American History and Civics Education National Activities Program
2021 Competition Review

(CFDA) 84.422B

Applicant Geo-Civics(Arizona)	Application Number U422B2021 _ _ _

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
A. Quality of the Project Design	30	26
B. Need for the Project	20	20
C. Quality of Management Plan	20	18
D. Quality of the Project Evaluation	30	30
Selection Criteria Total Score	**100**	94
Competitive Preference Priority #1	5	5
Invitational Priority #1	Yes/No	Yes
Invitational Priority #2	Yes/No	Yes
Total	**105**	99

Part I. Selection Criteria

A. Quality of the Project Design (30 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. 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 demonstrates a rationale.

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(Maximum Points 30)   Reader's Score: _____

Overview:

The applicant proposes a project design that demonstrates a rational for funding and implementation. The various instructional approaches and strategies employed are based on evidence-based practice and grounded in socio-cultural and curriculum theory. (e18) The Absolute priority is addressed by applying ELs linguistic skills in developing academic content knowledge in diverse student populations. (e54) GeoCivics develops, implements, expands, evaluates, and disseminates teacher PD in the areas of American History, Civics and Government, and Geography.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i) The applicant demonstrates a clear rational for why the project should be funded. The Logic Model (e19) includes all program objectives, resources, activities, and outputs. It also indicates the short-term, mid-term and long-term outcomes and impacts including the identification of instruments for measurement or documenting each outcome. (e63) The goals, objectives, and outcomes are included in Table 1 (e23). Each year 10 teachers will participate in online PD training and bring new knowledge to an average of 35 students from culturally diverse districts. The impact on teachers and students will increase each year. Goals 1-4 are the primary focus of the grant. (e23) Creative and research-supported approaches are used to develop, deliver, and disseminate effective GeoCivics technology based online PD and classroom lessons. GeoCivics will evaluate the goals, objectives, and outcomes each year. (e23)

(ii) The project goal is to improve Civics, American History and Geography competency, leadership abilities and student achievement in culturally and linguistically diverse populations in both Arizona and across the America. By

developing a design plan to implement teacher PD education using digital resources, and GeoCivics lesson plans as outputs, educators will further equitable educational opportunities in classrooms of local high needs districts. (e11)

Weaknesses:

(i)   The objectives included in the logic model do not address how teachers will be selected (application process) or what tools will be used to assess that teacher requirements are met in the classroom. All student lessons and PD training will be online and face time, but no details are provided as to time commitment. There is missing in the plan interaction and collaboration with other online teachers. The applicant does not comprehensively state how participants will be prepared to teach students using academic rigor and how this will be evaluated. e35)

B. Need for the Project (20 points)

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i)   The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

(ii)   The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

(iii)   The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(iv)   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.

(Maximum Points 20)   Reader's Score: _____

Overview:
The applicant demonstrates a need for the project and the problems to be addressed. Activities are outlined in the grant that will address weaknesses in current services. The project is appropriate to and will address the needs of the target population of ELL students and their teachers who present Civics, American History and Geography in those classrooms.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i)   Geo Civics will support teachers who work with culturally and linguistically diverse student populations by growing them as teacher leaders through professional development coursework. (p.35)
(ii)   A summary of most recent data indicates students are performing at below proficient rates in Arizona and across the country although statistical data is not included in the grant. (p.35)
(iii)   The KUSE pre-assessment application for the GeoCivics grant-funded program will be used to select teachers who teach ELL students who have the greatest needs. Teacher perspective is considered in the assessment and will guide development of PD content and approach to American History, Geography, Civics and Government classes. (e100)

Weaknesses:

None

C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

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 adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(Maximum Points 20)   Reader's Score: _____

Overview:

The management plan described by the applicant is adequate to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. There is a timeline based on a once a semester meeting over three years or twelve meetings in three years. Three years. the roles for key personnel are defined and a timeline indicates benchmarks to be met each semester over three years if grant is funded.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i)   Charts and timelines are provided as well as resumes and duties assigned to each member of the management team. (e39-50)

(ii)   The applicant uses adequate management activities that will yield periodic assessment of progress toward the intended outcomes like teacher surveys and self-assessments. Pre and posttests will be developed to measure language acquisition content and skills presented in the face-to-face and online pd. (e.52)

Weaknesses:

There are none noted.

