

EED Renewal Technical Review Form

US Department of Education

**Division of Effective Educator Development (EED) Grant Review
2021 AHC-NA Renewal
Application Technical Review Form
(CFDA 84.422B)**

Applicant Name: AKEDC Project CHARGE, KY	Application Number U422B180027
---	-----------------------------------

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
A. Quality of Evaluation Plan	25	25
B. Quality of the Project Design	25	24
C. Strategy to Scale	25	25
D. Adequacy of Resources	25	24
Selection Criteria Total Score	100	98

A. Quality of Project Evaluation (up to 25 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.
- (2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25_

Strengths: #1

- Charge describes detailed plans and methods they will use in year 4 and 5, to determine continued significant improvements in teacher and student content knowledge such as pre/posttest measures aligned with CHARGE training syllabus/activities with at least 50% of its questions based on the validated test of American History AP College Board exams.
- Activity objectives are clearly stated as well as coherent performance measures leading to the further progress outcomes to sustain the training program (pp.38-40).
- The project will increase teacher knowledge in traditional early social studies content with exposure and in-depth study provided through Encounter Session presented by National Council for History Education activities with content and student centered teaching strategies.
- An outside evaluator and the Advisory Council using the decision-focused model, will meet quarterly during the school year to review formative and summative data, discuss ways of improving activities that did not meet expectations and revise activities according to feedback statistics (chart p.42) from participants so that mid-course revisions can be made.

Strengths: # 2

- (2) The grant clearly identifies quantitative and qualitative evaluation data that will be collected and reported to the Advisory Council and to the evaluator quarterly as indicated in the *Performance Measures and Outcomes* chart p.46-48 which ensure program implementation and integrity as intended by project staff.
- Quantitative evaluation data includes teacher pre/posttest, teacher survey data, student interest data, student pre and posttest content data and workshop evaluations/participant attendance.
- Qualitative data collected includes structured interviews with CHARGE participants, classroom observations, Lesson plan/DBQ reviews and activity logs created by participants and principal walkthrough review and PD plan quality.

Weaknesses: None**B. Project Design (25 points).**

The Secretary considers the quality of the proposed project design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 24__

Strengths: #1

- The KEDC content in the project design focuses on K-8 teacher participants and the years 1619-178 (*Creating and Defining a Nation-chart p.30*) and 1784-1877 (*Preserving and Redefining a Nation chart-p.30*) which addresses the need for strengthening teacher history and civics background (many teachers completed less than 3 college history classes) in the subjects they teach in K-8 classrooms (p.22).
- Students will participate in Capstone Projects and participate in KY KUNA and National History Day projects which helps build future replication and national exposure.
- Teachers will complete *Historical Encounter Sessions*, (32 hrs.) and 12 hrs. of online courses which are offered throughout the school year in both face-to-face meetings and web/online format and recognizes flexibility needs due to COVID.
- Non-Evaluative classroom walkthroughs by administrators and online observation data collection by teacher mentors will effectively enable administrators and program staff to see day to day workings of the classroom and give teachers and students an opportunity to shine
- **Strengths # 2.**
- Each summer, "Summer Colloquiums" will provide an understanding and application of traditional American History, Civics and Government content through exposure to rare documents, primary sources and historical lectures, travel to unknown destinations through virtual trips with Google Expeditions and Virtual Reality Goggles as well as teacher training in practical classroom and online application (p.26) which will greatly benefit teacher technology needs and will be available on the website and available after federal funding.
- The Colonial Williamsburg Institute in year 4 and the Historical Field Institute in Gettysburg and Philadelphia in year 5, will offer teachers an a relevant educational experience and address the inadequacies they indicated in their historical knowledge when surveyed (pp.30-34) with a clear timeline of expectations and outcomes.
- The use of Training of the Trainers model using master teacher mentors to train colleagues will build capacity for expansion after federal funding.

Weaknesses:

- 2.1 and 2.2 Coherent Performance Measures chart indicates students of participating teachers will increase their scores on NAEP released questions in American History, Civics, Government and Geography in year 4 by 10% and year 5 by 15% but the assessment may are not age appropriate for grades K-3th and can be improved with more clear alignment with the state standards for those grades (p.39).

