the information on p. 42. From page 46: "The evaluator will meet monthly with the Advisory Council quarterly during the school year and then quarterly during after Year One of the project." Along the same lines, p. 49 confirms that the reports are developed monthly but will be shared on a quarterly basis. While there might be a good reason for this, the plan does not explain why.

For the purposes of this grant, it seems like in-person meetings by the evaluator with the AC would be most beneficial. The grant proposal is vague on this element noting only that he will meet with the council either in person or via video conferencing. (p. 47) Then on page 48, the plan indicates he will sometimes meet by phone instead of in person or via the web.

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 proposal addresses a, b, and c and provides specific services (via a graphic on p. 4) that delineate where and when activities and events will occur that align with this competitive priority. Throughout the proposal, digital learning, blended learning, OER et al are integrated into activities and lessons.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: **10**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/18/2017 11:03 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: National Council for History Education (U422B170026)
Reader #1: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of Project Design	35	30
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	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority		
1. CPP	10	10
Sub Total	10	10
Total	110	105

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Civics Panel - 2 - 7: 84.422B

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

Applicant: National Council for History Education (U422B170026)

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 provides a detailed plan to address the need for classroom teachers to improve their knowledge of social studies and to improve their strategies to increase student learning (p. e34). To ensure that the professional development will result in improved instructional practice, the applicant breaks down the services into multiple components: in person institutes focusing on evidence based instruction, access to web based tools and curriculum, field experiences, on line webinars, and curriculum writing (p. e24-e32). All are described as intense with role playing and continuous feedback. The applicant provides research findings that support the effectiveness of the approach proposed in the project. The proposed approach draws on a variety of partners, including the University of Florida, the Library of Congress, historians, authors, and organizations (p. e35-e37).

   The logic model, presented on page e23, supports the project design and the evaluation. It maps out and supports the proposed activities and the long and short-term outcomes.

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant did not include a plan for teacher attrition. The proposed project relies heavily on multi-year teacher participation.

Reader's Score: **30**

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 presents a proposed project that has a high potential for having both short and long-term impact on improving classroom instruction and improving student achievement (p. e62-e63). Measurable goals are identified for each aspect of professional development.
There is a strong likelihood that teaching strategies will be revised to reflect the varied concepts presented by intense professional development and if teachers effectively apply the peer coaching strategies at their school site (p. e65).

The applicant's dissemination plan is very likely to impart the knowledge gained in the participant's local school district through the train the trainer strategy, and possibly shared at local and national conferences. This strategy supports the belief that teacher buy-in will continue the implementation of the teaching strategies included in this proposal (p. e66). Teachers will also have the opportunity to share their knowledge through teacher created lessons on an OER website and through presentations at the NCHE national conference (p. e66). The strongest component of the plan is the creation of open education resource lessons and dissemination of results.

Weaknesses:

None 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 applicant presents a detailed management plan. The management timeline includes dates, tasks and delineates responsibility for the key staff and their time commitment (p. e68-e71). In addition, the applicant plans to utilize an advisory board that plans an appropriate schedule to ensure the adequate progress of the project. The advisory board will meet quarterly to review the status of the goals and outcomes (p. e73).

Weaknesses:

None 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 applicant presents a well-defined plan for evaluation (e59-e67). The evaluation will use both qualitative and quantitative data as defined in the table on page e59. In addition, the plan is further supported by well-articulated performance measures, presented in table form that include the major benchmarks, evaluation method to be employed, the measure, and timeline (p. e80-e51)

A preliminary evaluation plan is provided in Table 10 (p. e54-55). The table aligns the evaluation questions to the measures to the data to be collected and provides a timeline for data collection.

The applicant plans for periodic performance feedback enabling the management team to improve the project (p. e52).

The applicant adequately addresses reliability of data in a discussion regarding data sources (p. e53-54).

Weaknesses:

None 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 applicant proposes to combine in person professional development with online sessions. The applicant proposes to provide participants with laptop computers and train them to access and participate in webinars, use Library of Congress digital tools to create interactive and engaging lessons and to use research based video games as learning tools for students (p. e31).

Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 10

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/15/2017 05:08 PM