D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (30 points)

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

(i)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (10 points)

(ii)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in this notice) about the project's effectiveness. (10 points)

(iii)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies. (5 points)

(iv)   The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings. (5 points)

(Maximum Points 30)   Reader's Score: _____

Overview:

The applicant presents a comprehensive evaluation plan that allows for continuous monitoring and collection of qualitative and quantitative data. Summative and formative feedback will measure the intended outcomes of the project.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i)   The methods of evaluation are appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the
         proposed project.
         and data will measure the intended outcomes of increasing the level of teacher and student
         knowledge of
         history and civics and geography. This information will provide valuable feedback as to whether
         the participants develop and use provided strategies and technology tools.
(ii)   The content knowledge of instructional materials will be tested on diverse student population
         with high needs.
(iii)   Feedback and data will be used to measure and substantiate claims for closing achievement
         gaps. (e45)

Weaknesses:

None

Part II. Competitive Preference Priority

Competitive Preference Priority 1: Innovative Activities for Civic Engagement (Up to 5 points).

Under this priority, projects that include one or both of the following--

a) Hands-on civic engagement activities for teachers and students; or

b) Programs that educate students about the history and principles of the
     Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights.

Overview:
The Competitive Preference Priority is addressed through Goals 1 and 3 and GeoCivics has developed and implemented innovative activities for civic engagement. Hands- on civic engagement activities have been developed for teacher professional development and for implementation in their classrooms. (e34)

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

(i)   Strengths: These activities are modeled, designed, and implemented to educate students about GeoCivics including the history and principles of the Constitution of the U.S. including the Bill of Rights. (e34)

Weaknesses:

None

Part III. Invitational Priority #1

Invitational Priority 1: Projects that Incorporate Racially, Ethnically, Culturally, and Linguistically Diverse Perspectives into Teaching and Learning. (Yes/No).

Projects that incorporate teaching and learning practices that reflect the diversity, identities, histories, contributions, and experiences of all students and create inclusive, supportive, and identity-safe learning environments that--

(a) Take into account systemic marginalization, biases, inequities, and discriminatory policy and practice in American history;

(b) Incorporate racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse perspectives and perspectives on the experience of individuals with disabilities;

(c) Encourage students to critically analyze the diverse perspectives of historical and contemporary media and its impacts;

(d) Support the creation of learning environments that validate and reflect the diversity, identities, and experiences of all students; and

(e) Contribute to inclusive, supportive, and identity-safe learning environments.

Overview:

Geo Civics and the trained classroom teachers will create projects that will reflect the marginalization, biases, and discriminatory policies in American history and will support the creation of learning environments that validate and reflect the diversity, identities, and experiences of all students.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

Invitational Priority 1 is addressed through Goal 4 whereas teacher leaders from underrepresented populations are supported throughout Goals 1-3 to not only improve teacher pedagogy and student engagement, but to bring culturally and linguistically diverse perspectives to the social studies. The priority is met through the creation of history, government, civics, and geography learning environments that validate diverse and ensure inclusive learning spaces. (e34)

Weaknesses:

None noted

Part III. Invitational Priority #2

Invitational Priority 2: Promoting Information Literacy Skills (Yes/No).

Projects that foster critical thinking and promote student engagement in civics education through professional development or other activities designed to support students in-

(a) Evaluating sources and evidence using standards of proof;

(b) Understanding their own biases when reviewing information, as well as uncovering and recognizing bias in primary and secondary sources;

(c) Synthesizing information into cogent communications; and

(d) Understanding how inaccurate information may be used to influence individuals, and developing strategies to recognize accurate and inaccurate information.