C. Strategy to Scale (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the strategy to scale for the proposed project. In determining the strategy to scale for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.
- (2) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

(Maximum Charge Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25_____

Strengths: #1

- Charge staff will follow the CHARGE PLC model on p.51 which was successful in years 1-3 and can be replicated in a variety of settings with a variety of populations by following the same teacher-centered collaborative activities.
- Collective results of studies (chart p.52) show that well-developed PLC's have positive impact on teaching practice and student achievement, and the National Evaluation Group will continue to provide the random-matched comparison in years 4 and 5 to continue success provided in years 1-3 of proposal.

Strengths #2

- To disseminate Project Charge strategies, the staff will work collaboratively with project teachers, the Evaluator, and targeted schools' students to contribute what they have learned from this experience to their peers in the fields of American History, Civics, Government and Geography in proposals to scholarly publications which will begin in year 4 to present national/regional conferences in other schools and districts across the country.
- Charge staff will expand the number of participants at the summer Field Institutes and expand training dates as well as online training modules to enable others to participate alongside participants online and in PLC's (p.59)

- The project team will provide access website online materials developed for the CHARGE project at no cost and include DBQ's Google Virtual Tours etc.

Weaknesses:

- None

D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

(2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 24___

- **Strengths: #1**
- Virtual classrooms, DBQ projects, GOOGLE Certification, collegial networking, Kagan Learning, KDE Online modules, Podcasts and online virtual sessions (provided by KEDC and partners) are all products that can be used in perpetuity. P.60)
- On-going collaboration, improved professional development models, pedagogy changes based on research-based practices, new curriculum strategies and changes in knowledge, attitudes and behavior will contribute to sustained impact. P.62
- Partners have demonstrated specific commitment after funding ends for future impact (see chart p.60-61) and in letters of support in (appendix).
- **Strengths #2**
- KEDC will provide the necessary resources to ensure the continued success of project after federal funding ends such as continued administrative support, website monitoring, provide offices, classroom space, professional development and facilities for regional workshops.
- Historians have provided a replicable product to share by recording lecture sessions and discussions which will be placed on the CHARGE website and historians will be available to answer questions and provide feed-back on research-based pedagogy strategies for classroom implementation (p.55).

- The Systemic Change chart (p.63-66) provides evidence on how project CHARGE would use renewal funding to develop or enhance capacity in the key areas (human, material, structural, and organizational) at little cost to future districts.

Weaknesses:

- Numerous support letters for Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (KEDC)'s resubmission for the U.S. Department of Education's *National Activities Grant Program*, Project Title: Civics History through Advanced Research and Geography Education (C.H.A.R.G.E.) are repetitive and without detail as to why and how they will continue to support the program.

EED Renewal Technical Review Form

US Department of Education

**Division of Effective Educator Development (EED) Grant Review
2021 AHC-NA Renewal
Application Technical Review Form
(CFDA 84.422B)**

Applicant Name: Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (KEDC)	Application Number U422B18
--	----------------------------

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
C. Quality of Evaluation Plan	25	25
B. Quality of the Project Design	25	25
C. Strategy to Scale	25	25
D. Adequacy of Resources	25	25
Selection Criteria Total Score	100	100

A. Quality of Project Evaluation (up to 25 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.
- (2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25_

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides a thorough method of evaluation plan designed to determine the effectiveness of the implementation of the proposed project strategies. The applicant carefully describes their formative evaluation plan that allows for adjustments of project tasks, schedules, allocation of resources, and other management decisions. The applicant will continue to use a quasi-experimental, matched comparison group design and use multiple sources, mixed methods and statistical tests to measure progress toward meeting the established outcomes. The results to date have demonstrated moderate evidence of effectiveness. The applicant has and will continue to collect both qualitative and quantitative data (e43-e46). A robust logic model connecting the rationale to the goals, objectives, activities, and outcomes is also evident in the application (e24). The applicant has also mapped an effective continuation evaluation plan, highlighting the major benchmarks, to outcome measures and data collection timeline (e44-e45).

2. The applicant provides clear evidence of methods of evaluation that include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the proposed project. The evaluation methods noted will yield quantitative and qualitative data. For example, the applicant indicates that the summative evaluation will be consistent with the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy and the formative evaluation will assess implementation fidelity as well as teachers' attitudes about the project (e47-e51). A clear mapping of the quantitative and qualitative data to key questions and major benchmarks and outcomes measures is provided in the narrative (e47-e51). For example, the applicant will collect data from observations and analysis of teacher lesson plans, pre-post-test increases, teacher activities on CHARGE website and social media and pre-post-interest surveys (e47-e51).