Overview:

GeoCivics will use the Arizona Geographic Alliance (AZGA) model that provides effective PD and supports teachers in creating standards-based literacy lessons for diverse learners. (e12)

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

Geo Civics and teacher designed lessons will provide an all-inclusive learning experience for students to develop social studies knowledge, academic vocabulary, and literacy skills using evidenced-based approaches to teaching diverse and underserved student populations. ASU will leverage strong partnerships with local school districts that have large EL populations., GeoCivics will partner with teachers from underrepresented populations to participate and develop, collaborate, and create knowledge in the areas of American history, geography, civics, government through online modules and lesson

Weaknesses:

None

American History and Civics Education National Activities Program
2021 Competition Review

(CFDA) 84.422B

Applicant	Application Number
Geo-Civics(Arizona)	U422B2021 _ _ _

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
A. Quality of the Project Design	30	28
B. Need for the Project	20	20
C. Quality of Management Plan	20	20
D. Quality of the Project Evaluation	30	30
Selection Criteria Total Score	**100**	98
Competitive Preference Priority #1	5	5
Invitational Priority #1	Yes/No	yes
Invitational Priority #2	Yes/No	yes
Total	**105**	103

Part I. Selection Criteria

A. Quality of the Project Design (30 points)

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

(iii)   The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.

(iv)   The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(Maximum Points 30)   Reader's Score: _____

Overview:
The applicant recognizes a need for a dynamic cross-curricular approach to teaching English Language Learners literacy skills. The proposed project draws upon successful evidence based studies where geography is taught in tandem with math and science. The applicant proposes to utilize the study of geography as a vehicle for students to learn about American history and civics. The logic model demonstrates a well thought out design plan (e19). Applicant will use technology to support learning instruction as previous studies determined that ELLs learn better when computer simulations are used to support instruction (e22).

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

i)   The applicant draws upon two actual geo-literacy studies that were successful in the area of science content knowledge and academic vocabulary (e20, e21).

ii)   The applicant has planned for this project to perform and complete an analysis of how the PD process of training teachers to be project leaders trains them not only to lead in the current project, but also ultimately has a long term effect of empowerment in general. This process has the intention of leading them to take on additional roles in other projects. This study will be conducted by partners who have experience from previous projects to assist with best practices in developing teacher leadership in the area of Geo-Civics (e22). The design is extremely organized with intentional goals, objectives and outcomes (e23-e25). There will be a control group that will be comparatively matched with teacher participants by years of experience, teaching the same grade level and school demographics (e52). The recruitment

applications and collection of data to ensure proper matching can be seen in the submitted forms (e94-e107).

Weaknesses:

The applicant proposes three major goals in their project design. One of these goals is to leverage technology in order to support instructional practice (e19). The applicant proposes to work with Title 1 schools (e20) yet has not planned for the possibility of these schools not having adequate technology to handle this project

The applicant has not planned for Title 1 schools not having adequate technology to handle this project. (e20)

B. Need for the Project (20 points)

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(v)   The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

(vi)   The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

(vii)   The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

(viii)   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.

(Maximum Points 20)   Reader's Score: _____

Overview:
The applicant has laid out the severity of the problem through citing study results showing significantly lower academic scores of the English Language Learners versus the non-ELLs, particularly since the year 2000, when the mandated English only educational policy went into effect. The applicant reveals that there have been several studies that show a dearth of teachers who are able to meet the needs of ELLs. For example, they cite a 2015 United States Department of Education publication that

revealed teachers expressed a lack of training and preparation to meet their needs. (e35 and e36).

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

      Applicant has stated that they have the highest number of ELLs in their state and just when they were finally having some success in using certain research based pilot programs from 2018 thru 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic arrived and has forced them to rethink and regroup and use a more technology driven curriculum that also has a well-researched foundation, one that is evidence based and one that has been successful. (e37)

ii)   GeoCivics has designed a curriculum with the goal of increasing student civic engagement through a hands on technology driven program that challenges students to analyze in socio-economic problems that exist in their respective communities. By tasking them with real world civic activities such as petitions, work projects, letter writing, speeches, etc. students will be motivated to form and support their opinions by using real world evidence. (e35)

iii)   ELL learners have a significantly lower graduation rate than non-ELLs (e36). The applicant cites a number of studies that reported a significant disparity in achievement levels in reading (e36), and seeks to raise these scores through this project. The applicant has a proven track record for supporting teachers with instructional materials and developing teachers' content knowledge through other projects they have created. Examples of this include GeoLiteracy (e14-15). Research on the GeoLiteracy program showed that they were successful in promoting significant growth in language development and reading comprehension scores (e15). The GeoCivics project proposes to meet the need for civic education while developing geographic understanding (e15). reading (e36), and seeks to raise these scores through this project. The applicant has a proven track record for supporting teachers with instructional materials and developing teachers' content knowledge through other projects they have created. Examples of this include GeoLiteracy (e14-15). Research on the GeoLiteracy program showed that they were successful in promoting significant growth in language development and reading comprehension scores (e15). The GeoCivics project proposes to meet the need for civic education while developing geographic understanding (e15).

Weaknesses:

None noted

C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(iii)   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.

(iv)   The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

<div align="center">(Maximum Points 20)   Reader's Score: _____</div>

Overview:

The applicant has laid out very clear goals as well as a system of communicating with management personnel. There is also a system in place that will utilize available technologies to support instructional practice through data collection and analysis to guide informed-based decision making to improve teachers level of content knowledge and skills and to improve student achievement. In Objective 5c the project proposes to develop a free, university supported website that will document and disseminate qualitative data in the form of teacher leader stories (e32).

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

i)   The management plan is very organized and demonstrates clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, for accomplishing project tasks to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. This is laid out in the charts and includes lead teacher responsibility as an integral part of achieving teacher and student outcomes (e39 thrue45). The team has a wealth of experience in STEM plus Social Studies. Time management and goals are realistic within budget (e109-e120).

      The roles and responsibilities located in the charts also lay out who communicates what to whom (e39 thrue45). A more detailed bullet point description is located (e 46 thru e50

Weaknesses:
None note

D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (30 points)

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

(v)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (10 points)

(vi)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence (as defined in this notice) about the project's effectiveness. (10 points)

(vii)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies. (5 points)

(viii)   The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings. (5 points)

(Maximum Points 30)   Reader's Score: _____

Overview:
The outcomes will be measured via a pre-post survey as well as focus groups and interviews. AZGA will conduct the research with the teacher participants, and the teachers will conduct the research with their students. E32

The process for each objective will be evaluated for implementation and effectiveness. Both summative and formative assessments will be administered and overseen by credible staff. They will monitor outcomes regarding the progress levels of teacher and student knowledge of skills and content in American history, geography and civics(e19).

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

i)   The summative evaluation will investigate whether program participants developed and used strategies, technology tools, and instructional materials for improving knowledge

and skills in GeoCivics as well as supporting ELs linguistic skills in developing academic content knowledge in diverse student populations (e54).

ii)   There are charts that express measurable goals and basic timetables. (e54-e58).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Part II. Competitive Preference Priority

Competitive Preference Priority 1: Innovative Activities for Civic Engagement (Up to 5 points).

Under this priority, projects that include one or both of the following--

c) Hands-on civic engagement activities for teachers and students; or

d) Programs that educate students about the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights.