Weaknesses:

1. None noted
2. None noted

D. Project Design (25 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the proposed project design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25__

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides solid evidence of a project that is appropriately designed to be replicated. They have also clearly articulated detailed evidence on the effectiveness of their approach. For example, the applicant shows success of the CHARGE program throughout years one to three (e21). They will continue to offer professional development to teachers in k-8 to strengthen their knowledge of American History, Civics, Government and Geography. Through the inclusion of capstone project-based activities, teachers will gain a broader perspective of these topics. As a result, they will develop an open educational resources center website providing instructional sources to include standards-based lessons, Historical Encounter session videos with history professors, and primary source links to research based historical activities that will be available online through an interactive interface to share materials with others. These activities have proven successful in the previous years. Additionally, the applicant will develop professional learning opportunities that relate successful practices for college and career readiness. They will be able to disseminate the same information and expectations to all stakeholders as they relate to current accountability systems. A clear outline of activities and timeline are also provided in the narrative (e22-e36).

2. The applicant provides solid evidence that the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield positive results that will extend beyond the period of the grant. Through the use peer coaching with-in learning communities and the train-the-trainer model the applicant will provide opportunities for participants to share new methods of teaching and learning American History, Civics, Government and Geography and replicate them for other educators throughout their district. Additionally, lessons and activities developed will be available for all educators use on the CHARGE website. The applicant also has an advisory council in place to monitor progress ongoing and to ensure that project activities are able to be replicated (e36-e40).

Weaknesses:

1. None noted
2. None noted

C. Strategy to Scale (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the strategy to scale for the proposed project. In determining the strategy to scale for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.

(2) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: __25__

Strengths:

1. The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings with a variety of populations is appropriately noted in the application. For example, the applicant indicates the evaluator will measure programmatic implementation and fidelity by monitoring training attendance records, staff/student performance, and student participation rates. Further, the applicant clearly indicates that evaluators will use five dimensions (adherence,

exposure, quality of delivery, participant responsiveness, and program differentiation) to measure the implementation of fidelity (e53). All data will be disaggregated and program activities will be comprised of the most promising based on results (e53).

2. The applicant appropriately describes the mechanisms that the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication. For example, the applicant proposes to work collaboratively with project teachers, the evaluator, and their targeted schools' students to contribute what they learn from this experience to their peers in the field (e54-e55). They will develop publications to scholarly journals and present findings at national and regional conferences to promote success to other schools (e55). A plethora of opportunities to publish and present in journals, conferences and for organizations are identified for publication, presentation and collaboration in the narrative (e55-e61).

Weaknesses:

1. None noted
2. None noted

D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.
- (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25

Strengths:

1. The applicant provides strong evidence of continued support of the project after Federal funding ends. For example, the applicant notes virtual classrooms, DBQ projects, GOOGLE Certification, collegial networking, Kagan Learning, KDE Online modules, Podcasts and online virtual sessions (provided by KEDC and partners) are all products that can be used in perpetuity. Other appropriate partnership commitments are also evidenced in the narrative (e60-e61).

2. The applicant clearly notes evidence of the potential for the incorporation of project activities at the end of project funding. For example, the applicant notes they are committed to providing administrative support, technology integrated support, website, office and classroom space, and professional development facilities for regional workshops. The applicant also notes evidence of human capacity, organizational capacity, structural capacity, and material capacity (e64-e67).

Weaknesses:

1. None noted
2. None noted

**Division of Effective Educator Development (EED) Grant Review
2021 AHC-NA Renewal
Application Technical Review Form
(CFDA 84.422B)**

Applicant Name: KEDC Project CHARGE	Application Number U422B180027
---	-----------------------------------

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
E. Quality of Evaluation Plan	25	25
B. Quality of the Project Design	25	24
C. Strategy to Scale	25	25
D. Adequacy of Resources	25	25
Selection Criteria Total Score	100	99

A. Quality of Project Evaluation (up to 25 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.
- (2) 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.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25

Strengths:

- 1) The applicant has detailed an evaluation plan that will allow for examining the effectiveness of project strategies. Both formative and summative assessments in a quasi-experimental design with a matched comparison group will be utilized. This design should provide a moderate evidence base for determining effectiveness of strategies. (e42) An impact study will measure effects of project activities on student achievement and confidence. An external evaluator will provide evaluation guidance, face-to-face and from a distance, by attending meetings, workshops, and providing summary reports.
- 2) The applicant has presented clear objectives aligned with measurable performance indicators and indicators of progress. (e39-41; e46-51) Charts of major benchmarks, outcome measures, and a data collection timeline were provided to outline the evaluation plan. (e42-45) Both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected and analyzed by the evaluator. Dissemination of analyses will be available in monthly reports, and quarterly reports to the Advisory Council and the U.S. Department of Education. (e45-46)

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses cited.
- 2) No weaknesses cited

F. Project Design (25 points).

The Secretary considers the quality of the proposed project design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 24

Strengths:

- 1) The applicant has provided a solid overview of successes and needs for improvement in the initial funding cycle. The intent is to continue the project as previously planned to deepen social studies knowledge and skills on the part of the elementary teachers. A couple of new activities will be added that are based on teacher feedback from the initial project. Evaluation using a quasi-experimental approach with a matched comparison group strengthened the applicant's ability to show a causal relationship between practice and results. (e22-36) The design of the renewal grant mirrors the initial proposal by utilizing effective strategies such as Historical Encounter sessions, technology enhancements, and professional learning communities to support the teachers' professional development. The extended knowledge gleaned should guide possible replication for the future.
- 2) A detailed Logic Model was provided to show the overall methodology of the project. (e24) This organization coupled with a strong evaluation plan should build capacity and yield results beyond the funding period. In addition to the professional development received, participating teachers and others will have access to an Electronic Resource Notebook which will help ensure replication and sustainability. (e28) Other areas within the proposal that will guide capacity and

sustainability are the use of a training-the-trainers model and a peer-coaching model within professional learning communities. (e36-38) An advisory council in place to monitor project.

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses cited.
- 2) The content to be utilized in the training sessions is presented at a teacher's instructional level and often does not align with the standards for primary students. The application would be strengthened by providing specific examples of how the knowledge and skills gleaned from training will be utilized to prepare lesson plans that reach students at grade appropriate levels. (e21; e33-40)

C. Strategy to Scale (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the strategy to scale for the proposed project. In determining the strategy to scale for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.
- (2) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25

Strengths:

1. The applicant has supportive data to show that the results of the first three years of the project has yielded strategies that are appropriate for replication. Strategies from the initial project will be utilized with additional teachers to test the replicability. The addition of new strategies and venues for teachers will provide them with the hands-on experiences previous teachers have requested in the project. The random-matched comparison model will be continued in years 4 and 5 to support the successes of the initial project and continue to validate findings. (e3-21; e51-53)
2. The applicant has provided several avenues of dissemination. State education agencies will promote the project on their webpages. Presentations and publications showcasing replicability at local, state, and national venues will be provided by project staff, teachers, and the external evaluator. In addition, recorded sessions will be posted on the project and historical site websites and a colloquia will be supported by the National Council for History Education. (e54- 61)

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses cited.
- 2) No weaknesses cited.

D. Adequacy of Resources (up to 25 points).

The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.
- (2) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

(Maximum Points 25)

Reader's Score: 25___

Strengths:

- 1) Potential exists for continued support of the project post-funding. Teachers and administrators have been trained in strategies such as walkthroughs, PLC's, and peer coaching. (e62-64) In addition, several commitments have been secured that will assure future positive impact. For example, the National Council for History Education will provide memberships to participants, several national groups have pledged to provide access to webinars, workshops, institutes, etc. Partnerships forged will continue as evidenced by letters of commitment from partners and a memorandum of agreement from the National History Museum. (e60-61; 87-113)
- 2) The potential does exist for the incorporation of project purpose, activities, and benefits beyond the life of the grant. Systemic change will be evidenced through such activities as training of teacher leaders, wide-spread dissemination, and sharing of resources with partners. Recorded sessions, evaluation instruments, and workshop protocol are in place. A large cadre of teachers are now trained in the technology and pedagogy of online learning and field-based experiences. The applicant institution has pledged administrative support, technology-integrated support, website use, office space, and professional development facilities for regional workshops. (e64-68)

Weaknesses:

- 1) No weaknesses cited.
- 2) No weaknesses cited.