(Maximum Points 5)   Reader's Score: _____

Overview:
There are hands on civic activities built into the curriculum through the resources aforementioned. Both the Logic Model on (e19) as well as in the narrative on (e14) address both the details of the curriculum "hands-on activities" as well providing training for these activities during Professional Developments.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

a) The hands on activities shown in the Logic Model on (e19) are grounded in evidence-based research. The applicant reports research regarding GeoCivics lessons that were given to students within their GeoLiteracy program. The study found that students who received lessons that integrated geography lessons with reading and writing scored significantly higher in reading performance (e20).

b) The applicant has created 30 - 50 lessons that support the teaching and learning of the history and principles of The United States Constitution and Bill of rights (Objective 2, e19). The applicant guides teachers the development of technology-supported civic action projects for their classrooms (e24).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Part III. Invitational Priority #1

Invitational Priority 1: Projects that Incorporate Racially, Ethnically, Culturally, and Linguistically Diverse Perspectives into Teaching and Learning. (Yes/No).

Projects that incorporate teaching and learning practices that reflect the diversity, identities, histories, contributions, and experiences of all students and create inclusive, supportive, and identity-safe learning environments that--

(a) Take into account systemic marginalization, biases, inequities, and discriminatory policy and practice in American history;

(b) Incorporate racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse perspectives and perspectives on the experience of individuals with disabilities;

(c) Encourage students to critically analyze the diverse perspectives of historical and contemporary media and its impacts;

(d) Support the creation of learning environments that validate and reflect the diversity, identities, and experiences of all students; and

(e) Contribute to inclusive, supportive, and identity-safe learning environments.

Overview:

Objective 6 clearly states the intention to support underrepresented teacher leaders in GeoCivics self-study to improve teacher pedagogy and student achievement (e48). By

the very nature of this grant, this priority is answered as ELLS are an underserved population.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

The applicant's Goal 4 focuses their recruitment efforts on increasing the number of culturally and linguistically diverse teacher leaders in the areas of American history, geography, civics, and government. The applicant's goal is to locate and recruit these teachers who already work with diverse learners in Title I schools and who have common experiences as the students they work with (e33).

Weaknesses:

None noted

Part III. Invitational Priority #2

Invitational Priority 2: Promoting Information Literacy Skills (Yes/No).

Projects that foster critical thinking and promote student engagement in civics education through professional development or other activities designed to support students in-

(a) Evaluating sources and evidence using standards of proof;

(b) Understanding their own biases when reviewing information, as well as uncovering and recognizing bias in primary and secondary sources;

(c) Synthesizing information into cogent communications; and

(d) Understanding how inaccurate information may be used to influence individuals, and developing strategies to recognize accurate and inaccurate information.

Overview:

There is a pathway for the EL student to read primary sources. The applicant particularly addresses this in the content objectives in the Logic Model (e19). The

applicant has secured content resources partners that are credible through their relationships such as National Geographic.

Supporting Statements:

<u>Strengths:</u>

In the Logic Model, the applicant clearly addresses content as well as content objectives that foster critical thinking. Objective 3 (e19) utilizes university and content experts as resources as evaluation sources.

Biases are addressed. The applicant does make an effort to engage STEM teachers from diverse backgrounds (e14).

<u>Weaknesses:</u>

None noted

(CFDA) 84.422A

Applicant	Application Number
Geo-Civics(Arizona)	U422A2021 0 0 8

Summary Ratings		
	Maximum Points	Score
A. Quality of the Project Design	30	27
B. Need for the Project	20	20
C. Quality of Management Plan	20	20
D. Quality of the Project Evaluation	30	30
Selection Criteria Total Score	**100**	97
Competitive Preference Priority #1	5	5
Invitational Priority #1	Yes/No	Yes
Invitational Priority #2	Yes/No	Yes
Total	**105**	102

Part I. Selection Criteria

A. Quality of the Project Design (30 points)

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

(v)   The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale.

(vi)   The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

(Maximum Points 30)   Reader's Score: ___27____

Overview:

The application presents an excellent project design. The applicant presents a strong rationale for the proposed project which incorporates geography, civics, government, and English-language arts to support culturally- and linguistically relevant curriculum for students (pg. e12). The activities and project implementation provided in the application provide an excellent approach to the priorities for this competition.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

The applicant is utilizing GeoCivics which will be developed from the education initiative from the Arizona Geographic Alliance (pg. 12). The applicant and its partner AZGA have a history of evidence-based design and delivery of teacher professional development programs, such as GeoMath, GeoLiteracy, GeoSTEM, and GeoHistory (pp. e14-15). The proposed 4 project goals are high quality and comprehensive to demonstrate the project's effectiveness (pp. e15-16). The program will develop social studies GeoCivics teachers who will create content areas using real-world experiences to be made free and online (pg. e16). The teachers will then craft individualized PD programs to assist other social science educators while creating 3-5 history- or civics-focused lessons that will be culturally inclusive (pg. e16). The applicant's logic model on page e19 is detailed and identified clear deliverables and intended measurable impact. The evidence-based project activities will meet the proposed impact and 4 program goals as outlined starting on page e20. On page e54, the project indicates that periodic and summative assessments will measure the impact on content knowledge for diverse student populations.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not clearly identify who the target audience is other than a discussion in the evidence for middle school grade range (pg. e21). The applicant is clearly interested in student populations who are racially and linguistically diverse (as mentioned over 138 times in the application), however, there are no specific strategies that address how those target groups will be engaged or specifically address. The application could be stronger by addressing which specific activities they will use to engage marginalized student groups.

B. Need for the Project (20 points)

The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(ix)   The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project.

(x)   The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

(xi)   The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.

(Maximum Points 20)   Reader's Score: __20_____

Overview:

The application identifies exemplary evidence for the need of the project. The applicant identifies specific gaps in the current civics and history instruction and how the proposed project will build on similar efforts by AZGA to improve outcomes. The applicant's design and activities will successfully address the needs of the target population.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly identifies through numerous evidence sources and citations the need of the student population, especially with the reduction of reading time for social studies, lack of critical thinking, and quality ELL instruction. The project is built on the success of other AZGA initiatives such as GeoSTEM, GeoMath, GeoHistory, and GeoLiteracy (pg. e14-15). The project will integrate English-language arts, history, civics, and government with hands-on engagement activities (pg. e35). These activities address the critical need identified in the application.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

C. Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(v)   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.

(vi)   The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(Maximum Points 20)   Reader's Score: _____20__

Overview:

The management plan outlined in the application is excellent. The management plan is iterative and thus provides numerous opportunities for feedback and continuous improvement of the project activities (pp. e38-45). The application management plan completely addresses the alignment of clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones that will ensure the project objectives are completed on time and within budget.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

The detailed timeline for the grant activities and implementation is provided on pages e38-45. It clearly aligns the tasks with the timeline for implementation. The requested funding is for the salaries of the management team and numerous project activities. The budget seems reasonable to support all grant activities. The project personnel are summarized, and their specific responsibilities are clearly outlined starting on page e46. The project personnel are highly qualified to contribute to this project. The iterative, continuous feedback loop presented in the evaluation plan will provide ample opportunities for management team to review the data and make project adjustments as needed.

Weaknesses:
No weaknesses noted.

D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (30 points)

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

(ix)   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.

(x)   The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(Maximum Points 30)   Reader's Score: __30_____

Overview:

The applicant presents an exemplary evaluation plan that will meet the WWC standards with Reservations (pg. e53). The evaluation includes qualitative and quantitative data that will inform the regular feedback for the project and contribute to the summative effectiveness report. These data sources and analysis are clearly related to support the achievement of intended outcomes.

Supporting Statements:

<u>Strengths:</u>

The project short-term and long-term outcomes are all measurable and will contribute to the project continuous feedback and summative evaluation (pp. e53-54). The Logic Model presented on page e19 aligns the project design and outcomes to clearly address the evaluation plan. The timeline demonstrates adequate time for project leaders to reflect on data and analysis for the documentation of progress towards project outcomes. The timeline also allows for ample opportunity to adjust the project based on formative feedback.

<u>Weaknesses:</u>

No weaknesses noted.

Part II. Competitive Preference Priority

Competitive Preference Priority 1: Innovative Activities for Civic Engagement **(Up to 5 points).**

Projects that include one or both of the following:

▪ Hands-on civic engagement activities for teachers and students; or

▪ Programs that educate students about the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights.

Note: The Department recognizes that the National Park Service Centennial occurred in 2016, and that consequently it may not be feasible to coordinate activities with this initiative. However, applicants can address this priority by proposing to develop innovative and comprehensive programs using other resources of the National Parks.

<div align="center">(Maximum Points 5)   Reader's Score: _____</div>

Overview:

The applicant's GeoCivics project presents an exemplary address to this priority. The proposal includes hands-on civics engagement projects and activities.

Supporting Statements:

Strengths:

GeoCivics uses a problem-solving approach that culminates in student action, such as letter writing, petitions, work projects, and speeches (pg. e35). Additionally, on page e23, the applicant outlines an objective that will develop hands-on, content-based language instruction with effective ELL strategies through the teacher-lead lesson development.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Part III. Invitational Priority #1

Invitational Priority 1: Projects that Incorporate Racially, Ethnically, Culturally, and Linguistically Diverse Perspectives into Teaching and Learning. (Yes/No).

Projects that incorporate teaching and learning practices that reflect the diversity, identities, histories, contributions, and experiences of all students and create inclusive, supportive, and identity-safe learning environments that--

(a) Take into account systemic marginalization, biases, inequities, and discriminatory policy and practice in American history;

(b) Incorporate racially, ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse perspectives and perspectives on the experience of individuals with disabilities;

(c) Encourage students to critically analyze the diverse perspectives of historical and contemporary media and its impacts;

(d) Support the creation of learning environments that validate and reflect the diversity, identities, and experiences of all students; and

(e) Contribute to inclusive, supportive, and identity-safe learning environments.

Overview:

The applicant provides a limited address of this priority that incorporates diverse perspectives into teaching and learning. On page e12, the GeoCivics program seeks to expand PD for teachers to address culturally and linguistically diverse student learning (Goal 3) and increasing the number of culturally and linguistic teacher leaders in civics and American history (Goal 4).

Supporting Statements:

<u>Strengths:</u>

The application states that the GeoCivics program has goals to expand PD for teachers to address culturally and linguistically diverse student learning (Goal 3) and increasing the number of culturally and linguistic teacher leaders in civics and American history (Goal 4) (pg. e12).

<u>Weaknesses:</u>

No weaknesses noted.

Part III. Invitational Priority #2

Invitational Priority 2: Promoting Information Literacy Skills (Yes/No).

Projects that describe how they will foster critical thinking and promote student engagement in civics education through professional development or other activities designed to support students in--

(a) Evaluating sources and evidence using standards of proof;

(b) Understanding their own biases when reviewing information, as well as uncovering and recognizing bias in primary and secondary sources;

(c) Synthesizing information into cogent communications; and

(d) Understanding how inaccurate information may be used to influence individuals, and developing strategies to recognize accurate and inaccurate information.

Overview:

The application minimally addresses this priority. There is the mention of past projects involving English-language arts in the application as well as the emphasis placed on reading in social studies, however, there is no description of the activities that would promote and foster critical thinking around the topics.

Supporting Statements:

<u>Strengths:</u>

Past projects focused on ELLs and GeoLiteracy that incorporated reading into the curricula (pgs. e14-15, e20-21). There is a need stated in the evidence on the importance for critical thinking and reading within social science topics (pg. e35).

<u>Weaknesses:</u>

No weaknesses noted.